

MEETING OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

REGULAR MEETING

October 26, 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, October 26, 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. Ron Holt, Assistant County Manager; Mr. Mark Masterson, Director, Department of Corrections; 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. Crystal Spangler, Member, 4-H.

Mr. Anthony Siler, Member, 4-H.

INVOCATION

The Invocation was led by Mr. Ashok Aurora of the Hindu Community.

FLAG SALUTE

ROLL CALL

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

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES: Regular Meeting, October 5, 2005

The Clerk reported that all Commissioners were present at the Regular Meeting of October 5, 2005.

Chairman Unruh said, "Commissioners, you've had the opportunity to review the Minutes of October 5th. Is there any addition or correction?"

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

MOTION

Commissioner Sciortino moved to approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of October 5th, 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."

PROCLAMATION

A. PROCLAMATION DECLARING OCTOBER 2005 – OCTOBER 2006 AS “4-H CENTENNIAL YEAR.”

Chairman Unruh said, "Commissioners, I have a proclamation to read for your consideration.

PROCLAMATION

WHEREAS, 4-H is a community of young people across America who are learning leadership, citizenship and life skills; and

WHEREAS, 4-H is one of the largest youth organizations in Kansas; and

WHEREAS, 4-H in Sedgwick County reaches 15,000 youth and 500 adult volunteers every year; and

WHEREAS, 4-H is part of the Sedgwick County Extension Council and is a program where youth learn through experiential events and activities; and

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

WHEREAS, 4-H engages youth to strive to use their HEAD for clearer thinking, their HEART for greater loyalty, their HANDS for larger service and their HEALTH for better living; and

WHEREAS, 4-H helps youth prepare to be competent, caring citizens for tomorrow, and has been helping youth and adults learn, grow and work together for more than one hundred years.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that I, Dave Unruh, Chair of the Board of Sedgwick County Commissioners, do hereby proclaim October 2005- October 2006 as

‘4-H Centennial Year’

in Sedgwick County and encourage the community to take advantage of the opportunity to become more aware of this special program which gives youth a chance to learn together and on their own, and join us in recognizing the unique partnership between our county and our university system.

Commissioners, you’ve heard the proclamation. What’s the will of the Board?”

MOTION

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

Commissioner Norton seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

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

Chairman Unruh said, “And receiving the proclamation this morning are Crystal Spangler and Anthony Siler. Welcome.”

Mr. Anthony Siler, Member, 4-H, greeted the Commissioners and said, “As you said, we’re 4-H members, Crystal Spangler, Anthony Siler.”

Ms. Crystal Spangler, Member, 4-H, greeted the Commissioners and said, “On behalf of all the 4-

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

H members, volunteers and alumni in Sedgwick County, we would like to thank you for recognizing this centennial event.

The 2005-2006 Kansas Centennial Year was officially kicked off statewide at the recent Kansas State Fair. Events in Sedgwick County will be held during this coming year and will end at the 2006 Kansas State Fair.”

Mr. Siler said, “Over 15,000 Sedgwick County youth participate in a variety of 4-H sponsored activities, including community clubs and school programs, after-school programs and the McConnell Air Force Base. We are learning life skills of leadership, citizenship, communications and service.

Over 450 volunteers serve as mentors, project leaders, club leaders and helpers. They are a key ingredient in the reach and success of the 4-H program and we value and appreciate all that they do.”

Ms. Spangler said, “And we want to thank you, the county commission, for your support of the Sedgwick County Extension program, of which 4-H is a part. Your long-time commitment to improving the quality of life for communities will ensure the next 100 years of success.”

Mr. Siler said, “In commemoration of this event, we’d like to present you each with a special lapel pin with the logo ‘Forever 4-H’ which is the slogan of this year’s event. Thank you.”

Chairman Unruh said, “Okay. Well thank you all for being here and we all have our lapel pins that you have given to us. Appreciate it very much and we want to personally congratulate you on 100 years of 4-H and we appreciate the leadership of you two coming here and accepting the proclamation but we do have a couple of comments from commissioners, so stand by. Commissioner Sciortino.”

Commissioner Sciortino said, “Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I noticed something in your presentation that maybe others may not have noticed, but you apparently had some classes in public speaking where you try to read one line ahead and make eye contact and for somebody that young to be that professional from the podium indicates to me, I don’t know if you got that from 4-H or from your school, but that it was noticed and I applaud you on that.”

