

MEETING OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

REGULAR MEETING

November 2, 2005

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, November 2, 2005 in the County Commission Meeting Room in the Courthouse in Wichita, Kansas, by Chairman David M. Unruh, with the following present: Chair Pro Tem Ben Sciortino; Commissioner Tim R. Norton; Commissioner Thomas G. Winters; Commissioner Lucy Burtnett; Mr. William P. Buchanan, County Manager; Mr. Rich Euson, County Counselor; Mr. Randy Duncan, Director, Emergency Management; Ms. Jo Templin, Director, Division of Human Services; Mr. Glen Wiltse, Director, Code Enforcement; Mr. Ron Holt, Assistant County Manager; Mr. Ray Vail, Director of Finance and Support Services, Department on Aging; Ms. Kathy Sexton, Assistant County Manager; Mr. Jerry Phipps, Purchasing Agent, Purchasing Department; Mr. David Spears, Director, Bureau of Public Works; Ms. Iris Baker, Director, Purchasing Department; Ms. Kristi Zukovich, Director, Communications; and, Ms. Lisa Davis, Deputy County Clerk.

GUESTS

Ms. Lori Usher, Workforce Development.

Mr. Kenton Cox, Representative, Schaefer, Johnson, Cox & Frey.

Ms. Shannon Bowe, Schaefer, Johnson, Cox & Frey.

Mr. Pete Gustaf, Executive Director, Kansas Technical Training Initiative, Inc.

Ms. Sally Dewey, Andale High School.

INVOCATION

The Invocation was led by Pastor Rick Cline of Central Church of Christ, Wichita.

FLAG SALUTE

ROLL CALL

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

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES: Regular Meeting, October 12, 2005

The Clerk reported that all Commissioners were present at the Regular Meeting of October 12, 2005.

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

Chairman Unruh said, "Commissioners, you've had an opportunity to review the minutes of the October 12th meeting. Are there any additions or corrections?"

MOTION

Commissioner Sciortino moved to approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of October 12th, 2005.

Commissioner Burtnett seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Commissioner Norton | Aye |
| Commissioner Winters | Aye |
| Commissioner Burtnett | Aye |
| Commissioner Sciortino | Aye |
| Chairman Unruh | Aye |

Chairman Unruh said, "Next item."

NEW BUSINESS

A. WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.

1. PRESENTATION REGARDING KANSAS TECHNICAL TRAINING INITIATIVE, INC.

POWERPOINT PRESENTATION

Ms. Lori Usher, Executive Director, Workforce Development, greeted the Commissioners and said, "As you know, KTTI was created in 2001 as an answer to the local aviation industries need for developing skilled workers to support the ongoing needs of our largest employment cluster, manufacturing. Having accessed the needs of numerous stakeholders concerned about technical education and training, KTTI has developed a concept for a world-class technical education and training campus.

The Sedgwick County Technical Education and Training Authority has seen the presentation and

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

endorsed the campus concept. This concept would create an integrated flexible system that is affective in providing training services in response to the ever-changing needs of the business community, while simultaneously creating high quality programs and facilities which appeal to a wide range of potential students.

Here to provide you an update is Pete Gustov, Executive Director of KTTI.”

Mr. Pete Gustaf, Executive Director, Kansas Technical Training Initiative Inc., greeted the Commissioners and said, “I’d like to thank you for the opportunity to present our campus concept plan. As you know, the aviation companies and Cowley County Community College has put some funding together for us to do this study. We got approval from the city council to go ahead and proceed with the study and today we’re going to unveil some of our thoughts and ideas.

We have listened to stakeholders, almost 30 stakeholders: OEMs, aircraft OEMs, Tier I and Tier II suppliers who supply the OEMs and listen to their thoughts and what they see for their future and what their present needs are and how we can work together to create opportunity for our citizens here to get trained into an aviation-type career.

We also traveled throughout the country. I know some of the commissioners traveled with us to Montreal, Commissioner Norton, and we did go up to Montreal, Canada and see their outstanding system of technical training for aviation companies. We visited two or three sites and a couple of companies, a manufacturing training center and an aviation training center and aviation training A & P type center.

We also went to Sioux Falls to look at a campus plan. We looked at the latest A & P school that was built in Council Bluff, Iowa, had a tour of that facility. We also went to Hartford, Connecticut and to the Pratt and Whitney Customer Service Center and looked at their training system and they had an outstanding school. We also looked at Tulsa, Tulsa Tech.

So today, we’re going to present you with a concept plan that we put forth. We went to, so far, the airport authority. We also went to and presented to the Technical Education Training Authority, the KTTI Board and yesterday we presented it to the city council. And today we’re trying to update you on where we’re at and what we’re finding out.

I’d like to introduce some of the folks that are here: Mike Gerrmann from my KTTI Board is here and the representatives from the stakeholders group, John Oswald from the airport and Sarah

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

Gilbert, also from the World Class Implementation Team that works on this project, every week we meet, Eric Sexton is in the back and Vera Baughner. And we'd also like to thank Lori Usher for her help and support with what we've been doing. So with that, I'm going to introduce the architects, Kent Cox from Shaefer, Johnson, Cox and Frey is going to present what we've discovered so far."

Mr. Kenton Cox, Representative, Shaefer, Johnson, Cox & Frey, greeted the Commissioners and said, "We have a copy of our PowerPoint, which I'll go ahead and give to you. This is Shannon Bowe, and I'm Kent Cox and I think you know Joe Johnson, who will be here in just a second. We welcome the opportunity to present to you our work so far. We've been working for a couple of months now and looking at what a new aviation-training center could be and through that process, we have first of all, tried to listen to our stakeholders, and as Pete indicated, we've talked to a variety of companies, from almost 30 different organizations in our community to try to get an idea what an aviation facility could be, what kind of goals and objectives they would have.

We've also tried to look at what would be in it, what kind of spaces would we need to provide that kind of education and then the third thing which we will show you is preliminary concept designs of how those goals and objectives and space needs would be put into an actual facility.

And just, we've kind of summarized a few of the goals and I think we probably all agree with this one, that we want a facility that would be considered world class. Now, what do we mean by that? Well, what we really mean is that it's not just a regional facility. It would be a facility that would be recognized around the country and when folks were talking about A & P education and technical education, it would come to mind Wichita's facility, Sedgwick County's facility and that would be one that would be referred to.

We also feel like, and from our stakeholders believe that the building itself can really attract students, so we want a facility that, by its design, would attract students. It would be a place they would want to go and the programs within that facility would be the kind of programs that would attract students and so they could build a profession right here in Wichita and Sedgwick County.

The other major goal in the development of the facility and the running of the facility is that it simulate the work environment, that it be a hands-on, real world facility. So when students come in for education, they would be in the same environment that they would experience in the aviation industry or other industry. And also that the equipment, the current equipment that we have would not be outdated, that it would be up to date and we would really look to our aviation industry to help us here with making sure the equipment we use would be up to date.

And then finally, we design for the future, we'll make projections of what we think we could be today, but we certainly want to make sure that the design allows for changes and future explanation. I'm going to let Shannon Bowe now talk just a little bit about the program, some of those spaces

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

that would be included.”

Ms. Shannon Bowe, Representative, Shaefer, Johnson, Cox & Frey, greeted the Commissioners and said, “As Kent and Pete mentioned, we did meet with over 25 stakeholders and we took all the information that they gave us and asked them a lot of questions to develop this program and really, we’ve developed into five different categories. The first one is A & P, that’s airframe and power plant and you can see the spaces, hangar of 16,000 square feet. To put that into perspective, the current hangar that they’re using out at the Cessna plant is about 6,000 square feet, so we certainly increased that space. We also looked at some other facilities around, as Pete mentioned, what size their hangar was. As you can see, we adjusted accordingly.

A couple of the other large lab spaces, the airframe lab and the power plant lab, then also spaces that would support the entire program, electronics lab, weld shop, computer labs, non-destructive testing labs. We also have battery rooms, solvent rooms and other associated spaces, again to support these.

Along with this, we’d have general classrooms for some of the bookwork that is required for this program and then some common spaces for administration and then just general support and I’ve listed a couple of those spaces. One would be a commons cafeteria. This is 4,000 square feet. This would be a multi-use space, flat floor that could be used for cafeteria, for students eating, but also could be set up for career fairs or exhibits or maybe there’s some Olympic type spaces that come in for students, but anyway, it’s a multi-type space that would be available for use.

Adjacent to this space is a lecture hall with seating for 200 and Ken will show you plans for that. The next group would be assessment and career development, and you can see that this would really have a computer testing room, again for assessing students as they come in, to see what skills that they have and what they may need and what program would work best for them and then also multi-purpose testing rooms, 12 of those rooms that could be set up as testing rooms, as classrooms, as seminar rooms, very flexible spaces so that different testing could happen in those spaces.

I didn’t mention, the A & P program is set up to accommodate 250 students for day and 250 for night. Then the avionics program, you’d see we’d have a lab and a classroom that is set up to have 50 day and 50 night students, that’s really two spaces and that program is also being taught by Cowley in Sedgwick County here.

Then another space would be the manufacturing and we’ve got a lot of input from the stakeholders on manufacturing and this tends to keep growing over time, as we identify different labs that need to be included. You can see, in the types of labs that are listed here, composite, lab materials and testing, some of the computer labs, CAD and CATIA, large industrial technology labs, those are

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

flexible spaces that maybe we need to bring specific pieces of equipment in to do some training for customers for maybe 10 weeks or 16 weeks, but those can be set up, of a lot of electrical in those spaces, compressed air, etcetera, but very flexible spaces and then C & C and welding labs, so a number of labs in manufacturing.

Also associated with that would be some general classrooms. We have six total for any work that needs to take place, not in a lab setting. And then the last area we identified is aircraft interiors, again this is designed for 50 day and 50 night students and you can see the number of spaces, three, that would accommodate those students.”

Mr. Cox said, “If you put the service side and the production side together, we’re almost 200,000 square feet, with the spaces that Shannon has identified, with the A & P portion being about \$110,000 of that total, so about half of the facility and we’re going to talk to you a little bit now about the actual concept of the facility. I’ll use my cursor here, this is basic, at Jabara, you can see the main runway, we’re looking from the north looking south. The main outbuildings, you can see on to the south and then T-hangars a little bit farther to the north.

We had about 32 acres of land that we’ve identified as the potential location of the first phase of our construction and that is basically in that treed area, you can see just north of the T-hangar, about a 32-acre tract of land, south of 43rd Street. There’s, you know, additional acreage on to the north, should additional expansion be necessary or other buildings be contemplated in the future, but what you’re going to see today is basically this 32-acre tract, just west of the end of the runway and this is where we’d be connecting it onto the runway system.

We do like the location very much, because of the facility that’s already there, utilities are there and then the access to the bypass, just to the south and then Webb Road directly to our west, we feel like just really makes a great location for this facility.

The goal of the three building components, first of all we’ll talk just about the A & P school and this is a building of about 110,000 square feet. It is again a pretty simple box, as you can see, with . . . it’s kind of broken into two parts. This would be the actual, on the right side here, this would be the runway side and this is the 16,000 square foot hangar that Shannon identified, that would be basically a two-story space with two-story lab spaces supporting both sides.

In between then, is a kind of a utility core, that provides heating and cooling and ventilation and support to the hangar side and lab side, as well as then the two-story secondary part, which is our classroom portion, which you can see basically again, a simple rectangle. On the first floor is primarily classroom spaces that support the lab and the power plant and airframe programs. And then on the front of this simple box are the two more public spaces Shannon talked about. First of

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

all our cafeteria/ commons area, about a 4,000 square foot two-story space also that would have table and chairs, would be a place for students to come and gather for some lunch or snack activities or other programs.

This would be the main entrance way, coming off from the west, and then the 200-seat lecture theater is also shown coming off of the west side. One of the unique ingredients here, in addition to the capability for long-distance learning and etcetera, is the ability to bring in large equipment, for example GE, down at Strather Field, has talked about being able to come up here and set up programs for their employees, be able to bring in a large engine, right into the front of a lecture facility for demonstrations.

Go up to the second level then, again the airport side, the runway side is a two-story hangar space and lab spaces. The other portion is office space where employees and faculty, some common restroom facilities and then a lounge that actually looks down into the hangar space. And the ones that we went to visit, similar facility thought that was a very important ingredient, was being able to be up on the upper level and actually look down into the hangar space. We've also set up a couple of conference facilities in that prime location that can also look down into the hangar space. That's the A & P portion, again about \$110,000 of the total.

Directly attached to that building then would be the manufacturing facility, also shown here, the A & P school, that should be off to the left, facility offices located here, a series of the larger labs around the perimeter, with access for vehicles and deliveries and then classroom space in the center.

This is about 56,000 square feet of our total, and as Shannon indicated, as we've continued to meet, we've found more and more requirements for additional labs, so this portion actually could grow, as we continue to do our study.

And the third component would be the assessment and career development portion. It's mainly a group of classroom spaces, multi-purpose rooms that could be set up for different types of testing and career development classes, as well as a little faculty office area and then a little lobby. This would also connect onto my right, in this case going south, to the actual A & P school.

This is a little . . . beginning of our concept plan. You can see, and shown in different colors, we'll begin first of all with the aviation technology building shown in red, that 110,000 square foot facility. Hooked to that is the assessment and career development facility and then the manufacturing, technology linked together.

The manufacturing is shown so they could expand, as you can see on to the west, a large parking

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

area for around 600 cars and then also, as part of our development, we've looked at what could happen in the future, as you further develop and there's certainly room, within our 32 acreage to build additional facility onto the north of additional technical education facilities yet to be identified.

Again, we mentioned that we're directly to the runway, as you can see, this is the connection coming over from the main airfield and then this is our out space. We also have, shown in a little red space here an outside, enclosed engine testing facility, which is also very important to the development.

This is just a sketch then of what it might look like, looking from the west, from the parking area to the main entrance. Our concept here is to be technical in its nature, but also to reflect some of the Kansas heritage, so you'll for example the use of metal as a kind of screening devise and metal columns and glass and a very high-tech look, along with and at the base some limestone materials brought in to kind of reflect Kansas architecture too, so a blending of the natural and a blending of the technical and to make a facility again that would look, again technical in its nature.

Just a quick summary then, we have a site of 32 acres that we're identifying. There is much more acreage on to the north than what we've identified in that master plan right now, is using about 32 acres of the land. Our square footage, 10,000 for the aviation tech center portion, that's that red building, 56,000 for manufacturing/ technology, the yellow portion and then the assessment and career development, 24,000. Almost 200,000, I think, as manufacturing grows a little bit, we'll be right at 200,000 square feet. Also shown there are 600 cars, but the ability to expand up to about 1,100 cars in the future.

Looking at costs of again trying to look at construction maybe starting some time next year, spring or summer, so we put a little bit of inflationary cost into our estimates. We've also included the costs of driveways, parking, taxiways into the airport, the apron area, landscaping, interior furnishings. This will be loose furniture, tables and chairs, would not include the high-tech equipment, and then administrative expenses, architects fees, contingency. We've got about a 10% contingency we've included in our cost and we've also put a 5% inflationary figure into next year, so about 15% added to the cost.

This does not include the land cost. As you know, the city currently owns this land, does not include the specialized equipment, such as aircraft or parts of airplanes and those kinds of equipment items that we would expect the aviation industry to help us with on those costs.

Now let's talk about this one. As we've talked about the master plan for future development, again

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

this is the aviation and technology portion we've identified, we could also consider and we've been looking at is the possibility of these other future spaces could include the information technology portion of the technical education, it could include health technology or other identified technical education, but there is room certainly for additional technical education spaces to be added to the facility that we've talked about and then just again a close up view of that cafeteria/ commons area and what you see right here, with again the idea of some screening devices and a metal look, the use of some natural materials of stone and to make a nice blend between Kansas architecture and technical education.

That's basically our presentation, kind of a quick run through and we're now available for questions you might have about the building or about the programs and Pete, come up here and help me with the questions."

Chairman Unruh said, "Okay, well thank you Kenton, that's a good presentation and very attractive brochure. We hope we can get some reality to all this, but we do have a question/comment from Commissioner Sciortino."

Commissioner Sciortino said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I really . . . this is the type of technical training I think I can really get my arms around. I mean, you have gone out and have a well thought out plan. You've gone out to the industry and said, 'what is it you need?' and I assume you're developing a plan based on what the companies have said we're going to need today, tomorrow, five years out and I applaud your thinking on that.

I would be remiss if I didn't mention the fact that I . . . don't quote me on the times here, but it was this year, earlier this year I know Scott Schneider from the city and Andy Schlapp approached Senator Brownback and at that time they just had not just a nucleus of a concept, it wasn't a plan yet and he embraced it immediately and as I understand it, has allocated and set aside a half a million dollars toward this project and once again shown, at least to my satisfaction and I think to all of south central Kansas, his commitment to trying to ensure the fact that Wichita remains the Air Capitol of the world and he needs, I think, to be recognized for that type of effort.

I haven't heard yet what involvement you're going to maybe ask of the county. I have to assume that you're going look to us to be a partner with us in some way and I'm sure in the future you'll share that with us. But depending on how big a pill that is, I think I'm going to try to figure out how we can partner with you in some meaningful way, because this will ensure the vitality of this community and continually provide to the aircraft industry and their subcontractors the type of qualified workers that they're going to need for today and throughout the entire 21st Century.

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

I like the fact that you're thinking bigger than just Wichita/ Sedgwick County Kansas. I think what you're trying to say is if any manufacturer anywhere in the world needs trained people, why don't you send your people here and we'll train them up for you and provide you with trained personnel, and by the way, if you'd like to get closer to the training, why don't you locate your company right here. That's kind of a subtle message I hope you get across to them. Anyway, that's all I have to say. I did want to recognize Senator Brownback for his generosity and having the courage to stick his neck out without knowing the whole plan, but believe that what they said they were going to do, they did, and I applaud you for that."

Chairman Unruh said, "Commissioner Norton."

Commissioner Norton said, "Well I've been involved in this from the very beginning of KTTI, so I'm going to be very supportive of it. You know, they say you don't want to see sausage being made and I've had the luxury of watching the sausage being made, as we've tried to get to this point. I think the devil is going to be in the details, when we start working on financing as to who is going to support this and where is the money going to come from. I mean, it is, when you start talking world class and the dream of the future, it doesn't come without a price tag.

But the key here is that there is, the light plane industry and our commercial airplane industry is at a juncture where to be able to grow to survive and to flourish here, they've got to have a workforce that is well-trained and is immediate when they need it, and they've struggled with that. And this kind of facility will not only deliver those folks from an area close to us that people are qualified, but I think draw people to this area from all over a region and maybe the nation, and I think that's going to be so critical to the workforce development here for the aviation industry and other manufacturing technology type industries.

Aviation is manufacturing and we have a lot of other manufacturing industries that use AP mechanics and use a lot of the technologies that are also used in aviation. So even though we start with calling it an aviation tech center, we've already found out that some of our AP graduates go and do other things besides aviation and we're always going to fight that, and I think the only way that we'll be successful with our dream, is to build a world class campus, not just a building that can provide a little training, but a world-class campus that's going to draw the best and brightest young people, not only just kids that are smart and are college-bound, but kids that are very, very smart

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

and want to go into certain industries that they can make a very good living at, and I think this is a great step, I'm very supportive, but once again, the devil is in the details, as we get ready to swallow that tough pill of how do we figure out how to pay for it and I know you'll work hard on that soon, Pete and Lori and the Technical Training Authority will have to get very, very involved in this.

But it's not a case for me should or should we not, it's when and how quick, because we've worked on this for about four years and we're at that perfect apex that we need to say this has to be done. It's not a 'nice to have', it is a critical need in our community, so thank you Mr. Chair."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you, commissioner. Well, I would just make a comment that our involvement in economic development is not fresh to this commission. As Commissioner Norton mentioned, he's been very active in KTTI and Commissioner Winters I believe is an appointment to that. Commissioner Winters is also chair of the Economic Development Committee of the REAP organization and I serve on the Technical Education and Training Authority and Commissioner Burtnett is on the Downtown Development Corporation, so we all on this commission are very supportive of an effort towards economic development and this is a fundamental, foundational need in order to keep our economy in this area healthy, so I think you find support here for this.

One question that was asked on a trip that I took with Pete and Kenton, the question was asked of Terry Sullivan, how do you know when you get to a world-class facility? How do you know when you've got one? You know, everybody talks about that's the goal and the answer he gave, which I thought was very good, was that you have a world class facility when people are beating a path to your door to ask you what are you doing and how are you doing it, and why are you doing it and you become the standard for this training and in order to get to that point, you've got to have good programs to attract folks, and to have good programs you have to have facilities, and so I think this is the beginning point for our arrival at a world-class facility.

So beyond . . . fundamental to providing the support for our primary industry in our community, the aviation industry, is the fact that we need to have a system that will support a variety of types of training and that is truly world class and so this looks like perhaps step one to achieving that. Commissioner Norton."

Commissioner Norton said, "Well and we just talked about the aviation center, but we've had very deep talks about other technologies, computer technologies, health technologies, we've brought in all those industries to try to understand their needs. IBM has come to the table here and brought some capacity that we would have never had, if we hadn't been working hard at this, so all of these abilities to deliver technical education are going to be so critical to our community, so it's not just about aviation. That's where we kind of started, because we had four aviation partners, not just whispering in our ears, but jumping up and down and waving at us and saying 'What we've got

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

isn't working, we've got to take it to a different level if we're going to survive and have the kind of workforce that we need and have the capacity of workforce that we need, because right now all we're doing is stealing from each other, and that's not working.

We've got to be able to draw people here and train them, world class and I think we're on the verge of doing that, not just in aviation, but you see the campus starting to form and that idea of we're going to have a place where when people think about technical education in multi-state thoughts, they're going to say 'Boy, Wichita is the place to go', that's where I want to send my kids, that's where I may end up locating my business because that's where the workforce is going to be."

Chairman Unruh said, "All right, thank you. Commissioner Sciortino."

Commissioner Sciortino said, "I can't let Tim have the last word. The key to what is trying to be accomplished here is to have more companies get comfortable with the fact that we have a trained workforce so we can customize training for their work. I mean Kansas is ideally situated, south central Kansas especially. We've got ample land, we've got good resources; water, power, lights, the infrastructure is here. We just need to be able to also provide them with a trained workforce and I see about 25 or 30 young people right here that should be your first students as soon as they graduate and they can go on to have a tremendous career and stay here, because what we don't need to have happen is when our young people graduate, they don't see the potential of staying here and they move to someplace else and we've educated them and then somebody else gets the benefit of that education. This goes a long way to encouraging young people to stay in our community, to become a vibrant member of our society and to grow right here in Kansas. We all benefit if that can be accomplished. Thank you."

Chairman Unruh said, "Okay, thank you. Commissioner Winters."

Commissioner Winters said, "Thank you. I agree. I think this is a great proposal and I agree with basically everything that the other commissioners have said. The one thing I guess, and maybe this is not a good question for this time, but who do we perceive as being the backbone institution or the real . . . the mechanism here? Will it be a combination or folks? Will there be somebody that's there, standing behind the whole process, whether it be is it the city, the county? I mean, whose going to be the backbone of this proposal?"

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

Mr. Gustaf said, “Actually, we’ve had a lot of discussions regarding that. The technical training, Sedgwick County Technical Training Authority is the group that will be selecting providers for the different campuses. Whoever can provide the quality of training that we expect here that can be at the standards that are set by the training authority, they will be the ones that will be overall administering the program and the campus. That, I understand, is the commission’s intent with the creation of the authority and that’s where we’re very supportive of that.”

Commissioner Winters said, “Okay, and so KTTI then was the incubator of the creation of the idea, and that organization though will not be the focal administrator of this new aviation tech center?”

Mr. Gustaf said, “No sir, it will not, commissioner. We hope to transition over to the technical training authority when they get in a position to be able to take on some of the mechanisms that we’ve put in place to be able to organize a system that will cover our region and provide quality training for everyone.”

Commissioner Winters said, “All right, thank you very much. Thank you.”

Chairman Unruh said, “Thank you, Commissioner. Well Pete, I don’t see any more comment or question. I don’t know if there’s any more response to our comments that you want to say. I don’t want to just turn you lose, because I know you can talk a long time.”

Mr. Gustaf said, “Well, just a couple of things. We applaud the county commission and their foresight to be able to put together the training authority. We’re really pleased with the progress that the authorities come across so far and where they’re heading in the future. We’ve got actually a face now that we can call every day and talk to and Lori and I are working real close together.

And our next step, after updating you folks, is to update the business folks again, the round table folks, go back to our stakeholders one more time and then put together our financing team that we’ve already identified folks to do that, to work on different options for financing, not only the short term, the quick A & P school, which we have a need for right now, but for a long-term solution on how we can continually fund and have a revenue stream to be able to fund the different facilities in the future and fund our programs.”

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

Chairman Unruh said, “Okay, thank you very much. Commissioners, what’s the will of the board relative to this agenda item?”

MOTION

Commissioner Sciortino moved to receive and file.

Commissioner Norton seconded the motion.

Chairman Unruh said, “Thank you. Any discussion?”

Commissioner Norton said, “Is there any other actions that we will take, not at this time particularly, but at times in the future, as this comes forward? Today is just a ‘receive and file’, but pretty soon we’ll have to take more stringent action, as far as money and other things. Okay. I know there wasn’t an ‘ask’ today but there will be someday. That’s all I have.”

Chairman Unruh said, “Thank you. Was that a second? Did we get a second? Okay, thank you. Any more discussion? Seeing none, call the vote.”

VOTE

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Commissioner Norton | Aye |
| Commissioner Winters | Aye |
| Commissioner Burtnett | Aye |
| Commissioner Sciortino | Aye |
| Chairman Unruh | Aye |

Chairman Unruh said, “Thank you all for the presentation. Before we go to the next item, let me just recognize a group of folks who just entered our commission room just a few minutes ago, is youngsters from Andale High School I think. Is that right? Welcome you to our room and I know Sally Dewey coordinated this visit and Mr. Jones and Mr. Rivera are the sponsors or the chaperones, whatever the right . . . the teachers. I want to commend you all for . . .”

Commissioner Winters said, “Can we just ask Sally to come up and say something?”

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

Chairman Unruh said, "Sure. Well I really appreciate the fact you're here today. You had a big football game last night that you won and you guys are 10 and 0, right? Congratulations."

Ms. Sally Dewey, Andale High School, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Would the Andale students like to stand? They particularly wanted to see the meeting of commissioners because they've seen you on television and they wanted to see you live."

Chairman Unruh said, "Well, thank you all for being here. We appreciate it, hope you learn something. All right, thank you commissioners for that opportunity to introduce these folks and now we'll return to the agenda and Madam Clerk, next item."

2. APPOINTMENT OF KIM SHANK TO THE SEDGWICK COUNTY TECHNICAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING AUTHORITY.

Ms. Usher said, "As you will recall, the initial Sedgwick County Technical Education and Training Authority Board members were presented September 29th, 2004 to the Board of County Commissioners. The authority consists of nine voting members, and two ex officio non-voting members. Kim Shank will fill the vacancy left by Daisy Jenkins. Ms. Jenkins has relocated and resigned her commission on the Sedgwick County Technical Education and Training Authority Board.

Kim Shank is a current executive director of Wichita Clinic. Bill Buchanan, County Manager, requested her appointment to the Sedgwick County Technical Education and Training Authority Board. According to the bylaws of the authority, vacancies must be filled by the organization that made the initial nomination, until such time as an official election of board members has taken place. Kim initially began her assignment at the board meeting of the authority on Thursday, October 20th, this last week. This item is presented simply to keep you informed of leadership changes at the board level."

Chairman Unruh said, "Okay, thank you and I would just make the comment that at the first board meeting that Kim attended, she was active and engaged and I think she's going to be a very positive addition to the training authority so I'm very happy to be supportive of this. Commissioners, any other comment or discussion?"

MOTION

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

Commissioner Sciortino moved to receive and file.

Commissioner Norton seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Commissioner Norton | Aye |
| Commissioner Winters | Aye |
| Commissioner Burnett | Aye |
| Commissioner Sciortino | Aye |
| Chairman Unruh | Aye |

Chairman Unruh said, “Thank you, Lori. Next item please.”

B. PRESENTATION REGARDING COMMUNITY RESPONSE TO HURRICANE KATRINA.

POWERPOINT PRESENTATION

Mr. Randy Duncan, Director, Emergency Management, greeted the Commissioners and said, “And in response to your request some time ago, we are now prepared to visit with you about the topic of our response to get ready for potential guests for Hurricane Katrina in our area, so I’m pleased to be able to present this report to you today.