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

Commissioner Winters said, “Well, thank you. I also want to thank both of you for being here and

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

those other leaders who are here and professional staff that work with 4-H, we certainly appreciate what you all do. You know, later on in today's meeting we're going to receive a presentation about juvenile justice issues and how we deal with some of our young people that really are having difficult times and really need some extra assistance from all of us to make sure that they abide by the rules that society has put out there and that they become active and participating citizens in a productive way.

And sometimes I think we forget about how many great young people are out there already, on their own, exhibiting leadership skills and we hope that we can get all of our young people engaged in some kinds of activities like you all are involved in in 4-H and sometimes you may not think it's worth it. Sometimes you may, all 4-H people and all kids doing a lot of things, think 'Why am I doing this?' but there is a real good reason why you do what you do, and we appreciate everything that the 4-H clubs do and the timing kind of rings home and I know there's a lot of other things going on, but the State Fair and our Sedgwick County Fair are just great places to see all of the activities that young people are doing in a positive way, so we just want to say thank you for the leadership that you two, Crystal and Anthony, are proving for 4-H in Sedgwick County and so we're glad you came today, keep up the good work."

Chairman Unruh said, "Well, I think you can tell that we are very supportive of what you're doing and we're very proud of you two and the 4-H organization. Thank you for being here. Madam Clerk, call the next item."

NEW BUSINESS

B. JOINT FUNDING AGREEMENTS WITH CITY OF WICHITA, KANSAS.

1. WICHITA-SEDGWICK COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL OPERATIONS.

Mr. William P. Buchanan, County Manager, greeted the Commissioners and said, "You have before you an agreement for two items. The first is the flood control agreement, in which the City of Wichita and Sedgwick County have been partners for several decades. The county's contribution in 2006, which was in our budget, which you adopted, which was for \$789,310 and the conditions and terms of the agreement are the same as they were for the last several years, so I would recommend that you approve this agreement."

MOTION

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

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

Commissioner Norton seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

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

Chairman Unruh said, "Next item."

2. WICHITA-SEDGWICK COUNTY METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING DEPARTMENT.

Mr. Buchanan said, "We have the same sort of arrangement with the planning department. There are a few variations between that and the flood control, but not many. This agreement has been in place for the last several years. This year's agreement, for 2006, is for \$725,900. That's been budgeted. You have adopted that budget. I would recommend you approve this agreement."

MOTION

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

Commissioner Winters seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

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

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

Commissioner Winters	Aye
Commissioner Burtnett	Aye
Commissioner Sciortino	Aye
Chairman Unruh	Aye

Chairman Unruh said, “Madam Clerk, call the next item please.”

C. PRESENTATION REGARDING THE SEDGWICK COUNTY DOWNTOWN ARENA.

POWERPOINT PRESENTATION

Mr. Ron Holt, Assistant County Manager, greeted the Commissioners and said, “At your September 28th meeting I was here before you to officially announce the site areas that had been identified for further study for locating the Sedgwick County Arena in downtown Wichita.

At that time, we announced the four site areas and identified them as: the west or yellow site, the central or orange site, the east or purple site and the green or north site. We also told you last month that within a month we would be back before you to report on the analysis of the four site areas and to more specifically define the footprint for the arena on each of those sites, and I’m here this morning to make that report.

A couple of introductory comments however are in order, we believe, before we get into the specifics of the report. First, I would remind you that the overall goal for the Sedgwick County arena project is to construct a first-class arena facility that will seat 15,000 fans for basketball, depending on the concert, a few more for concerts, and a few less for hockey.

And to accomplish that goal within the 184.5 million dollars to be collected over no more than 30 months, through the 1% sales tax that the voters of Sedgwick County approved last November, the state legislature approved in the 2005 legislative session and the governor approved by signing the bill on April the 4th, 2005. The collection of the sales tax first started July 1st this year and will end no later than December 31, 2007.

As you know, the current plans are to open the new facility in late 2008 or early 2009. Plans for the exterior and interior design for the facility are in the very early, preliminary stage of development and just as there has been a very deliberative, open, transparent process, including significant engagement of the public in the site selection process, there will be a very deliberative, open and

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

transparent process engaging various stakeholders, as well as the public, as we move beyond this preliminary stage of developing the facility. But to get to development of plans for the facility requires that a site for the facility has been established and so, since April, the major focus of the teams working on this project has been to select a site, and we're getting close to having this stage of the arena project completed.