Let’s start out by taking a look at what happened, in terms of the sequence of events. The issue with Hurricane Katrina began for us on the 29th day of August when we received an initial kind of a heads-up call from a thing called the National Disaster Medical System. The NDMS is a mechanism designed to move patients who are in hospitals in disaster areas into hospitals outside of the disaster area. And the concept is to free up those hospital beds inside the disaster area for immediate needs patients.

So based on that, we began our initial medical public health department sorts of preparation issues. However, as you all are aware, the situation changed rapidly in that initial time period immediately after Katrina’s strike and on the first day of September, we were notified that you know, we may be utilizing the National Disaster Medical System transportation mechanism, but don’t count on getting hospital patients. You may be getting folks just rescued from rooftops and other areas coming in through this transportation mechanism. So we said, okay, we’ll take that information into account in our planning efforts and we’ve moved forward from there.

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

Basically, we operated our Emergency Operations Center at that point to begin the coordination activities among the various governments and agencies that would be responding to make this situation happen, should it actually materialize.

One of the things we did, initially of course, was to look at how we were going to actually make the reception and transport of patients, should we receive them through the NDMS mechanism happen.

So we had several different alternatives we were taking a look at. The first one was we might receive patients, through the NDMS airlift mechanism. The second one was we might be receiving just folks rescued from the hurricane through the NDMS mechanism, or we could be getting folks in that have relocated to Texas, by bus through a mechanism called the Emergency Management Assistance Compact, which is an agreement between the governors of the various states to help each other out in times of emergency.

So as you can see, we had a wide variety of issues that we were looking at, in terms of alternatives and a wide variety of different ways this could happen and naturally this took a lot of partnerships, both with our partners in government and non-profit and private and the community and health care.

Here's kind of an overview of who some of those key partners were. Of course, in terms of government issues, Sedgwick County and the City of Wichita, right along with Unified School District 259 and the Kansas Division of Emergency Management were the key government partners involved in making this situation happen.

On the health care side of the house, we had partnerships with the Veteran's Administration Hospital, Via Christi, Wesley, Wichita Clinic, Galichia Hospital and Hunter Health Clinic. Some of our private partners, our non-profit partners included the usual suspects, the American Red Cross and Salvation Army, plus our good friends over at United Way of the Great Plains and Catholic Charities.

And in the community, we had great, great response in partnership with the faith community, Skaer Veterinary Clinic and more volunteers than we'll ever be able to precisely put a number on. The effort going into this is amazing. So again, back to the various different things that we had to coordinate, assuming that we were going to receiving patients, forward moved through the NDMS process, that would be utilizing military aircraft and if that was the case, we would need to coordinate reception and transportation from McConnell Air Force Base to area hospitals. If they were hurricane victims coming in by military aircraft, they would also be coming into McConnell.

However, at some point in time, the Department of Homeland Security began taking over the airlift

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

process and utilizing commercial aircraft, which necessitated us including the possibility of aircraft arriving at Mid-Continent instead of McConnell and then of course there was always our other alternative, which was they might be coming by bus. So you can see, we had a lot of different alternatives to try to work out what would happen if they came in by bus or by aircraft and if the aircraft was coming into McConnell or to Mid-Continent.

Basically speaking, the most important thing to set up was medical related issues, and that was our first area of priority and concentration. So in terms of medical operations, we set up an initial triage officer and personnel that were able to respond either to McConnell or to Mid-Continent, depending upon the arriving aircraft and there were secondary availabilities set up in case of arrival by bus. We, in essence, created a clinic if you will that we could put together on almost a moment's notice and we arranged for transportation to hospitals by various different mechanisms. For example, by ambulance in case there were seriously ill personnel that came in, or by Wichita Mass Transit Authority in case there were less ill folks coming in, but still needed to be transported.

So at the receiving center, which most of you will remember was set up at the Kansas Coliseum, we had a number of services that we were going to provide for the potential guests to our community. They included the things that you see here on this particular slide, folks to help register people coming in so that we would know who was there and so that their family members would be able to locate them, because obviously that would be a matter of high priority.

We had a number of community volunteers who agreed to serve as ambassadors, to orient our guests to our community, because we are not only looking at the issue that they might be guests, but they might be transitioning into our community as well, we wanted to make them feel welcome. We needed folks to do the various things that happened, we call runners. We were even set up to take care of pet related issues, by having veterinary services available there.

In addition, we had medical operations set up. We had logistics and we had security, so that we could provide our potential guests a safe and secure environment when they arrived, after having been through the harrowing experience of a disaster.

At the Coliseum receiving center we also had some additional things set up. For example, after visiting with other states who had received relocatees, we determined that it was important to have what we call an amnesty area, an amnesty barrel for those folks who might be transporting things that would not be appropriate to be in a shelter environment. We also provided the ability to register folks utilizing the United Way of the Plains homeless management information system, which is a web-based database, thus allowing us to get that information out immediately to folks like the American Red Cross and others to help reconcile families so they could find one another.

We also provided some of the very, very basics, a secure area for pets to be treated and identified, showers, clean clothes, some basic food stuff, minor medical treatment and again, I think a key

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

element here is this series of ambassadors who would be helping to orient folks into the community, as they were being transported to the ultimate shelter area at Century II.

Here you see a photograph of the Kansas Coliseum receiving area that we had set up. This particular photograph depicts the computer area that would have been the intake, registration area, where folks would have provided the basics about who they were and where their family members were so that we could help facilitate the process of getting families that might be separated back together again.

Here's a view of some of the basics that we had set up, in terms of snacks and pop and water to hydrate the folks who we had no idea what their physical condition would be as they arrived, because the information we had ranged from the fact that they could have been hospital patients to they could have just been coming off a rooftop after a week in the hot southern sun, so we wanted to be ready, regardless of the situation.

And while all this was going on, of course there was a massive effort underway to get the shelter in place and operational, which was located in the convention center at Century II. The American Red Cross, the Fire Department and community volunteers basically prepared that facility in an incredibly short time to handle up to 1,800 anticipated guests, with potential planning factor in our mind of an additional potential 500 medical patients, if both mechanisms came into play.

So we had put in place the ability to shelter up to 23 people on a short-term basis. Our idea of short-term was we didn't want those folks to be in a congregate shelter environment for more than 30 days, and there's a very good reason for that. You need to start transitioning into more permanent housing, so that the recovery process can begin. Our friends at the American Red Cross tell us, on the day they open a shelter, the first thing they do is begin to plan to close it, because that's a sign that things are moving on toward recovery.

Also another bright, shining spot in this situation is our friends at the United Way of the Great Plains. They put together a one-stop center consisting of folks from the school systems, mental health, people who had jobs, housing, specialized needs, child care and more so that any potential survivors that came in would be able to go to one spot and access all the services that they need, rather than travel all over to get to the various different services.

Here's a photograph of one of the American Red Cross volunteers, putting kind of the finishing touches on the cots that we had prepared, through the courtesy of the American Red Cross to provide shelter for our guests.

Here's a look at the identification center that was set up inside of Century II. We were prepared and

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

ready to provide identification credentials to the folks who were in the shelter to assure that we were providing services for the folks who came in as a part of this area, and again more water. It seemed like we had enough water to hydrate a bunch of folks, and as you all are aware of when our survivors ended up not showing up, this was all transferred back to the various private voluntary agencies, so it could be utilized where it was needed.

Here's kind of a large-scale overview of the convention center in Century II showing 1,800 cots set up and ready to roll, an amazing sight for such a short period of time, to go from the idea stage to the actual implementation.

And of course, in the shelter, our friends at the American Red Cross were going to be the primary lead in terms of running the shelter and they have a lot of this stuff down. For example, here's an illustration of the shelter rules, which are available both in English and in Spanish.

So, what is it that worked well as a result of our response to Hurricane Katrina? Well, I think there are a number of things that went really well, not the least of which is we had high levels of cooperation. Why did that happen? Because when we have a situation that's a potential emergency or disaster, we simply can't have turf issues, and so we don't. We operationalized all . . . many of our plans, including the plan to receive forward-moved national disaster medical system patients. We had the resources here necessary to do the job made available to us. We set up and utilized an incident command system, in conjunction with the National Incident Management System, which is a requirement of the Department of Homeland Security. You all remember that you helped us with that, by passing a resolution in June of this year saying that that would be our response system.

We also did something a little bit new, which was the use of a joint information center and our experience with that was very positive. As a result, we were able to get unified information out to the public and status updates, a very good operation.

We also demonstrated that we had the flexibility to respond to changes that were happening in a very, very fluid situation. As many of you know, when we were coming in to do the updates and briefings, the situation would sometimes change on almost an hourly basis.

What did we learn? Well, there's some lessons to be learned out of this situation, not the least of which is we probably need a more detailed and in depth disaster reception plan, so that is now on our list of things to accomplish. We also need to understand, I think a very important issue, which is regardless of whether we're local government or private citizens, when we have an initial period of time, right after a response, probably four to 72 hours, we're going to be on our own and it's our job to make sure we're prepared to deal with that initial time until additional help gets there to help us out.

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

Another interesting lesson we learned that offers, unsolicited offers of volunteer and materials can sometimes be difficult to manage. People make these offers from the best of intentions, because they seriously want to help and be a part of the solution to the problem. Unfortunately, sometimes that creates problems in and of itself. We have learned that we need to talk about that in more detail. Another lesson learned, we need to involve our faith-based community earlier in our planning process and we need to make sure that our employees know their role in disasters and emergencies.

And another bright, shining lesson I think we learned out of this situation is the issue of technology and communication. Technology helped us do a lot of things in a very quick way, and get them done in a very efficiently and effectiveness and we also learned again the importance of communicating, not only internally, between ourselves, but externally with members of the public. What's helped us get through all of this? Well, you all remember a number of the issues that have made us prepared for this sort of thing, not the least of which is our experience with disasters. Over the last several years we've had experience with major disasters, and responded well to those. We have cooperation within our community, which I think is a key element and without that, we can't really do anything else. We have folks who are professional and committed planners and responders, and the important overarching thing is, we have the political support in terms of our elected leadership and our senior management leadership to allow us to do the things that are necessary to respond to an emergency and we're very, very grateful to acknowledge that.

So as a reminder, and in closing, getting along towards summarizing things here, one thing I would like everybody to remember, the first and most important thing you can do, as an individual, is have an emergency plan at home. Understand what you're going to do, if there is a disaster and you and your family are impacted by that, have a disaster supply kit available, because there may be a certain period of time when you may not have access to the stuff that you would on a day-to-day basis. Make sure that you have a 'Go' bag that has the critically important stuff, like water, medication, those sort of things in it, and be prepared to follow instructions and evacuate if it becomes necessary in a situation. You can find out a lot more details and information about this and you can learn how to be ready to respond by going to our website, at sedgwickcounty.org and following the appropriate links, and you can get access to a lot of information there.

I know there are probably at least a couple of other things that I ought to cover with you, regarding this situation. One of the key concerns I think was how much did it cost us to engage in all of this,

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

to put these preparations together to welcome these guests into our community and according to my conversations with Assistant Chief Financial Officer Troy Brunn yesterday, the latest accounting tally is approximately \$5,000, which is an amazingly cheap price. That's the total amount of taxpayer funds expended here at the local government level in order to do all the things that we did and accomplish all of the things that we accomplished.

And you may also recall that we're operating under a presidential declaration of emergency, which makes us eligible to reclaim 100% of those costs to our local government treasury. So on balance, I think it's fair to say that a great deal of time was expended, un-measurable amounts of talents were utilized, in terms of dealing with this, but very little treasury was utilized, so I think that is a positive situation. I'd be happy to answer any additional questions that you might have at this time, commissioners."

Chairman Unruh said, "Well thank you for that report, Randy. That was very comprehensive and my immediate reaction or response is that's a huge logistical and organizational challenge that falls under your area of responsibility but you did a great job and we're very proud of you. I kind of get the feeling that those sorts of challenges you like. I mean, you look like this has energized you."

Mr. Duncan said, "Yes, commissioner, unfortunately you're correct."

Chairman Unruh said, "But you know, I think our whole community can be very proud of our response. It was organized and it orderly and it was comprehensive. It seemed to be efficiently run and so you and your folks need to take a great deal of credit for that, but we appreciate this update to see your evaluation of the process and what you've learned and what you can build on, should this arise again. But very much appreciate your effort and we appreciate this report."

Mr. Duncan said, "Thank you, Commissioners."

Chairman Unruh said, "We do have a comment from Commissioner Norton."

Commissioner Norton said, "Just one comment. I think the mark for me was that there wasn't a sigh of relief that people didn't come. There was a disappointment that we didn't get to be a part and take care of people, with the preparation we put together and I think that's the mark of caring and preparation that I saw during this whole event, is that at the end of the day, when they didn't come, there wasn't an 'Oh, boy I'm glad we didn't have to deal with any of that'. It was 'Wow, we were ready, we were prepared, we were energized', we wanted to help our fellow Americans and it just didn't happen and I think that's a mark of what I saw at the end of the day."

Chairman Unruh said, "All right, thank you. Commissioner Sciortino."

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

Commissioner Sciortino said, “Thank you Mr. Chairman. Two things, first of all Randy, you were very . . . I’m glad you pointed this out, in any emergency or disaster, the very first responder is the individual that finds themselves in the middle of this disaster and I can remember attending meetings that we had, when we went out to the community to try to educate them that it’s going to be an period of time, maybe it’s only an hour or so, or maybe in some cases it may be days, but you have to be prepared to respond to the disaster yourself, to take care of yourself or your immediate family, until the mechanism for further help can get to you and depending on the disaster, like we saw down in New Orleans, it could be days before the machinery can get out to it, and I’m glad you pointed that out.

And I’m glad that we went out into the community and maybe we’re going to do this on an ongoing basis, to continually reinforce in the public eye that no matter how great a plan that we have, it’s going to be yourselves that you have to rely on until we can get out there to help you.

I echo what Commissioner Norton said, too. First of all, I was humbled, when we were a part of implementing this plan and getting it ready for practical application. It amazed me, I mean, how well we were ready. It seemed like every dot that we could consider or ‘t’ that we consider was either dotted or crossed, Century II was literally turned into a self-contained city: daycare, restaurants, telephone banks, computer services, job placement. I mean, we were ready to go and emotionally, my initial reaction was ‘Oh shucks, we can’t now put this plan to the trial by fire and see how it really works’. But there was a part of me, when the emotions subsided, my intellect, whatever I had left, took over. You know, long term I guess it was good that we didn’t have all those visitors here because it would have probably put some additional pressure on our social services long-term and what have you.

But yeah, the initial reaction was ‘Darn it’. It’s like an athlete, you train for the Olympics and then find out, for whatever reason, your country has boycotted the Olympics or you can’t put all that training to actual use, so that says a lot for us. I echo . . . the one thing that I wasn’t prepared for and maybe you mentioned it in your presentation, was the overwhelming unsolicited offers for help in food and clothing and I don’t think we anticipated that big of an outpouring, but we should have remembered that we’re Kansans and we’ve got a history of being very generous with our time, our talent and our treasurer when it comes to helping neighbors.

So I was humbled over this and I hope we never have to implement it, but it’s comforting to know that, like Tim says, we have a plan and it’s better to have a plan and not need it, than to need one and not have it. That’s all I have, thank you.”

Chairman Unruh said, “Thank you. Commissioner Burtnett.”

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

Commissioner Burtnett said, “Well Randy, after just real briefly just going through this nice little brochure you gave us, I noticed there’s a lot of bullets on what could we improve, so it looks like all the people that were involved have really taken the time to see, in case this would happen again, what they could improve, the lessons learned, other findings and then the after-action report. This is going to be a great document. I’m looking forward to reading this and seeing what their comments were and how we can improve, so thank you very much for the report and for this.”

Mr. Duncan said, “Thank you very much, commissioner. That’s part of the process that we do after every actual response. Our large scale evaluation . . . exercise or evaluation is determine basically three things: what did we do well, what could we improve and what are the lessons learned.

And if you’ll allow me one additional comment, I forgot to mention to you all and remind you that there are a number of folks from local government who have been deployed down into the Mississippi area to assist with the hurricane response there. For example, I think you’re aware members of the Sheriff’s Office have been down in that area. Of course, our Coroner Dr. Dudley has been deployed down into that area. We’ve had folks from our COMCARE facility go down to provide mental health assistance. We’ve had folks from our fire department down there and others, my Deputy Director Jack Kegley spent a two-week deployment down there and DeAnn Kunkel with our Public Safety Office actually spent a four-week deployment down there helping out. So Sedgwick County has been down there and has been helping people who are badly in need of help in that area and the devastation goes well beyond New Orleans, and our help is really necessary in Mississippi, so again thank you very much commissioners.”

Chairman Unruh said, “All right, thank you Randy. Commissioners, I don’t see any more comments. What’s the will of the Board relative to agenda item B?”

MOTION

Commissioner Burtnett moved to receive and file.

Commissioner Norton seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

| | |
|----------------------|-----|
| Commissioner Norton | Aye |
| Commissioner Winters | Aye |

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Commissioner Burtnett | Aye |
| Commissioner Sciortino | Aye |
| Chairman Unruh | Aye |

Chairman Unruh said, “Well, before we call the next item, we have the second half of the Andale student body coming in here. They wanted to be home celebrating the big win last night. Concordia is next, right? Well, good luck to you all and welcome to the commission meeting. We hope that this is profitable for you all, as you continue your government studies, so we’re glad you’re here. Madam Clerk, please call the next item.”

C. RESOLUTION REPEALING RESOLUTION 168-04 AND ESTABLISHING A NEW PROCEDURE FOR QUALIFYING PROGRAMS FOR VOLUNTARY PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS.

Ms. Jo Templin, Director, Division of Human Resources, greeted the Commissioners and said, “This resolution requests approval to repeal resolution 168-04 and establish a new procedure for qualifying programs for voluntary payroll deductions.

Resolution 168-04 required each vendor requesting a payroll deduction to first have at least 15% of the Sedgwick County employees eligible to be enrolled indicate a desire to enroll in the program. After a vendor had met that requirement and upon approval by the Board of County Commissioners, the vendor was given 90 days to enroll 25% of eligible county employees prior to the vendor’s program becoming a payroll deduction.

If the 25% threshold was reached, Sedgwick County would move forward with the payroll deductions. If the 25% threshold was not met, no payroll deduction was granted. This resolution also required each voluntary program to be verified, their percentage verified annually.

The proposed procedure requires the county manager to assess programs to determine the value of providing the service to county employees and make recommendations to the board of county commissioners for approval for payroll deduction. As in the past, the proposed resolution covers voluntary programs. The definition of voluntary programs are those in which the county does not contribute to or receive a portion of the employee premium. They are offered to employees to enroll at the employee’s own choice.

The proposed resolution retains approval authority of any voluntary program as a payroll deduction to the Board of County Commissioners. The proposed resolution allows the county manager the ability to assess the needs and desires of county employees for additional voluntary programs through surveys or other means he deems appropriate. The procedure will promote the county’s competitive solicitation process, by allowing all vendors of products and services to respond in the

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

authorized process for doing business with the county. That is through an approved vendor application and submission of a response to a posted RFP. We recommend your approval of the resolution and will respond to any questions you might have.”

Chairman Unruh said, “Okay, thank you Jo. Commissioners, are there any comments? Commissioner Sciortino.”

Commissioner Sciortino said, “Just one. Jo, do we have an example of a program that has met these qualifications and does have voluntary payroll deductions right now?”

Ms. Templin said, “We have had in the past, we had a company called Colonial that had kept it for a while, but their numbers dropped and were told that they didn’t meet the standard and we had to drop that program.”

Commissioner Sciortino said, “Okay. That’s all I had.”

Chairman Unruh said, “Thank you. Commissioner Norton.”

Commissioner Norton said, “I don’t see any dialogue in here that talks about RFPs and that whole process. Am I just missing it, or . . .?”

Ms. Templin said, “The resolution requires the manager to assess and then promote that to the Board of County Commissioners and I think the intent is that we do allow for that competitive solicitation through the normal purchasing and business process.”

Commissioner Norton said, “It just seems like we’re pretty vague here, for me it seems like it should be more meat on the bones than just say ‘The manager is going to look at it’. I mean, that there should be some kind of an RFP section that talks about how that’s done and everything. I think it’s pretty vague to me.”

Chairman Unruh said, “All right. Commissioner Winters.”

Commissioner Winters said, “I was just going to respond to Commissioner Sciortino and I wasn’t sure what his question really was asking perhaps, but there are others such as the Sedgwick County Employee Deferred Compensation plan is a voluntary plan. Is that not right?”

Ms. Templin said, “Correct. Those are voluntary programs that were waived from the 25%

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

threshold, because they were for limited employee eligibility, such as fire union, those kind of things.”

Commissioner Winters said, “So there is a list of those that are currently in place.”

Ms. Templin said, “Correct.”

Commissioner Sciortino said, “Yeah, the point I was trying to make, Tom, is that at least the program isn’t so onerous or so convoluted that nobody would ever qualify for it. Apparently there has been some people that have gone through the system and adhered to the rules and have qualified and it seems to work. That’s the point I was trying to make.”

Commissioner Winters said, “Okay.”

Chairman Unruh said, “Okay. Any other comment, commissioners? I’d just make the comment, it seems appropriate that we establish a policy whereby we have some evaluation process, both of the program that’s being presented and of the employees, through a survey or something, of their desire for the program and then at that point, if it looks like it’s a good benefit and we have demand for it, then we can decide if we have to talk to one vendor or we put it out for RFP or whatever the circumstances require. I like this much better than just a formulate approach to these programs, because that kind of leaves us open season and that doesn’t seem like a good way to go forward, so I’m going to be very supportive of the new resolution. And commissioners, I see no more requests to make a comment. What’s the will of the Board? Commissioner Winters.”

Commissioner Winters said, “Mr. Chairman, I guess I would just, in response to Commissioner Norton say that I would hope that there are still ways for us to proceed on certain avenues, even if we as commissioners here need a response from employees and/ or others, that we always have that availability to share those with the county manager and Human Resources staff and get feedback and answers from them about their concerns or their believing that some kind of program is good. So, I still think we have a method to move processes through the system by just us being aware about it and asking the manager and staff to investigate them.”

MOTION

Commissioner Winters moved to adopt the Resolution.

Commissioner Sciortino seconded the motion.

Chairman Unruh said, “Thank you. Is there any further discussion? Commissioner Norton.”

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

Commissioner Norton said, “Well I’ll probably not be supportive of this, not because I don’t think we need to change from the old resolution, but this just doesn’t do it for me. I mean, I just think it’s a little too nebulous, doesn’t have enough meat on the bones. I think we should describe more of what we’re looking to do with this. It doesn’t set how those thresholds are going to be looked at, what is even appropriate to look at. I just think it needs more than what we’ve got here, so it’s not about that . . . I don’t think I like the old one very much, but I don’t know that I like it being this watered down and non-specific.”

Chairman Unruh said, “Okay, thank you. Commissioner Burtnett.”

Commissioner Burtnett said, “Well, how many times has this come up that we have vendors that want to come in, because looking at the old resolution, it does seem strange. You have to have 15% of your employees say they want it and then you have to go in . . . it just seems like a lot of work, but how many times has this actually come up?”

Ms. Templin said, “It has happened several times in the past. When we described the resolution, then the vendor makes a choice on whether they want to pursue that or not. In the past couple of years, I can think of two times is all.”

Commissioner Burtnett said, “So they would still come to us and ask for some sort of support, but then instead of going through the 15% employees, it would go through the manager?”

Ms. Templin said, “Correct.”

Commissioner Burtnett said, “Okay. And then . . .”

Ms. Templin said, “It does not preclude any vendor from contacting us to try to pursue some type of program here. It just allows more of the work to be done up front, without the departments or the employees getting geared up and then to be told that it now cannot be a payroll deduction, so it allows all that discussion and that dialogue and that work up front, before we pursue it with employees and department heads, causing them to come to meetings or whatever.”

Commissioner Burtnett said, “So we’re basing our opinions on the manager will know that this is something that possibly the employees want? How are we going to get the employee feedback?”

Ms. Templin said, “We have the capabilities to do on-line benefit surveys now and we have a survey tool that we use now for several different types of surveys and it’s just an efficient way to survey the needs and desires of employees that we would hope to utilize.”

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

Commissioner Burtnett said, "Is there a high percentage of employees that use that when it's activated?"

Ms. Templin said, "Well, we have just now done several, not for benefits, but it has been pretty effective on just departmental customer service surveys, the response that we get back from those, and so we're hoping to pursue that with this type of survey."

Commissioner Burtnett said, "Okay, that's all I had."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you. Commissioner Sciortino."

Commissioner Sciortino said, "If I read this correctly, I kind of like the fact that it is a little nebulous and cloudy and not setting strict, you know you've got to have 15% of the people interested and then 25% has to sign up and etcetera and so forth, because I could see the time that maybe some of us more chronologically gifted employees might get really interested in a cancer extra type of insurance, but the majority of the employees think that that's so . . . or maybe burial service . . . think that that's so out in the future, they're not interested in it, and we have the flexibility that maybe if we would like to accommodate the 15 or 100 of the people that have this particular concern, just to give them another benefit for staying on as an employee."

We would have the flexibility of doing that, so I kind of see that there could be some positives by not having those stringent slot 'a', tab 'b' requirements, but allow the flexibility to react to the particular situation or concern that maybe a group of employees have or another select program comes up that helps left-handed follicle impaired employees do something."

Ms. Templin said, "It gives that flexibility of the manager to make many recommendations and retains the authority to the board of county commissioners."

Commissioner Sciortino said, "Yeah, okay. Thank you."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you. Commissioner Norton."

Commissioner Norton said, "Well the part I do like about is taking that old one and throwing it out, with all the thresholds that you had to meet. I just want . . . really for me it's about more dialogue about RFPs and that if we're going to . . . if somebody does come before us, that we're not just going to go 'Oh that sounds like a good deal' and all the sudden we vote on it and it leaves out

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

RFPs and taking it to other companies. That it's not just about kind of whims. It just doesn't have enough information."

Commissioner Sciortino said, "But we still retain, at the board of county commissioners, don't we still retain the authority that if this particular plan is being recommended by Mr. Buchanan and we feel that there might be two or three other providers of that same program, that we could say, 'well wait a minute, on this particular one, why don't you go out for an RFP, and get the best deal'. I mean, would we have that flexibility to modify it here from the bench?"

Ms. Templin said, "I think yes, in working within the purchasing guidelines, I think you do have flexibility on using RFP process when there's many vendors involved, or a sole source opportunity, where you would make that approval."

Commissioner Sciortino said, "Okay."

Chairman Unruh said, "The bottom line is, to initiate a program, to approve a program the ball is ultimately in the court of the commissioners, so we call the ball on all of those issues."

Ms. Templin said, "That is correct."

Chairman Unruh said, "And I'm comfortable with that."

Commissioner Norton said, "I have one last question. How many of these on-line benefit surveys have we done for our people?"

Ms. Templin said, "What I referred to was surveys and we've done one on-line benefit survey, but we've also done surveys using an on-line survey tool called Voom-erang, and we use it for a survey tool for Human Resources, for feedback on our own services in our department. We've used them for environmental assessment instruments to do on-line, so we're experimenting with lots of opportunities for using that on-line tool and benefit surveys is certainly one of those."

Commissioner Norton said, "So we haven't done one just for benefits yet."

Ms. Templin said, "We've used e-line for a benefit survey in the past. Now that we have a benefits manager, that was the tool to get employees' information."

Chairman Unruh said, "Okay. Well commissioners, I see no more requests for discussion. We have a motion and a second. I will call the vote."

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

VOTE

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Commissioner Norton | No |
| Commissioner Winters | Aye |
| Commissioner Burtnett | Aye |
| Commissioner Sciortino | Aye |
| Chairman Unruh | Aye |

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you, Jo. Next item please."

D. CODE ENFORCEMENT.

1. RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING A SEDGWICK COUNTY ADVISORY BOARD FOR ONSITE WATER WELL CONSTRUCTION.

Mr. Glen Wiltse, Director, Code Enforcement, greeted the Commissioners and said, "What we have before you today is a resolution requesting you to establish a Wastewater Advisory Board. This board is an advisory board for our Code Enforcement Department for an upcoming . . . I'm sorry, I shouldn't have said wastewater, it's Water Well Advisory Board."

We will have a water well code on the next agenda item and this board is for advisory positions within our department itself. This board will consist of seven members from the community they have worked. We've had members from the community work with us on just establishing a code and are requesting that you adopt this resolution and if you have any questions, I'll be glad to answer them."