The architectural and engineering team working with us on this project, as you know, is the Arena Design Consortium. The Arena Design Consortium was formed by four architectural firms in order to give Sedgwick County the benefit of their collective expertise related to arena design. Each of those firms has contributed to the process of the analysis of the arena site options. Those firms are: HOK Sport Venue Events from Kansas City, Gossen Livingston Architects Wichita, McCluggage, VanSickle and Perry Wichita, Wess Darnell and Mann Wichita. Consultants on the Arena Design Consortium Team that also assisted with the site analysis study are: HMTB from Kansas City, their tracking analysis, Walker Parking Consultants, Indianapolis office parking consultants. Yes, HMTB traffic, Walker parking consultants, Professional Engineering Consultants, Wichita, drainage and infrastructure analysis, Turner Consultants from Kansas City, cost consulting, ME Consultants from the Denver office, mechanical and electrical analysis, Wrightson, Johnson, Adam, Williams, WJHW Dallas office, communications and acoustical analysis, Bigelow Companies, Kansas City, food service analysis and the other consultant on the team is W.P. Moore from Kansas City, structural engineers.

Again, I'm pleased to announce today that site selection is getting closer. Here's where we are. As I mentioned earlier, at the September 28th BoCC meeting, Board of County Commissioners meeting, we officially announced the four site areas. The next night, Thursday September the 29th, we held our third public meeting on site selection at Eaton Place. Over 200 people attended and around 130 of those in attendance completed survey forms as a means of providing input and feedback on each of the sites. Since September the 30th, the day following the last public meeting, the Arena Design Consortium, our architectural and engineering team, has been working with the county, the city using data and information from their technical studies, considering input and feedback from citizens who attended the September 29th public meeting and citizens who have weighed in the sites otherwise, and factoring into the site analysis equation critical considerations for selection of the arena site that was provided by these cities, Arena Neighborhood Redevelopment Plan Steering Committee.

The team has been hard at work analyzing the four selected sites in detail. Today, we are officially announcing the specific arena footprint for each site. This is another . . . very close to the end, important step toward final site selection. Again, this picture depicts the four areas, three in the blue cloud, south of Douglas: the west or yellow site, the central or orange site, the east or purple site and then the site north of Douglas, the north or green site.

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

These are the site areas that were presented last month and these are the site areas that have been analyzed, in detail, over the past month. As we move through a review of each site, you will see how each of these sites has been better defined and the reasons why they're defined as they are.

Before reviewing the specific site information for each of these sites, let me just remind you of the major considerations, the most important criteria that was used to select the four site areas. Historic buildings and structure was a major consideration, and as you know, we hired a consultant to help us develop this information. The listings in the consultant's report to the county designate categories for consideration of buildings as follows: buildings currently listed on local, state or national registers, buildings potentially eligible for individual listing and buildings potentially eligible within a district. Each of these categories of buildings were considered in the analysis of each site.

Utilities and infrastructure, the primary analysis here was the impact of changes to existing utilities at each site. Storm sewer improvements were considered. There are existing systems in place, but none of the systems have adequate drainage. Drainage for each site will be addressed, although there's a little bit different focus there, depending on the site.

Sanitary sewer and water service, in the study it has been revealed it does not pose any significant problems with any of the sites. Traffic flow, ingress and egress, a given for the traffic study folks was that Broadway, Main and Waterman could not and would not be closed and so this was an important consideration, as the traffic study folks got their work underway.

And as you will see in a minute, each of the sites require some closing of at least one north/ south street and some closing of at least one east/ west street and we'll show you those and talk about those more in a minute.

Linkages to existing anchors and really those existing anchors have been defined as Waterwalk, as we talk about existing anchors for this projects we're talking about Waterwalk, Old Town and Century II. Each of these sites has a linkage to one of the existing anchors and we'll more define that as we go through site review.

Parking, findings are that the overall parking for each of these sites is very similar and therefore parking differences per site will not be a driving factor in the final site selection. It should be noted that regardless of the site selected, a comprehensive parking plan or strategy will need to be developed, prior to the opening of the facility. The plan will be developed as a part of the next phase of the project and will be developed when we get into the operations and maintenance plan

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

development for the next phase of the facility.

We will, tomorrow at the public meeting, we will have a station or a table specifically focused on parking, so that those who have questions or concerns or issues will be able to see in more detail what the plan is at the current time and weigh in on what other considerations we need to do relative to parking.

Another consideration has to do with the views, questions like what is the view from Kellogg, how will this building fit in with the other buildings around it were addressed. Also views from the building will be considered . . . Views from the building, from the building to the outside, will be considered in the building design phase of the project.

Costs relative to each site, here I would remind you that the plan is to hire a fee appraiser and a Real Estate acquisition team to develop these costs and to negotiate property acquisitions. So with that in mind, you need to remember as we go through these costs for each site, that that has to be done, has not been done and will be done once a final . . . only once on the site that is selected as the final site, so we're not doing that for every site, just the final site that's selected.

Site acquisition cost data that you will receive today has been developed for each of these sites, but please keep in mind that the cost data that you see today is very preliminary. It is based on common assumptions for each site and these assumptions are subject to change, based on the work of the fee appraisers and the Real Estate acquisition team. And that the cost data has been prepared solely for the purpose of comparing the four proposed sites on the basis of information currently available.

In addition, it is important to note that there are no real differences per each of the sites, with respect to physical safety, environmental remediation and zoning and platting issues so we won't be addressing those at all in today's report.

Now let's take a look at each of the specific sites, beginning with the west or yellow site. Historic buildings and structures . . . and the way we will do this, I will talk about each of these sites and then I'll show you a diagram that has been developed based on these criteria. Historic buildings or structures, there are no National Park Service registered historic structures on the proposed west site. Primary traffic access will be via Main, Broadway, Kellogg and Waterman. This site would require a closing of Market Street from Dewey to Waterman, and Lewis from Main to Broadway.

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

We're proposing 418 on-site surface parking spaces for this site. This site has a direct link to Waterwalk, two blocks, three blocks or a five-minute walk less than a quarter mile to Century II, 10 blocks or about a 15 minute walk, around three-quarters of a mile to Old Town. Cost for site acquisition, site preparation, demolition, infrastructure improvements for this site are estimated to be 24.3 million dollars. Again, I would just remind you, these are very preliminary. They are based on assumptions that are common to each site. Again, these assumptions are subject to change when the fee appraisers do their work and the cost data has been prepared solely for the purpose of comparing the four proposed sites, again on the basis of the information that we have available currently.

So lets look at what this site footprint looks like. Please note, the layout of the building, the little note down at the bottom of this diagram says 'The site layout and building footprint, are provided to establish context and allow pricing'. This scheme may change with further design study, meaning that it's not going to be necessarily a rectangular building with those kinds of corners, so with each of these site diagrams, what you should know is that this is the footprint for the arena. It does not indicate what the exterior design might look like.

Again, this site closes Market, from Waterman to Dewey, and Lewis, from Main to Broadway. This site is bounded on the north by Waterman, on the south by Dewey, on the west by Main and on the east by Broadway. The front entry is oriented to Waterman. The service area is on the south end of the facility. Surface parking on the west and east sides of the building and you will note, this footprint would be right across the street from the Waterwalk project. Just leave that there for just a second so that you get a clear picture in your mind of this site for a minute.

The central or orange site, historic buildings and structure, this site does not require loss of any National Park Service registered historic buildings. However, the area would be within the historic environs of National Park Service registered buildings and therefore will be subject to review by the state Historic Preservation Office. The primary traffic access would be by the way of Broadway, Waterman, Emporia and Topeka. It requires closing of Topeka from William to Waterman. This site would require the . . . and by the way, each of these sites south of Douglas, I didn't mention this on the west site, but each of these sites south of Douglas, to get the traffic flow we need would mean that Topeka, from Douglas to Kellogg, would need to be turned into a two-way street. So, please keep that in mind, as we go through each of these sites.

There would be 380 on-site parking spaces. The closest link is to Century II. It would be about three blocks, again about a five-minute walk, less than a quarter mile, four blocks to Waterwalk, six to seven minute walk, a little over a quarter of a mile and eight blocks to Old Town, twelve or so minute walk and a little less than three-quarters of a mile.

Costs for site acquisition, site preparation and demolition, infrastructure improvements, 20.7 million dollars, and again these are very preliminary estimates and based on the same assumptions as the

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

other sites.

How does this site lay out in the downtown area? The site closes Topeka, from Waterman to William, closes English from Broadway to Emporia. The footprint of the site, it would be bounded on the north by William, except for the Transit Center location, to Waterman on the south, Broadway on the west and Emporia on the east. The front entry would be oriented to Broadway. The service area to the east side of the facilities off of Emporia. Surface parking on the north and south sides of the facility and again, three blocks or about five minutes, less than a quarter of a mile walk down English Street to Century II.