Chairman Unruh said, "Okay, thank you Glen. Commissioners, are there any questions? It's an important advisory board I think, it's something we needed. I'm glad to see this progress on it and I'm going to be supportive. Commissioners, if there's no other discussion, what is the will of the board?"

MOTION

Commissioner Burtnett moved to adopt the Resolution.

Commissioner Norton seconded the motion.

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

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

VOTE

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Commissioner Norton | Aye |
| Commissioner Winters | Aye |
| Commissioner Burtnett | Aye |
| Commissioner Sciortino | Aye |
| Chairman Unruh | Aye |

Chairman Unruh said, "Next item."

2. RESOLUTION AMENDING THE *SEDGWICK COUNTY CODE* TO CREATE THE "DOMESTIC WATER WELL CODE."

Mr. Wiltse said, "Yes, this resolution is for the water well code for Sedgwick County. This will be the first code that we've had. We're currently probably one of the few in the state that actually do not have a code adopted. There are state regulations that identify how wells are installed with distances to property lines, but nothing locally that we govern ourselves and there is a state license requirement in the state code.

What we are requesting within this code is to require that the installers actually just register with us. It's a no-fee registration. That way we know who we can issue permits to. There's fees within the code for the inspection and we mirror the regulations within the state statute itself for the installation.

The City of Wichita currently has a code adopted and this is very similar to the City of Wichita's code and we are recommending adoption of this code."

Chairman Unruh said, "All right, thank you. Commissioners, any questions? Commissioner Winters."

Commissioner Winters said, "Thank you. Glen, could you maybe even relating to both of these, share with us the citizens' filter or what you did in the process of coming up with these and have we had someone really seriously review them, besides you and the people on your staff."

Mr. Wiltse said, "Basically, we've been working on this periodically, probably for the last year or more possibly. We have currently people from the Wichita Area Builders' Association that we've

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

worked with, the Realtors' Association has had feed back in this. In fact, they have worked with us for probably a year and a half, different people there, mortgage, we have one individual from the mortgage industry who has sat on the Code. We've had just about all the well-drillers themselves that we know about in the county have been to just about every meeting that we've had with it. So, we have worked throughout the industry and hopefully we've covered everybody who has actually had an interest, or would have an interest within the regulations that we've proposing today."

Commissioner Winters said, "And none of them have serious problems or concerns with any of the technical requirements or the fees that are involved here?"

Mr. Wiltse said, "To the best of my knowledge, no."

Commissioner Winters said, "Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you. Any other discussion? What's the will of the Board?"

MOTION

Commissioner Burtnett moved to adopt the Resolution.

Commissioner Norton seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Commissioner Norton | Aye |
| Commissioner Winters | Aye |
| Commissioner Burtnett | Aye |
| Commissioner Sciortino | Aye |
| Chairman Unruh | Aye |

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you, Glen. Next item please."

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

E. FUNDING AGREEMENT WITH WICHITA AREA TECHNICAL COLLEGE.

Chairman Unruh said, "Before we go on, Commissioner Winters."

Commissioner Winters said, "Before we begin this item, Mr. Chairman, which has to do with funding agreement with the Wichita Area Technical College, commissioners and chairman, I know that some of you know that my wife works for the Wichita Area Technical College. I've been advised that I do not have a conflict under the conflict of interest statutes and the reason is that the college does not qualify as a business, as that term is narrowly defined in the statutes. But I believe that the conflict of interest regulations set the minimum standard for officials to follow.

So even though this may not be a legal conflict, I'm troubled by the appearance of a conflict by the fact that my wife Gerry is receiving a salary from the college. So, I plan on not participating on this discussion and when we vote on this issue, I will abstain. Thank you."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you Commissioner, appreciate the comment and the clarification before we get to this issue, so thank you."

Mr. Ron Holt, Assistant County Manager, greeted the Commissioners and said, "This item is the request for approval of a funding agreement between Sedgwick County and the Wichita Area Technical College. For the past several years, work force development and technical education and training have been on the public policy platform, because of economic development ramifications, Sedgwick County made this item a priority, as you discussed earlier, when we talked about the possibility of a new training center.

It became a more important priority when the legislature passed a bill that separated the Wichita Area Technical College from Unified School District 259. USD 259, at the time of that happening, had roughly prepared a required transition plan to separate Wichita Area Technical College from receiving political and financial support, and that plan was implemented in Spring of 2004.

At that time, the spring of 2004, the board of County Commissioners became engaged in discussions regarding the role of Sedgwick County and what role we should play in technical education and training.

After several months of discussion, you decided and determined that Sedgwick County's vision for technical education and training for the region would be an integrated, flexible system that is

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

effective in providing training, workforce development services in response to the ever-changing needs of the business community, while simultaneously creating high quality programs and facilities which appeal to a wide range or potential students or learners.

In August, 2004 you passed a resolution creating the Sedgwick County Technical Education and Training Authority and the purpose of the authority was to be the broker or overseer of technical training that fits the needs of businesses and at the same time serves as the Board of Directors of the Wichita Area Technical College.

Prior to and during the formation of the authority, two separate and independent technical education and training experts were consulted. They talked to community leaders regarding technical education and training.

Both experts, Dr. Kenneth Breden from Georgia and Dr. Terrance Sullivan from South Dakota, acknowledged and expressed recommendations that a strong Wichita Area Technical College was necessary to be part of a larger, flexible technical training and educational system. In addition, during the 2005 Kansas Legislative Session, Sedgwick County committed to earmarking funds that would be saved from a reduction in community college out-district tuition and put those funds towards technical education training programs and workforce development.

That legislation was passed, reducing the community college out-district tuition from \$12 per credit hour to \$6 per credit hour, resulting in a potential savings to Sedgwick County of around 1.2 million dollars for the '05-'06 school year.

Of that 1.2 million dollars, the request here is that \$750,000 be awarded to the Wichita Area Technical College. This is about \$350,000 less than they requested. The remaining savings are reserved for the Sedgwick County Technical Education and Training Authority to be used to further the mission of developing a world-class technical education training system and facility in Sedgwick County to serve the south central Kansas region. We would ask that you approve this agreement and I would be happy to answer any questions that you might have.”

Chairman Unruh said, “Okay, thank you Ron for that presentation. This is an issue that has been kind of on our plate or at least on our menu for some time now and we’ve just been working through the process to get to this point. I’m going to be very supportive of this. As many of you know, I’m involved with the Board of Trustees with the Tech College and now the Technical Education and Training Authority, which has assumed board responsibilities for the tech college and that is an entity of the training authority, is something that we established and gave direction for it to take over the governance of our local technical college. So I think it’s quite appropriate and logical that, in our effort to provide funding and facilities and leadership for this technical and

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

education training effort, that we bring that to reality with the funding capability that's been made available to us through the buy-down of out-district tuition.

So, I'm very supportive, I think it's appropriate. It is less than the college had originally wanted, as far as their dividing that out-district tuition money, but it's a substantial amount of money and would be very helpful to them in establishing programs and delivering education for up to maybe 155- 200 more individuals, so it's a good investment in our community and we have the funds provided to us, so I think it's an appropriate thing to do. And I'm looking here to see if there are other comments or questions and Commissioner Norton."

Commissioner Norton said, "Well we have wrestled with this for a pretty good while and in fact, it's much like the conversation we had over KTTI earlier today. As we've evolved and got . . . evolved and gotten involved in technical education as a county, we've had to break a lot of eggs to try to make this omelet, I guess is the way we've had to do it.

And I have to tell you that I've been a little bit of a person who put a stake in the ground and I have to have some questions answered about the future of technical education, some of the goals of WATC, how their management has taken technical education and our new directions at heart and integrating into the system, as opposed to being kind of outside of that and I've finally came to the conclusion, after a lot of conversations with our Chairman, because he's very close to this, that I would lend my support to moving this money over to WATC but that I have not always been supportive of doing that until I had a lot of questions answered, and I think hopefully those have been answered. It looks like we're well on the way with our technical authority, everybody is under the same umbrella, everybody has a focus on what is right for our community and I think I'm ready to move forward on this."

Chairman Unruh said, "Very good, thank you commissioner. Any other comments or questions? Seeing none, what's the will of the Board?"

MOTION

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

Commissioner Norton seconded the motion.

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

Chairman Unruh said, "Any discussion on the Motion? Commissioner Sciortino."

Commissioner Sciortino said, "I'm not going to be supportive of this, even though I know I'm in the minority. I can remember when 259 relieved themselves of any responsibility of the technical college and was able to withdraw \$3,000,000 of their support. WATC had heard that the governor was getting ready, in her plan, to maybe give us full reimbursement back of the out-of-state tuition and at that time, the total number would have been 2.2 million. And they came to us and asked us if we wouldn't supplement that 2.2 million with an additional \$800,000 and make them whole so that they could continue that they could be the entity that they were.

I also remember that when they found out that all we were going to get was half of that, they came back and said, 'Well, we could do what we want to do with only 1.1 million, please give us all of that money'. We had talked to them and I think the Manager had entered into this discussion, 'Well, what's your plan?' How are you going to change what you're doing? What's your program? I know KTTI, if my memory serves me right, was actually formed because of dissatisfaction of many of our major employers towards the type of product that they were getting out of WATC.

We just saw KTTI come before us. They've got a concept. They haven't formulated their plan yet and they're reserving coming to us, asking us for any money, until they can show us a plan, so that we can make an intelligent decision whether or not we think that plan has a good chance of succeeding and whether we should invest taxpayers' dollars into the plan.

WATC is still on this fast track for accreditation, accreditation, accreditation but I personally believe that's a flawed approach. I'm not convinced right now, under the present leadership, that they have the capability of reinventing themselves. They've refused to respond to some of the requests that staff has made on showing us a detailed plan on how you're going to change the amount . . . how you do business. It also concerns me, when they first said they needed \$3,000,000 to survive. When they found out we were only going to get 1.1 million, they said 'Well, we can survive on 1.1' and now they're happy with the \$750,000 but we still haven't seen the plan on how are they going to be successful and still, every time I've had conversations, it's 'accreditation, accreditation, accreditation', that seems to be the main focus point of the WATC. My sense is we've formed the authority because of maybe some of the concerns we had about technical training and I would have been a little more comfortable if the authority itself was saying this is the proper way. Maybe the authority could have asked them for a plan, before just coming to us and we give them \$750,000 with no caveats, no strings, no requests that we would have them do prior to getting the money.

So, I'm not saying that the concept of the county supporting technical education isn't a good

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

concept, I just think we're rushing into something without seeing a plan that would guarantee their success and would give us comfort that they're doing what the business community really needs and that's providing the type of training people . . . so for those reasons, I won't be supporting this project."

Chairman Unruh said, "Commissioner Norton."

Commissioner Norton said, "Well certainly, Commissioner Sciortino, I understand where you're coming from because you and I have had that conversation many times and some of those reservations are the ones that I've continued to have, to try to understand. I've finally come to the conclusion that Chairman Unruh is intimately involved in everything that's happening, as far as technical education and particularly WATC and that he will make sure that that money is well used and that if it doesn't follow the track of what our technical authority and what the board of county commissioners expect, that it won't be an ongoing proposition, that it will fall away and we'll do something else.

So, I think that's my challenge to WATC. I see Jim Means here and that certainly is going to be our challenge, is that we want all of our entities to succeed, but we're setting a new course for technical education, as the county, and we're very intimately involved and there will be some money available but it's going to have to be used very prudently and within the confines of what we're trying to solve in our community and I have yielded to the Chairman on that, that he is intimately involved and that he's going to make sure that happens."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you. Commissioner Burtnett."

Commissioner Burtnett said, "Well, I've always been a supporter of the Wichita Area Technical College, as I've hired some of the people that have gone through the program into my print shop and have always felt it was good. In the last few months, as we've had our discussions, I feel confident that they are trying to listen to the people and the businesses around, to see that they can help in whatever way they can, getting students out to be their employees, doing a good job, so I'm going to be very supportive of this and I have always felt like WATC has been a good program for the county."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you. Commissioner Sciortino."

Commissioner Sciortino said, "Well, I do want to say, I have a lot of respect for my Chairman also and it bothers me that I have to vote against something that he feels so strongly about. The

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

thing that's bothering me is we've set a course of action, but I don't know what WATC's course is. I don't know if their course is parallel to what we're saying. I haven't seen a plan and I don't know that it would be outrageous for the commission to ask this entity, before we give them \$750,000, could we see your plan on how you're going to address the employment needs, now and in the future, of this community prior to us investing \$750,000 taxpayer dollars into your entity. I don't know that that's an outrageous request of them.

We're giving them the money. We're hoping they come up with a plan and our only recourse is, if they don't we won't fund them in the future. But to just give them the money, with nothing from them showing how they're going to spend it, is to me . . . I'm uncomfortable with it and that's the reason I can't vote for it."

Chairman Unruh said, "Well, I appreciate your comments commissioners, and I would tell you that this afternoon I could have a strategic plan on your desk that will give you an idea of how they're planning to address future requirements for technical education and training in our community.

The tech college, one of the things it does, it does provide for a diversified and highly skilled workforce in our area that focuses not only on aircraft and manufacturing technology, but also provides the training that we need for the health industry and for the trades, which is a big part of our local economy.

But I believe that the strategic plan is on track. I know that the college falls under the governance of the Sedgwick County Technical Education and Training Authority, the same body that has the responsibility for the kind of the umbrella governance for training in this area, so I'm confident that it is a good investment, beneficial to not only business and industry, but also to the citizens of our community.

But having said all that, I do understand your concerns and respect your conviction. Is there any other comment? We have a Motion and a Second. Seeing no other request to speak, I'll call the vote."

VOTE

| | |
|------------------------|---------|
| Commissioner Norton | Aye |
| Commissioner Winters | Abstain |
| Commissioner Burtnett | Aye |
| Commissioner Sciortino | No |
| Chairman Unruh | Aye |

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you, Ron. Commissioner Norton."

Commissioner Norton said, "Just a comment. I'd like to compliment Commissioner Winters for . . . he did stay quiet during all this and it's the highest compliment, because I have to tell you, Commissioner Winters has been intimately involved in every conversation we've had. He has great insight on the technical education. He's been involved in workforce development and things with the chamber and the Greater Wichita Economic Development Coalition and he understands this and I'm sure he gets to hear it at home occasionally too, and I'm really saddened that he didn't get to enter into our conversation, because I think he had a lot of intellectual capital on the subject to bring to the table, even though at the highest level, he thought that there was a conflict, so I thought I had to say something about that."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you, Commissioner. Next item please."