The east or purple site, historic buildings and structure analysis, there is no individually significant historic buildings removed by the proposed layout of this site. However, two buildings that are part of the historic grouping listed as contributing, along the rail tracks south of the old Spaghetti Warehouse building are shown to be removed to allow for the correct placement of the arena on the site. The two buildings appear to be less significant than the others in the group. The arena footprint would be within the historic environs of at least three National Park Service registered buildings that will require that the arena design be reviewed by the State Historic Preservation Office.

Primary traffic access would be by the way of Waterman, Emporia, English and William Streets. This site requires the least disruption of traffic of all of the sites. It would require the closing of St. Francis from William to Waterman and Commerce Street from William to Waterman. English Street would be closed from Emporia to the tracks, the railroad tracks. On-site surface parking of 260 spaces. This site would be linked to Old Town, four blocks, six to seven minute walk, again a little more than a quarter of a mile. Five blocks to Waterwalk, eight to nine minute walk in less than a half mile and five blocks to Century II, again an eight to nine minute walk and less than a half mile.

Cost for site acquisition, site preparation and demolition, infrastructure improvements estimated to be 14.7 million dollars, very preliminary estimates, again based on the same assumptions as the other sites.

How does this site lay out? Again, it closes St. Francis and Commerce Streets and it closes English. The north boundary of this site would be William Street, except for the old Spaghetti Warehouse building and the three adjoining buildings. The south boundary would be Waterman, Emporia to the west and the railroad tracks to the east. This site would have the building fronting onto Emporia. The service area would be to the east, up against the railroad tracks. Surface parking would be on the north and on the south side of the building.

The north, green site, the final site, the historic buildings and structures analysis shows that the

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

placement of the arena building at this site would require the removal of four buildings, with St. Francis Street addresses, that are within the National Park Service register listed as the East Douglas Historic District. Additionally, it is proposed to take one additional building from the historic district along Douglas, the Value Center building at the northwest corner of Douglas and St. Francis has been overlaid with plaster and is no longer compatible with the original historic fabric of the adjoining buildings so it is proposed for removal to give a needed opening vista to the arena from Douglas.

The new arena building on this site would be within the environs of at least two historic districts. The arena design at this site would have to be reviewed by the State Historic Preservation Office. Primary traffic would be by way of First Street, Douglas and Emporia. St. Francis would be closed from First Street to Douglas. On-site surface parking of 112 spaces. Direct link to Old Town, two blocks to Old Town, less than a five-minute walk. Eight blocks to Century II, twelve or so minute walk, less than three-quarters of a mile. Nine blocks to Waterwalk, a fifteen or so minute walk, around three-quarters of a mile.

Cost for site acquisition, site preparation and demolition, infrastructure improvements estimated to be 12.7 million dollars. Again, these are very preliminary estimates and they're based on the same assumptions as the other sites. How does this site, how does the arena lay out on this site? Again, St. Francis would be closed from First Street to Douglas. This site would be bounded on the north by First Street, on the south by Douglas, with the exception, if you will, of those buildings that would remain, on the west by Emporia and on the east by the railroad tracks. It would front to Emporia, with a couple of vistas from the building to Douglas, and you can see those green spaces there and the yellow space there, in the center off of Douglas, showing those vistas. The service yard would be to the east, up against the railroad track. Service parking would be on the south side of the building.

That's the four sites and the footprint for each of the four sites. Another point about traffic that was developed during this analysis, that regardless of which site would be selected, all four sites or any one of the four sites would require improvements to Washington at Waterman. A left turn bay would need to be installed at Washington and Waterman. It's not shown on here, but I would just say again that any of the three sites that's south of Douglas would require, for good traffic ingress and egress, would require that Topeka be changed to a two-way street. What does the acquisition look like at . . . potential for acquisition look like at Waterman and Washington? You see the red, over on the right side of this diagram, you see those red dotted areas there. Again, much more study would need to be done to know exactly which of those buildings would need to be acquired. We

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

have talked, are in conversation with the city engineer, and the traffic folks from the city. I have talked to all of the building owners within those areas to just give them a heads-up that while we have a lot more work to do, this is not a final decision. That they will be potentially impacted by this street improvement, as we move into development of this project.

The entire arena project has used a very deliberative process. It has engaged the public and specific stakeholders all along the way. We developed the arena plan June to September '04, we had the campaign and vote September to November, '04, the approval by the state legislature and signing of that bill to implement the tax by the governor was on . . . we started that in November and it was finalized in April of '05.

The site selection process, we're almost done. We started in April on this process and we hope to be done by the middle of this month. I would just remind you that on the site selection process . . . middle of next month, yes, middle of November. I would remind you, we started with a preliminary plan for the site that was the blue cloud area. That was the preliminary plan. We have worked through to come to a final plan after hearing from the public, after doing in-depth analysis relative to each of these sites, based on the criteria that I indicated earlier.

The first public meeting was held on April the 12th. The city's Arena Neighborhood Redevelopment Steering Committee has weighed in on this site selection process. The second public meeting was in August. The third public meeting was held, as I mentioned, September the 29th. The fourth public meeting will be tomorrow evening, where these specific footprints for each of the sites will be displayed and the public will have a chance again to give us their thoughts about which site makes the most sense for them. We will have, it is our hope, a final recommendation on a site by the middle of November coming back to you.

The future components you see there are design and programming. We'll start that as soon as the site is selected and it will go through early 2007. Land acquisition will start as soon as the site is selected and we have allowed time, through early 2007. It is some of our hopes that we will be able to work through that process, through negotiations and be done sooner than that, but we have recognized that it takes some time to go through that entire process and to make fair offers to folks on their properties.

The construction would then begin in early 2007 and the arena would open at the end of 2008 or early 2009. Just like site selection, all of these components start with the preliminary plan and there's a very deliberative, open, transparent process used to get to the final product. What are the

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

specific components, future components? The budget for the project, you have seen a preliminary budget that was put together to help us take a look at site selection. More work will need to be done on that budget as we work through the programming design phase. Once site selection has occurred we can then, and will then go to work taking those preliminary plans and doing the kind of review and analysis and engaging of stakeholders and the public to make sure that we can deliver the first class facility within the 184.5 million dollars.

Parking, I mentioned earlier that the experts working on this have prepared a parking plan which includes no additional parking except those surface parking areas that we mentioned on each of those sites. We will, immediately after the site is selected, as a part of the design process, begin to look at a more comprehensive and in depth parking plan and analysis. We will be engaging folks along the way to help us make sure that we are thinking about all aspects of parking for this project that needs to be addressed. Parking will be addressed through again a deliberative process in the programming design phase and we will be listening very closely to the Arena Neighborhood Development Steering Team, because of the work that they're doing to stimulate . . . with the arena, to stimulate development downtown and then sell to us, time and time again, an urban parking design is what is needed to do that. We will be more engaged with them to define the urban parking design and developing a plan around that.

Again, traffic, experts have developed a plan that says we need, with any of the four sites, improvements at Washington and Waterman and that with the three sites, south of Douglas, that we need to move Topeka from a one-way north to a one-way south to a two-way street, from Douglas to Kellogg. Traffic will also be further designed in the process.

How to get more information? Well, the public meeting that is scheduled for tomorrow evening, it will be at the Bank of America lobby, 100 North Broadway. It will be a come and go meeting again, 4 to 7. We will have stations or tables so that folks attending can go to all of those and get as much information about any of the subjects that they like, or if they have only one or two areas that they're interested in, they can go to those areas and get their questions answered. They will also be given again an opportunity to fill out a survey sheet that gives us a change to hear from them in a more formal manner, after they have been to the public hearing and we always invite folks to go to our website, www.sedgwickcounty.org for fact sheets, interviews, on-line forms and to sign up for the arena e-news.

So commissioners, on behalf of all of the teams that have been working on this project, we

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

appreciate the confidence that you and the public have shown for the process that we've used in development of this project. We appreciate the confidence and the patience that you and the public have shown in the process to this point. The process will continue. Again I would say to you, it will continue to be a very deliberative, open, transparent process. The goal again is to deliver a first-class arena that will seat 15,000 fans for basketball and to do it within the budget of 184.5 million dollars that the voters approved for this project. Thank you and I would be happy to answer any questions you might have."

Chairman Unruh said, "Well, thank you Ron. There are commissioners who would like to make a comment or ask a question so Commissioner Winters."

Commissioner Winters said, "All right, thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Ron, thank you for the presentation. It continues to be very good information that we're receiving and you can tell that it's well thought out and so far has been managed very well. I certainly appreciate the open process that you've commented about several times in your presentation and it's going to be, again, very interesting to see the public weigh in tomorrow evening and I'm sure that many of the property owners in the area are going to have comments to make and we're going to certainly accept those and I'm sure there are other interested parties from outside the area. And again, that's why we're having the meeting tomorrow evening, Thursday October 27th from 4 to 7.