F. AGREEMENTS (16) TO PROVIDE IN-HOME SERVICES, SUCH AS HOMEMAKER, ATTENDANT CARE AND RESPITE, TO OLDER RESIDENTS.

- **AFFORD-A-CARE, INC.**
- **ALL SAINTS' HOME CARE, INC.**
- **ASSOCIATED HOME CARE**
- **CAREGIVERS OF KANSAS**
- **COMFORT KEEPERS OF WICHITA**
- **DEPENDABLE ASSISTED LIVING**
- **HOME HEALTHCARE CONNECTION**
- **HOME INSTEAD SENIOR CARE**
- **LOVING HEARTS HOME CARE**
- **MEDICALODGE HOME CARE**
- **MT. HOPE HOME HEALTH**
- **PROACTIVE HOME CARE, INC.**
- **PROGRESSIVE HOME HEALTH & HOSPICE**
- **RIGHT AT HOME**
- **SAINT RAPHAEL HOME CARE, INC.**
- **SENIOR SERVICES, INC.**

Mr. Ray Vail, Director of Finance and Support Services, Department on Aging, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I'm here to ask your approval for in-home service contracts for the

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

federally funded Title III programs, under the Older Americans Act. The Central Plains Area Agency on Aging contracts with these service providers to provide attendant care, homemaker and respite services for the frail and elderly.

These contracts have been approved by both Legal and Finance and I ask that you approve the contracts and authorize the Chair to sign.”

MOTION

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

Commissioner Sciortino seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Commissioner Norton | Aye |
| Commissioner Winters | Aye |
| Commissioner Burtnett | Aye |
| Commissioner Sciortino | Aye |
| Chairman Unruh | Aye |

Chairman Unruh said, “Thank you, Ray. Next item please.”

G. RESOLUTION DESIGNATING AND CLASSIFYING CERTAIN STREETS TO THE SHERMAN TOWNSHIP SYSTEM. DISTRICT #3.

Mr. David Spears, P.E., Director/County Engineer, Bureau of Public Works, greeted the Commissioners and said, “It is standard procedure that after a road is constructed within a platted residential subdivision in accordance with county standards that road is then assigned to the township road system. In this particular case, Busy Bee Lane and Busy Bee Court, located in the Bluestem Acres 2nd Addition will become the responsibility of Sherman Township. The Sherman Township Board was informed that this resolution would be on the county commission agenda by letter, dated September 22nd. I recommend that you adopt the resolution.”

MOTION

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

Commissioner Winters moved to Adopt the Resolution.

Commissioner Sciortino seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Commissioner Norton | Aye |
| Commissioner Winters | Aye |
| Commissioner Burnett | Aye |
| Commissioner Sciortino | Aye |
| Chairman Unruh | Aye |

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you, David. Next item please."

Commissioner Norton left the meeting room at 10:54 a.m.

H. REPORT OF THE BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS' REGULAR MEETING OF OCTOBER 27, 2005.

Mr. Jerry Phipps, Purchasing Agent, Purchasing Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, "You have the Minutes of the October 27th meeting of the Board of Bids and Contracts and there are six items for your consideration.

**1) STREET IMPROVEMENTS- PUBLIC WORKS
FUNDING: DEBT FINANCE**

Item one is street improvements for Public Works. It was moved to accept the low bid with Cornejo and Sons for \$149,946.

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

Item two, police sedans for Fleet Management. It was moved to accept the low bid from Bob Lubbers Ford in the amount of \$301,093.

**3) FIRE DAMPER PROJECT- FACILITIES MAINTENANCE
FUNDING: FACILITIES MAINTENANCE**

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

Item three, fire damper project for Facilities Maintenance. It was moved to accept the low proposal from Facilities Maintenance for a negotiated price of \$56,130. I might note on the note in your handout, line four it says Seimen's was at \$1,450. That should read \$145 each, and of course their total would be the correct amount.

**4) ANTENNA SITE LEASE- EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS
FUNDING: EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT**

Item four, antenna site lease for Emergency Communications. It was moved to renew the five-year lease for the antenna on top of the Epic Center, with Pinnacle Towers, with a first-year expenditure in the amount of \$70,200.

**5) COMPUTER HARDWARE- EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS
FUNDING: EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS (AVL/ MDC INERGRATION PROJECT)**

Item five, computer hardware for Emergency Communications Department. It was moved to accept low bid from Southern Computer Warehouse for \$35,699.68.

**6) OFFICE FURNITURE FOR THE NEW JUVENILE DETENTION FACILITY-
FACILITY PROJECT SERVICES
FUNDING: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT**

Item six is office furniture for the new juvenile detention facility for Facility Project Services. It was moved to accept the low bid from John A. Marshall for the National Furniture in the amount of \$20,863.77, the low bid meeting specifications for the Moduform Furniture from Moduform for \$20,906.50, the low complete bid for the Norix furniture from Norix for \$82,499.78, the low bid of Mity Lite furniture from E.J. Office Furniture for \$2,992 and the low bid for Egan Visual from Scott-Rice in the amount of \$1,175.28. This is a grant today for all of these items is \$128,437.33.

I'll be happy to take questions and recommend approval of these items as presented."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you, Jerry. Commissioners, are there any questions about items on the Bid Board?"

MOTION

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

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

Commissioner Burtnett seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

| | |
|------------------------|--------|
| Commissioner Norton | Absent |
| Commissioner Winters | Aye |
| Commissioner Burtnett | Aye |
| Commissioner Sciortino | Aye |
| Chairman Unruh | Aye |

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you, Jerry. We can do the consent agenda."

CONSENT AGENDA

I. CONSENT AGENDA.

- 1. Easement for Right-of-Way for Sedgwick County Project 634-32, 33, 34, 35, 36; widening of 63rd Street South between Rock Road and the Butler County line. CIP# R-275. District #5.**
- 2. Resolution stating finding made by the Board of County Commissioners at the post-annexation hearing held October 19, 2005.**
- 3. Plat.**

Approved by Public Works. The County Treasurer has certified that taxes for the year 2004 and prior years have been paid for the following plat:

Sigwing Addition

- 4. Order dated October 26, 2005 to correct tax roll for change of assessment.**
- 5. General Bills Check Register(s) for the week of October 26 – November 1, 2005.**

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

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

MOTION

Commissioner Sciortino moved to approve the consent agenda as presented.

Commissioner Winters seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Commissioner Norton | No |
| Commissioner Winters | Aye |
| Commissioner Burtnett | Aye |
| Commissioner Sciortino | Aye |
| Chairman Unruh | Aye |

Commissioner Norton returned to the meeting room at 10:58 a.m.

Chairman Unruh said, “Commissioners, we’ve made it through our agenda, and now we need to take an off agenda item.”

MOTION

Commissioner Winters moved to consider an Off Agenda item.

Commissioner Burtnett seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Commissioner Norton | Aye |
|---------------------|-----|

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Commissioner Winters | Aye |
| Commissioner Burtnett | Aye |
| Commissioner Sciortino | Aye |
| Chairman Unruh | Aye |

Chairman Unruh said, “And our off agenda item, Mr. Ron Holt will lead the discussion on the arena siting.”

POWERPOINT PRESENTATION

Mr. Holt said, “This off agenda item, as you mentioned, is dealing with the site selection, continuing the site selection process for the Sedgwick County arena, downtown Wichita. We, the team that’s working on this, including the architectural engineering team and all of our internal working partners, including folks from the City of Wichita and here in the county are working very diligently to be able to come before you next Wednesday with a final site recommendation, recognizing that in our discussions with you you may or may not be prepared to approve that at that time and may want to send us back to do . . . you may have more questions and we’ll have another week to do that. But we are moving and working with a site . . . final site recommendation for next week.

What I want to do this morning, and I am somewhat challenged with directions unless I’m standing and facing the way I’m talking, so you will bear with me, I hope, this morning as we go through this presentation. What we want to do is to give you a building review for each of the sites and I’m going to try to do this as efficiently as I can, but not moving so fast that we get you confused, because what we will be doing is looking in certain directions and talking about buildings from certain directions and I will try to keep all that straight and focused with you.

As you see there, we have the north site plan, which is green and the east site plan, on here it’s blue. On our focus it’s purple, the center site plan, which is orange and the west site plan, which is yellow. I would also remind you, as we go through this presentation, that we had our own consultant to take a look at, to do a survey of historic buildings within these sites. Her report indicated to us that there are three ways to consider or three categories for historic building

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

considerations. Those buildings that are on a local, state or national register. Buildings that are potentially eligible as individual buildings as historic consideration and buildings that are part of a district that are potentially eligible, as part of a district, for historic consideration, so I would ask you to keep that in mind as we go through this presentation this morning. So let's start with the north site.

The north site is bounded on the north by 1st Street, on the east by the railroad tracks, on the south by Douglas, on the west by Emporia. And just so that, as we go through this presentation, when I start talking about intersections, I'll give you a context. The intersections that are in this site are 1st and Emporia, 1st and Saint Francis, Douglas and Saint Francis, Douglas and Emporia. So those are the affected intersections that are included in this site area.

This picture . . . and by the way, I want to thank the Communications Department, Tony from that department and Tonya, Management Intern, worked on putting these pictures together and they've done an excellent job in not only capturing the building so you get some sense for their architectural but their placement as a part of this site as well.

You are, if you will place yourself at the intersection of Douglas and Emporia, looking . . . the north side of Douglas looking to the east. You see the building #1 is the Planet Hair building. Building #2 is the Frame Guild building. These buildings are a part of the East Douglas Historic District and these buildings would remain.

Continuing to look east on Douglas, from Emporia, this is the building there are numbers, designated one is the Boulevard Bar and Grill, which is also part of the East Douglas Historic District and would remain. Continuing to look east on Douglas, from Emporia, in fact you are at the corner of the northwest corner of Douglas and Saint Francis. This is the Value Center building and this building would be removed.

Again we're at the corner of Douglas and Saint Francis. You're still oriented toward the east. The two buildings there, the Design and Decorations buildings, the Sam Zeldman Clothing building, these buildings are part of the East Douglas Historic District and these buildings would remain. Continuing to look east, along Douglas, we're between Saint Francis and the railroad tracks, Sam Zeldman's Clothing Store, the Old Mill Tasty Shop, these buildings are a part of the East Douglas Historic District and these buildings would remain.

We are continuing to look east on Douglas, from Saint Francis, this is building one is the John Barleycorn building and Victoria Park building. These buildings are part of the East Douglas

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

Historic District and these buildings would remain. Again, we're continuing to look east on Douglas from Saint Francis. You see the Buildings Controlling Services building there, Tillie's Flower Shop building there. These buildings are part of the East Douglas Historic District and these buildings also would remain.

And finally, continuing to look east from Saint Francis, you see the Moore Martin, LLC building, the Old Town Market building. These buildings are part of the East Douglas Historic District and these buildings would remain.

I guess . . . I said finally, I guess there are a couple of more buildings there before we get to the end of that block, before the end of the railroad track. The Winds of Change building and the Dance By Design building and again, these buildings are part of the historic district and would remain.

Now, let's go back to Emporia and we are just north of Douglas, looking north up Emporia towards 1st Street. The Rivercrest Community Church building there, the AM Consultants Premier Health Services building, these buildings are on Saint Francis, the east side of Saint Francis, north of Douglas. These buildings, although a part of the Historic District, are slated for removal to make the arena fit on this site.

Now we've gone on up Emporia, we're at the corner of Emporia and 1st Street, still looking to the north. This is the Positive Directions building. This building would be removed. Now turned down 1st Street, looking to the east from Emporia, this is at the southwest corner of 1st and Saint Francis is actually where this building is located, Tracy's Automotive. This building would be removed. We're continuing to look east of 1st Street, from Saint Francis, this is part of the Marine World building. This building would be removed.

Continuing to look east on 1st from Saint Francis, just to the east of this is the railroad tracks, so this building is up against the railroad tracks, there on 1st Street, east of Saint Francis, the Don Vonn Incorporated building. This building would be removed.

Now we're looking south, on Saint Francis from 1st Street. We're on the west side of Saint Francis. This is the Marine World, another part of the Marine World building. This building would be removed. Continuing south on Saint Francis, from 1st Street, but on the east side of Saint Francis, looking south you see these buildings that . . . look there, a minute ago, these buildings would be removed.

This is Saint Francis, east side of the street between 1st and Douglas, it's the Old Town Architectural Salvage, the Kendal Electric Company. I misspoke a minute ago. I was on Emporia, going north of Douglas and I mentioned that those were part of the historic district. I misspoke,

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

when I showed you the church and so forth there, those are not part of the historic district. These are buildings that are part of that East Douglas Historic District. These are up Saint Francis, north off of Douglas, on Saint Francis, the east side of the street. I apologize, I misspoke when I said that earlier. So it's the Old Town Architectural Salvage and the Kendall Electric Company building. These buildings would be removed. We're still on Saint Francis, east side of the street, just north of Douglas, the Wichita Fencing Academy and Huber Incorporated buildings would be removed.

I keep fast clicking here and what I moved over was the orientation, and I don't know how to go backwards, so . . . thank you, Tony. There. That's the east site orientation. Let me again give you the boundaries and the intersections there, so that we continue to stay in context and oriented here. The north boundary of the east site is William Street. The east boundary would be the railroad tracks. The south boundary is Waterman and the west boundary is Emporia. The intersections to be considered here in your thinking is William and Emporia, William Street and Saint Francis, English and Commerce, Waterman and Commerce, Waterman and Saint Francis, Waterman and Emporia, English and Emporia, English and Saint Francis, English and Commerce and William and Emporia. Again, I would just point out to you that in this section, we have Commerce and Saint Francis, north/ south streets that are being affected and English, which is the east/ west street that's being affected, okay.

Here we're looking east on Waterman, from Saint Francis, east on Waterman, I'll just give you a minute in your mind to go there, from Saint Francis. The buildings that would be affected and removed are Belford Electric and CableCom Incorporated. At the corner of Waterman and Commerce, Commerce is the street in between Saint Francis and the railroad tracks, the east side of the street, the building to be removed, Beards Enterprise Incorporated building.