So that's going to continue, I think, to demonstrate the openness of our process. You know, I realize that we're in, as you mentioned, the very early stages of the design process and one of the things that we do need to start the development at this stage is the budgetary issues that follow the plan to help guide decisions.

I think that it may be appropriate, at least from my perspective at this time, to remember that as we were going through the process in 2004, there were a whole host of things that we talked about with the public, as we were going through the campaigning process and trying to develop the plan of what this facility would look like, and I'm not going to go back over all of those plans, but there were at least three or so that kind of step out to me, and you've mentioned part of those in one shape or form, but I think it's important that we continue to remember them, as we begin to build budgets.

And again, as a preliminary comment, we did have some budgets out there in 2004 but we all realized that there are a number of those items were going to be moved up and down and around and shuffled until we got to the exact point of where the budget was going to work, but there were some things that we talked pretty seriously with citizens about. One is we said, you know, 184.5 million is going to be able to do the deal and we were going to say we can do it for this price.

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

Secondly, you know, one of the things that citizens were concerned about was the viability of the facility after construction and once it was open and a number of us indicated to a lot of folks, you know we've got . . . At that time, I think the number was \$23,000,000, but I think something in that \$20,000,000 range, we had plugged in there as an operations and maintenance reserve fund. And in listening to people in the community, I think that was a pretty important concept and I think it's pretty important, at least to me. And the third thing that I think we heard so much about was the parking issue. And in my recollections, you know, I think that we said to the citizens we were going to have a comprehensive plan and strategy that would work to provide adequate parking and so, as we continue to work on these budget numbers, site selection, I think the budget doesn't necessarily become the driving force at this point, but I think we need to remember that those three issues, we've got an overall maximum, we've told folks that we were going to have a reserve of maintenance and operating fund that was going to be adequate and that we would provide for an adequate parking strategy.

So as we move forward, just in . . . for the whole project, but as we move forward in this site selection, I think those are a couple of things that we need to keep in mind. But again, I think you've and the A & E team and staff have done a good job of presenting the options and now some of the real refining is going to start, so Mr. Chairman, at least for right now, those are the only comments that I have."

Chairman Unruh said, "Okay, thank you commissioner. Mr. Holt, did . . . we have other commissioners that want to speak, but did you want to respond right now."

Mr. Holt said, "I have duly noted those three significant considerations and we will make sure that, as we move through the rest of the site selection and certainly as we move through the design development, that those are uppermost in our consideration, as we work through this next stage of the project."

Chairman Unruh said, "All right, thank you. We have a comment from Commissioner Sciortino."

Commissioner Sciortino said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I could just maybe say I echo exactly what Commissioner Winters had said, but I need to just maybe put it in my own words. When we were really out among the people, educating them on what this concept was, and then the ensuing campaign, the three things that I heard on a continual basis was one, they really looked with kind of a jaundiced eye that we would be able to put this budget together for the budget that we said we could put it together for, that's the 184.5 and that is the one number that people just, I don't know,

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

have a cynical view of government, that they never do things on budget. They always overspend, etcetera. I don't think any of my colleagues here want to get into a position where we're going to micro-manage this project, but it is too easy to say 'Well, we don't care, as long as you come in at the bottom line, whatever you do is fine'. That would not be doing our job.

The two items that came up, as Tom alluded to, when we were out talking to the people, parking, parking, parking and I believe originally we set aside like almost 20-some odd million dollars, just in case there wasn't existing surface parking. We even said that, if that was the case, we would have sufficient money to build a parking garage, etcetera. And I think that it would be prudent for us to leave something in reserve for parking, just in case the existing surface parking isn't there or the existing surface parking needs some work to be done to it to make it adequate, as we alluded to the public.

And the final thing and people are very quick to find fault with anything government does and the nay-sayers were saying 'yeah, and who is going to pay for the subsidies when this white elephant doesn't come out the way you think it is? You're going to be coming back to us for more money and it's going to be a never ending drain, etcetera' and like Tom said, we had set aside 20-25 million for a prudent reserve that we told the public would be adequate to carry any subsidies that may be needed for these complexes, and I believe that included the Coliseum, whatever we do to it, for the next 20 years, that we wouldn't be coming back to them, and you've already said that you're going to look into it, but I just wanted to reemphasize, that was another thing that I think we have to assure the public that not only have we built this and have it come in on budget, but we've prepared for any unforeseen emergencies or monies that may be needed to sustain it.