We're now going up Commerce, from Waterman, to the north, east side of Commerce. This is a warehouse building. This is the building you saw on that site that is not going to be removed. It's the Environmental Remediation site that will stay intact. Still going north on Commerce, the east side of the street, the building to be removed, Mid-West Electrical Supply. Going up still further north, the Cox Communication has a service yard/ warehouse type building there that would be removed.

Still going north, on that same street, Plant Masters is part of the East Douglas Historic District, I think this is one of the contributing sites there. This building would be removed. We're still going

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

north, on Commerce, to the east side, and again the orientation is Spaghetti Works building and then there are three buildings just south of that, the Midland Materials, the Even-Temp and the Vicar's Tax Service, those buildings all a part of that contributing to the East Douglas Historic District, they would remain.

Now then to the corner of William and Saint Francis, William and Saint Francis, this is just west of the Spaghetti Warehouse building, old Spaghetti Warehouse building, this is the Gore building. It would be removed.

We're now at the corner of William and Saint Francis, the west side of the street, this is the building that's being refurbished and you notice, this is designated potential historic district. When we go from on Saint Francis from William to Waterman, on the west side of the street, it is a potential historic district and I underline or underscore potential. There is certainly some consideration there, but it's not on a historic register. These are the loft apartments that are being refurbished by the group from Minnesota. This building would remain.

Continuing south on Saint Francis from William Street, the truck there and the fencing there is part of the construction for the lofts building. This is the west side of the street still, just looking down the street, so you can get some orientation for the next few buildings we're going to be looking at. Again, continuing down Saint Francis, between William and English, we're still on the west side of the street, again I indicate to you, this is potential historic district, buildings to be removed are the Auto Glass building and the Copa Cabana buildings there.

Continuing on south, this is the Episcopal Social Services building, which would be removed. Continuing on south, again a part of that potential historic district, A & M Superior Upholstery building to be removed. Again, we're continuing south, on Saint Francis, south of English between English and Waterman, three buildings to be removed, the Tabu building, the Prairie Print building and the Sergio's building.

Now we are at Saint Francis and Waterman, looking to the west, Saint Francis and Waterman looking to the west, this is the Rim Straightening Center, to be removed. We're at the corner of Emporia and Waterman, the LSI Corporation building there at the northeast corner of Emporia and Waterman, to be removed. We're now going north on Emporia, from Waterman, on the east side of the street, north on Emporia from Waterman on the east side of the street, Strategic Financial Concepts building, to be removed. Continuing on up that street, the Contract Furnishings building, to be removed. The corner of Emporia and William Street, again potential historic buildings, as individual properties, the Ray Sales, this is right across, east of . . . right across the street, east of the

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

Transit Center, right across Emporia, east of the Transit Center, the Ray Sales Company building and what is called that blue looking building, light colored building, it's the Dancers building, right there on the corner, to be removed. This is that same building, that Dancers building, looking at it from the north, kind of northeast.

The next is the center site. The boundaries here, on the north William Street, on the east Emporia, on the south Waterman, and on the west Broadway. The intersections, to give you again a context orientation, is William Street and Broadway, William Street and Topeka, William Street and Emporia, English and Emporia, Waterman and Emporia, Waterman and Topeka, Waterman and Broadway, English and Broadway, English and Topeka. Again, the street affected for closing, there north and south is Topeka, the street, and the street affected for closing east and west would be English.

Okay, we're at the corner of William and Topeka and looking to the west. You get a sense of what that skyline looks like there. We're at the corner of William and Topeka, looking to the south. Corner of William and Topeka, looking to the southeast and you see now the Transit Center there and that would remain. Topeka, between William and English, the west side of the street, buildings to be removed, the Accident Recovery Team building. Corner of Topeka and English, west side of the street, part of potential historic district, the Mid-States Fitness Equipment building to be removed. Corner of Topeka and English, the east side of the street, Topeka and English, east side of the street, buildings to be removed, they have potential for historic listing as an individual building, Briggs and Stratton building and the Casado, McKay building.

The southeast corner of Topeka and English, buildings to be removed, this building would be removed, Chilton Billiards. The southwest corner of Topeka and English, building to be removed and when we talk about a significant employer in this area, it's Professional Engineering Consultants. In excess of 200 employees I believe work in and out of this building, building to be removed.

Waterman and Topeka, looking to the west, Waterman and Topeka, looking to the west, buildings to be removed, the NRP Group building and Rainbows United. We're at the corner of Waterman and Broadway, looking to the east. This would still be part of the Rainbows United building to be removed. We're now looking up Broadway, on the east side of Broadway, between Waterman and English, potential historic building for an individual property, the Greyhound Bus Terminal. We're

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

at the corner of Broadway and English, still on the east side of the street, just north of the bus terminal building with potential for historic listing as an individual property, the English Key building.

East on English, from Broadway, on the south side of the street, east on English, from Broadway on the south side of the street and that's still that building, the English Key building, I think is what it's called. This is the north side of that building, looking east on English. East on English, from Topeka to the north side of the building, the Snelling Personnel Services building. The corner of English and Emporia, the corner of English and Emporia, south side of the street, this building has potential for eligibility for historic listing as an individual property. This is the Temple Labor Federation building. We're at the corner of Emporia and Waterman, Emporia and Waterman looking back to the west. This building would be removed. That whole area there, that's a fairly large facility though, it's a car lot, it's the Easy Credit Auto Sales.

And finally, the west site plan, the west site plan is bounded on the north by Waterman, on the east by Broadway, on the south by Dewey and on the west by Main. The intersections are Waterman and Main, Waterman and Market, Waterman and Broadway, Lewis and Broadway, Dewey and Broadway, Dewey and Market, Dewey and Main, Lewis and Main and Lewis and Market. Again, the north/ south street that would be impacted is Market. The east/ west streets that would be impacted, well it's on Dewey, so I guess it's only one there, Lewis. And as you know, Lewis, when it comes across the bridge from the west takes a jog to the north and becomes part of Waterman, and so it really, in the Water Walk proposal there, dead ends anyway.

All right, we're on the west site, we're at the corner of Main and Waterman, we're on the corner of Main and Waterman and we're looking to the south. This is the U.S.D. 259 building. It's the old IRS building and I think I indicated to you, I've had . . . or in discussions with Martin Liebhart, over at the 259, they acquired this building from the federal government and there are some covenants that are part of that agreement and we're trying to figure out exactly what those are. It's that this building would be used as an educational facility, and when it's not used in that fashion, then there are certain things you have to do, and we're trying to figure out what those things are and I think they can be answered, as long as you're willing to pay for them, but we're investigating them.

This is again the corner of Main and Waterman, looking to the east, again this is the 259 building there, Joyce Fouch Instructional Center. Corner of Waterman and Market, corner of Waterman and

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

Market looking to the south, this is the Goodyear building and it would be slated to be removed.

We're at the corner of Waterman and Market, looking to the east, corner of Waterman and Market, we're looking to the east, building to be removed. Again, this building is potentially eligible for historic designation as an individual property, the Ray Party Rental building. The corner of Waterman and Market, looking to the south. The corner of Waterman and Broadway, looking to the south, buildings to be removed would be McDonald's. The corner of Broadway and Lewis, the corner of Broadway and Lewis, looking to the north, buildings or businesses to be removed, the American Cancer Society and the Martens Company buildings.

The corner of Broadway and Lewis, looking to the south, this is indicated as the 505 South Broadway office building, south on Broadway from Lewis, west side of the street, building to be removed, Subway. Corner of Broadway and Dewey, west side of the street, building to be removed, Wendy's. The corner of Broadway and Dewey, looking to the west, the corner of Broadway and Dewey, looking back to the west. Corner of Dewey and Market, looking to the west, building to be removed is the Conoco Station there.

Now we're looking north on Market, from Dewey, north on Market from Dewey, looking to the east, the building to be removed is the Market Plaza building. North on Market from Dewey, looking to the west, the Appraisal Company building. North on Market, on Dewey, looking to the west, this building is potentially eligible for historic . . . as part of the historic district and those apartments there. We're at the corner of Market and Lewis, looking to the east, building to be removed, Special-Ts. Looking to the east, north on Market from Lewis, buildings to be removed, part of . . . has the potential eligibility . . . to be eligible for historic designation as an individual property and this is the Shaffer and Sheriff's Training building.

At the corner of Market and Lewis, looking to the south, Market and Lewis looking to the south, again potential historic eligible building, as an individual property, the Ultimate Auto Detail facility. The corner of Market and Lewis, looking to the west, the corner of Market and Lewis looking to the west, the Firestone building. Corner of Lewis and Main, looking to the east, Premier Open MRI Facility. Corner of Lewis and Main, looking to the southeast, corner of Lewis and Main looking to the southeast, potential historic district, again those apartments. And last, the corner of Lewis and Main, looking to the northeast, again back we see the Firestone building and the USD 259 building. I believe that's all of the buildings.

Let me just reiterate a couple of points for you. We have a lot more work to do over the next few days to bring you a final site recommendation by next Wednesday, at which time, depending on your desire, you can approve that or give us more work to do. We will stand prepared either way.

I would indicate to you that out of our public meeting a week ago, or last Thursday, out of that public meeting at Bank of America building, we had well over 250 people come through that. We

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

had a number of surveys that were filled out. Overwhelming, the results of those surveys said take the north site off of . . . out of consideration. The west site became a distant third. The center site, there was separation between it and the east site, but it was a second preferable site and the east site became the preferable site.

Out of the Arena Neighborhood Redevelopment Steering Committee meeting the other night, they indicated after discussion, take the north site out of consideration. The west site became a less desirable site, because of the thoughts that it had the potential for blocking future development of Water Walk and the closing of Market was not very desirable. The folks at that meeting the other night, by consensus, really voted for either the center site or the east site, and the determination there was, or the consideration was if you were strong for the center site and the east site was selected, would you fall on your sword for it and the answer was 'no' and if you were strong for the east site, and the center site was selected, would you fall on your sword for that, and the answer was 'no'.

I do think, and we're waiting to get the actual report from that meeting. I think that report is going to say either the center site or the east site, because they offer the most potential for development, but I think both of them are going to have a caveat that says 'Take off the northwest corner of each of those sites', and for just thinking purposes, on the center site, that northwest corner would be the parking lot that is part of the agreement with the state office building. It's just west of the Transit Center and the northwest corner of the east site is the Ray Sales building and the Dancer's building, or it would be in that slot. And I think we're going to get, based on the discussion and I think what we heard in the summary they're going to say either of the sites, east or west . . . or east or center, and with the qualifiers that would ask you to consider taking those off.

I would say to you that in the center site and in the east site, there are historic building considerations that we will have to work through. I do think, and again we'll work through these, the greater potential for those are on the center site, having to work through those, than on the east site. And the last thing I would say to you is that we've heard a lot about parking. We still recognize a need for a parking plan. We will continue to work on a parking plan. We will have a comprehensive parking plan. We'll have a stronger statement about that at our final . . . at the recommended, final site selection recommendation. We think we have . . . very close to being able to give you all you need to make a decision and I'd be happy to answer any questions that you might have."

Chairman Unruh said, "Okay, thank you Ron. It's very comprehensive presentation, thank you. We have a question from Commissioner Sciortino."

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

Commissioner Sciortino said, “Well, I don’t know for sure if it’s a question or just a general comment, Mr. Chairman. First of all, once again I have to compliment everyone that’s been involved in this process, from Ron, from staff, from the professional . . . the architects, everybody that’s been involved in this process. It’s been open, it’s been thorough, it’s been detailed and the clearer I see a plan, the easier it is for me to say, ‘Yes, I want to invest in that process’.

I think that last commission meeting, I was one of the commissioners, I think I was joined by I believe all of us were talking positive on this that, you know there were three real key elements that we want to make sure happen with this process. One, that the total budget of \$184,500,000, I wouldn’t be saddened that if it came in below budget, but at least on budget. That embodied within that budget, that we reserve an adequate amount of money to take care of the . . . what I perceived will be subsidies for the ensuing years, because we did assure the people, when they were voting, that we wouldn’t come back asking them for any money if there were shortfalls that we didn’t perceive of and third was the parking. When we were out with the community meetings for educating the people prior to the vote, that was the biggest thing we heard, was parking, parking, parking.

We had a joint en banc meeting with the City of Wichita yesterday and again we heard parking, parking, parking and I would encourage you all that are working on this project, if there’s a way to set aside a reserve fund for parking, just in case the surface parking that we feel is available doesn’t materialize, then we have funds available to do some sort of alternative parking. I don’t know if that’s a parking garage or what. Those are just the three general comments.

I’ve looked at all four of these sites. I listened intently to what I heard across the street yesterday. I listened intently to the architects explaining what their druthers were on all of the sites that were being talked about yesterday and I’d like to . . . I don’t know if it’s appropriate now, I want to wait to see if there’s any other comments, but I’d like to maybe make your job easier, Ron, and perhaps maybe after I hear from some of my other colleagues, maybe make a motion where we just shrink down the potential sites, so that now the public knows we’re only dealing with one or two and what have you, but I’ll wait for that motion. I’d like to make one, but I’d like to wait and see if there’s any other comments.”

Chairman Unruh said, “Commissioner Burnett.”

Commissioner Burnett said, “I wanted to make some comments on that, because it’s very evident that the public has not been thrilled with the north site, and I have no problem taking that off the map. Going to all the meetings that I’ve gone to, which is I think all but two meetings, there’s been very good discussion on all the sites and as it does get narrowed down, I think the people that are

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

giving us recommendations from these other groups have really done their research on what they feel is good and bad on these sites and they definitely come down to the center and the east sites as being the best locations and I'm tending to agree with them at this point.

I see we do have a lot of work, especially with historic properties to see what that's going to take. The parking is an issue. I'm assuming that these north corners that everyone is talking about that we might save, that shouldn't be a problem. Can we tweak these sites down to that kind of thing, Ron?"

Mr. Holt said, "That will be what the site review team will be working on, over the next few days and if we can't, we'll have reasons why we can't, but certainly we will be taking a look at that, yes."

Commissioner Burnett said, "Okay. When you're talking about the warehouses on the east site that are going to stay, I assume then that the businesses are going to stay there also, so they will be open for business as the arena is built? That's going to be kind of . . ."

Mr. Holt said, "That would be their option. I mean, we would hope."

Commissioner Burnett said, "Okay. What other questions do I have? Well, that's it for now, but as the discussion gets going, I have other . . ."

Chairman Unruh said, "Well, there are other requests to make comment. I would just want to ask, Commissioner Burnett used the word 'tweak'. What we're seeing here is essentially the way this site will lay out for each option. I mean, it might more a little bit, but there's not going to be dramatic changes with how the footprint of the arena itself sits on the site?"

Mr. Holt said, "We don't have any reason to believe that there would be a significant change to any of those sites, right."

Chairman Unruh said, "All right, thank you. Commissioner Winters."

Commissioner Winters said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ron, good presentation. I'd make just one comment about our meeting yesterday. We had a good meeting with the City Council yesterday. They all had input and thoughts and ideas. I thought it was . . . I don't want to feel over-good about the process, but I think we can feel good about the process, because they did not seem to

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

indicate that we had run any significant red lights and that things weren't out in the open and they seemed all to be thinking that this was a worthy project, process or selecting a site. So again, that doesn't necessarily mean that everybody in the room agreed, but I certainly didn't hear any comments about a flawed process, which I think is a good thing.

I guess I would like to maybe have staff's option about us narrowing the list today. I know I could probably pretty much eliminate that north site, and again, not that I think it is a terribly flawed site. I'm glad we studied it. I'm glad we looked at it. I think it was important, but I just haven't seen much support in the public or with council members or with commissioners, really, so I wouldn't have any problems eliminating that one today, but I'd like to hear if staff has other comments about narrowing it to just the east or the center site at this time, or whether we should do that next week, or when we make the final decision."

Chairman Unruh said, "Well Ron, you want to respond to that?"

Mr. Holt said, "From all of the information that we have looked at and considered, it really does come down to weighing in . . . and the information and feedback we've gotten from the citizens is very important consideration and I think it was very telling from your discussion yesterday with the City Council, the mayor and the City Council folks, that we don't have a strong indication . . . let me put it the other way, we have a, as you've said, an overwhelming input that the north site should be off consideration. We have a pretty strong indication that the west site does not meet certain requirements relative to people's concerns about traffic, with the closing of Market, with the strong indication from the city's Arena Neighborhood Redevelopment Team the other night that that site would have, in their mind, in their view, in their opinion, and this was the consultants for the city, a significant negative impact on future development, either directly related to Water Walk, or that would develop because of Water Walk.

So I guess my response will be, as we go through looking at these sites, I'm at the point where I don't have any reason that I could recommend the west site and I would leave it to your wisdom whether you want us to really take another look at that or you wanted to direct us not to take a look at it today."

Chairman Unruh said, "All right, thank you. Assistant County Manager Kathy Sexton, would you want to weigh in on Commissioner Winters' request to have staff input here?"

Ms. Kathy Sexton, Assistant County Manager, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Commissioner, I think it's most appropriate for you to go head and remove the north site, if that's

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

what you're hearing from the public and from the committees you've asked. I would ask Ron, I just can't remember the timeline right now. Have we heard from our planning commission, or are there any other committees or neighborhood groups or anybody else out there that we're planning to hear from this week?"

Mr. Holt said, "Thank you, Kathy, that's an important point. Tomorrow we will be making a presentation to the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission and it's an information meeting, as far as I know but of course anytime you do that, you're asking for feedback. We do have that established group that we will be presenting to tomorrow, so good point."

Chairman Unruh said, "All right, thank you. Well, I would just kind of echo many of the comments that have been made. At least two of the sites that have been under consideration find some serious objections or problems with professional people, with our advisory committees and also with the public in general.

So I don't want to get ahead of any presentations or input that we're asking for, but on the other hand, if we're at a point where something seems pretty obvious, it might lighten our load going forward, as far as the considerations we have to make, so I'm inclined to be willing to reduce it. Commissioner Sciortino."

Commissioner Sciortino said, "Well, just a couple of comments and then I'll try a motion, if it's appropriate. We did hear from the head of the Planning Department yesterday and Mr. Schlegel was focusing in on what the city is willing to accomplish, after we build our arena, and that is the Arena Neighborhood Area Redevelopment and he spoke very favorably, in fact we asked him pointedly, because it looked like it was the overwhelming majority of the city council was leaning toward the center area. They said they didn't have a big problem with the east, but they were leaning on the center site, but none of them talked about the west site and he indicated that there would be difficulty in putting together a neighborhood redevelopment there because of the blockage of Water Walk and you could get what they were referring to as the 'ripple effect', but he did state to us and I can't remember which of us pointedly asked him the question, I may have, but that either the center site or the east site would serve equally well for what their original plans were and that was the reason why we decided to locate our new arena in downtown Wichita, was the redevelopment around the arena for further economic development, so he was very positive about center and east, did not speak favorably about the west site. So, I don't know, if it's appropriate now, I would like to try a motion."

MOTION

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

Commissioner Sciortino moved to that we eliminate all other site considerations other than the center site and the east site and direct staff to now continue focusing just on those two sites for consideration.

Chairman Unruh seconded the motion.

Chairman Unruh said, "We have a Motion and a Second. Is there discussion? Commissioner Norton."

Commissioner Norton said, "Well for me, I don't have a problem eliminating the west and the north site but the Motion says 'all other sites' and you know I've been an advocate for maybe keeping it open that there's a hybrid that might come out of this and I'm not going to shut up because it's my idea and I have ownership of it."

I think, as we go through this and find out what properties we're going to have to take and make those decisions about businesses that have been downtown and employ a lot of people, we may change our minds about how we look at this and that there may be . . . when you talk about tweeking, there may be a tweeking of a little movement of the footprint, and saying all other sites, that lends us to these two only and I know those are the ones that the public have looked at, but I don't think we've come to the final answer on this yet, and I hate to say that now we only have these two. Now that's just me advocating for thinking outside the box, within the blue cloud and I've said my peace."

Chairman Unruh said, "Appreciate your comments, commissioner. We have another comment. Commissioner Burtnett."

Commissioner Burtnett said, "Well I certainly have no problem taking the north site off and I personally don't have a problem with the west side, but as a professional courtesy to the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, I think maybe we should keep the west side onboard, so they have an opportunity to weigh in, although they had an opportunity at public meetings to come and weigh in on this too, but I don't think it's going to be a huge issue if after the meeting tomorrow, I'm sure the Arena Design Consortium people are going to be there and if they hear that it's not in their favor either, I'm sure that they will focus their attention on center and east at that point in time, but I don't think we need to take it off the board right now."

Chairman Unruh said, "Okay, is that all? Commissioner Winters."

Commissioner Winters said, "Well I think I could agree with Commissioner Burtnett a little bit. I don't want to be too hasty in removing that west site, if there's others going to talk. I

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

don't have a problem removing the north site and I guess, in the next seven days or in the next 14 days, if another site would develop, then so be it. I could support a motion that didn't say 'only going to look at these two sites' but I think it's pretty obvious to staff and our A & E team that this center and east site are rising to the top of everybody's interest and are going to be the ones where I think focus is going to be placed, but I wouldn't have a problem with rewording that motion, if it would be helpful to Commissioner Norton."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you, Commissioner and Commissioner Sciortino wants to talk. Before I call on Commissioner Sciortino, I just want to say that we are hoping to make a final decision a week from today and all the information that I have received implies to me that eliminating down to these two sites is pretty reasonable and pretty logical, so I'm still willing to support the language in the Motion. However, we used language early 'falling on your sword', I'm not falling on my sword over this one, so Commissioner Sciortino."

Commissioner Sciortino said, "Well I respect Commissioner Norton thinking out of the box. I think it would be disastrous for us to even start to consider now some other yet to be named site. We got a lot of heat from the public when we even consider the north site, because they kept telling us that this wasn't what we voted on. We voted on the blue cloud and what have you."

Commissioner Norton explained in detail the site that he was thinking of, and we got a pretty detailed response from the architectural people why that site wouldn't fit. We got comments from the City manager as to why that site wouldn't fit, so I can't see realistically that we would ever seriously say 'City, we don't care what you say, urban planners, we think we know better than you' and pick a site that no one that's involved in this whole project is supporting with the exception . . . and Tim, you've got a right to your thoughts and I think you've expressed it and I do believe the arena that you're talking about needs some urban redevelopment. There's no question about it, but it just doesn't fit what the city and the county were trying to work here, as far as rejuvenating downtown Wichita.

I am still very comfortable and would like to keep my Motion the same and eliminate the west site and the north site so that we can start to tell the public 'Okay, relax, you had a building over on the west site that you were concerned about, USD 259 relax, you don't have to move' and we're letting some of the people's blood pressure go down.

The MAPD is not supportive of the west side. This presentation that is going to be made to the MAPC is just informational. I have to tell you, I don't think there's any support on this board, after what we heard from the professional urban planners, from the City of Wichita, from our staff that if the MAPC all of the sudden said 'we like the west site', I don't think we're going to pick the west site anyway. So maybe it will make it easier for the MAPC to just focus on the two sites that we think make the most sense and then they could give us valuable input on what

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

they think of these two sites, which could sway my decision, central or east. So I would like to keep my motion the same and try it and see if it flies.”

Chairman Unruh said, “Well, Commissioner Burnett.”

Commissioner Burnett said, “Okay, well I won’t fall on my sword either over this, because I think we have pretty much narrowed it down to the center and the east side, but I would like to at least, with the MAPC, that we do appreciate their comments and if they do have any comments on the west site I would like to hear them.”

Chairman Unruh said, “Well thank you, and I agree with the comment. We want to be professional and we want to be polite as we go through this process. We also want to be totally open and transparent and the openness and transparentness of this process pretty well to me implies that this is kind of where we’re ending up, with the choice of two sites, so I don’t have an reticence about making that as a decision. And I also agree with the point made that if somebody comes up with overwhelming evidence, one way or the other, this commission can make a change and adopt a new plan. But at this point, I’m still ready to support the Motion. Commissioner Norton.”

Commissioner Norton said, “Well, I don’t even think I have a sword to fall on. It’s more like a butter knife maybe. I mean, the truth is one of the things I think all of you know about me is that I’m going to try to stimulate us to think all the thoughts that we can. I believe that there is such a thing as group think and you can kind of get yourselves trying to be so good to each other and kind of come to a consensus, that maybe you don’t think of all the options that could be out there. And truthfully, let’s look at what happened. We put some experts on it and they threw the north site on there, when they weren’t supposed to and which site was the worst site, that nobody liked? The one that some experts told us that we ought to consider, so I’m maybe not an expert, but I want to make sure that there’s a site that I’ve tried to look at and say, ‘Lets consider it’ because I think it’s an area that is in peril of not getting to look like what we want right next to our arena, which it’s starting to form up that part of this space is going to be either across the street or catty-corner from one of the sites we pick.

So for me, I’m not going to be a roadblock obviously, but I want us to think all the thoughts about where we’re going to put this arena. It is a 30 to 50 year deal and we’ve got a lot of professionals, a lot of people engaged but that doesn’t mean that the process is not flawed, that we all try to work together so hard that maybe we don’t consider every avenue of what it’s going to do to downtown. I mean, if no other role . . . if I play any other role than that, that’s what I’m looking at doing.”

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

Chairman Unruh said, "All right, thank you. Commissioner Winters."

Commissioner Winters said, "Thank you and thanks for those comments, commissioner. I think I'm going to support this Motion, but just as we make this Motion we can make another Motion next week or we've given ourselves another week after that, so until we make that final decision, I think if some new information comes about, we can certainly consider it, but I think this Motion will clearly reflect that there are two primary sites on the horizon. So, I'm going to be supportive of this Motion."

Chairman Unruh said, "Okay, thank you commissioner. I don't see any more requests for comment. Seeing none, call the vote."

VOTE

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Commissioner Norton | Aye |
| Commissioner Winters | Aye |
| Commissioner Burtnett | Aye |
| Commissioner Sciortino | Aye |
| Chairman Unruh | Aye |

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you, Ron. There is no other question or comment. We've come to the end of our agenda and Commissioner Norton."

J. OTHER

Commissioner Norton said, "While we're talking arena, we're not off that yet. We don't have to be, do we?"

Chairman Unruh said, "We're not off of it if you want to talk about it."

Commissioner Norton said, "Well, the biggest concern I've heard and Commissioner Sciortino has certainly talked about it is I've analyzed this and I've talked to people, parking it still doesn't look like we've solved that and I just want to challenge us to keep thinking, as we look toward these two sites, that parking is going to be critical and I'm just not convinced that what we've talked about as surface parking has been continued to be thought out and that we've come to the best conclusion and I want to be sure that we don't, you know, just . . ."

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

Commissioner Sciortino said, "Talk to those guys out there in the audience."

Commissioner Norton said, "I think they've heard that message over, and over, and over but I want to be sure, as a commission, we keep challenging ourselves to deal with that issue."

Chairman Unruh said, "I think it was well summarized, we talked about staying in budget, provide for the operating reserve and contingency, and provide parking, do all that and have a wonderful building and everybody is happy. All right, commissioners any more comments about arena issues? If not, this is an opportunity to talk about you other items of community interest.

I would just like to say that this Saturday, from 11:30 to 1:30, the Kansas Food Bank will have its 'Live Drive', their mini-telethon. The food bank operates a very beneficial, charitable operation that's not only for Sedgwick County, but it serves 85 counties in our state, so it's very important that we figure a way to fund and support that, so I would encourage everyone to, if they can, find a way to be supportive. Commissioner Norton."

Commissioner Norton said, "This is not really an event, but I'd like to encourage people to realize that the United Way is having their campaign right now. They've set a very lofty \$16,000,000 pledge goal and this is going to be a tough year for them, with some of the things that have gone on in our business community and the aviation industry and the amount of money that should have been but was moved out of this community into Mississippi and Louisiana, with a big heart, it has put what we're going to do in our own community at peril and I would just urge everybody, if they have a chance in their own workplace, to contribute to United Way by payroll deduction, that they do that, at least they think about it, because that money will stay locally and certainly we all know that we have plenty of needs here to take care of. So, that's all."

Chairman Unruh said, "All right, thank you. Anyone else? I see no more requests to speak, so Commissioners, we are adjourned."

K. ADJOURNMENT

Regular Meeting, November 2, 2005

There being no other business to come before the Board, the Meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

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

DAVID M. UNRUH, Chairman,
First District

BEN SCIORTINO, Chair Pro Tem
Fifth District

TIM R. NORTON, Commissioner
Second District

THOMAS G. WINTERS, Commissioner
Third District

LUCY BURTNETT, Commissioner
Fourth District

ATTEST:

Don Brace, County Clerk

APPROVED:

_____, 2005