But I want to acknowledge that. I do want to say that it makes me feel very proud of what this county is doing on this project. It's the largest public works project we've ever undertaken. We've had a lot of partners that have stood beside us and said, 'We're going to support you on this', you know the trade unions are with us. Wichita joined with us. We're going to make this a showcase, something that our grandchildren will be proud of for the next 20 years, but please do pay attention to those elements that the public indicated to us were of utmost concern. Thank you."

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

Commissioner Burnett said, "Well first I want to commend the Arena Design Consortium for this document that we've received, the analysis, it's all very easy to read, the maps are easy to read and from what I understand, these same maps are going to be at the meeting tomorrow, just in a bigger form for people to scrutinize and I think they will be able to see very clearly where we're going with this and I appreciate your presentation today too.

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

And I would encourage everyone, we had a very, very good turnout for that last public meeting and I think this one needs to be as well turned out, so I hope a lot of people show up to get their input into this. So great analysis, and are there going to be some handouts also for people to take home, regarding . . .?”

Mr. Holt said, “Each of the sites, yes.”

Commissioner Burtnett said, “Okay, pros and cons to this. Okay, that’s all I had.”

Chairman Unruh said, “All right, thank you. Well Ron, thank you for the presentation. I don’t see any other lights coming on. Don’t want to keep repeating the same words, but we want to be in budget, we want something that we’re proud of and we want to maintain our promise about maintenance and operating reserve. Thank you very much. Madam Clerk, call the next item please.”

Commissioner Winters said, “Mr. Chairman, if we need a motion, I’d make a Motion.”

MOTION

Commissioner Winters moved to receive and file.

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, “We have a comment, before we proceed, from Commissioner Norton.”

Commissioner Norton said, “I don’t have any comments on this, but I do have a question about when are we going to start having that dialogue about all of this information in a staff meeting or a workshop or whatever? I mean, we’re getting down to that time we’re just going to come and make a decision and it’s all been nicely packaged, but we haven’t had some hard conversations about what our values are and what we believe about all this and I just wanted to know when we were

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

going to do that.”

Chairman Unruh said, “I’ll ask the Manager to respond.”

Mr. Buchanan said, “Commissioners, the plan is that we will hear from the public tomorrow night. We will do an analysis of what we’re heard. We have a workshop scheduled with the City of Wichita Council for next Tuesday at 11:30 or noon to review the details of the site selection process, what you heard today, to receive any comments that they might have. And we would hope to bring that information then to you, . . . you’d be there and hear that, have a full discussion of that at a staff meeting the next Tuesday and if we’re prepared to make a decision the following Wednesday, which would be November 9th, if not we could still be on schedule if we delayed it a whole week. So the plan is, as we continue to try to be . . . make sure that the stakeholders are at the table, to hear what the public says tomorrow night, hear what the City Council may say and certainly receive information between them and then for you to do whatever analysis and discussions you needed to do about these sites, so we can proceed with the process.”

Chairman Unruh said, “All right, thank you. Commissioner.”

Commissioner Norton said, “When do we get briefed on what the other group that’s working on the part around it . . . what is it called?”

Commissioner Sciortino said, “Arena Neighborhood Plan.”

Commissioner Norton said, “Because for me, depending on what the neighborhood revitalization will look like, will depend on which site that I might be most interested in. I mean, to me there’s some perils downtown on tying the site with traffic and with what else could happen in those areas.”

Mr. Buchanan said, “Ron, could you help address this question. The question was when will we hear from the Downtown Arena Neighborhood Revitalization Planning folks?”

Mr. Holt said, “And this is specific to the site selection?”

Mr. Buchanan said, “Yes.”

Mr. Holt said, “There is a meeting, the next meeting of the Arena Neighborhood Downtown Redevelopment Steering Committee is next Monday, Monday October the 31st at 4:00 and they will come with a recommendation from that steering team on one of these sites.”

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

Commissioner Norton said, “Will they have neighborhood revitalization plans for every site? Because it’s great that they may come with what site they want, but if we make a decision it’s another site and they’re not prepared with a neighborhood revitalization plan for each site, that would maybe skew things a little bit.”

Mr. Holt said, “I . . . based on the work that I’ve seen them do, I think they will weigh in on each site and then have a recommendation on the site that they would prefer and if you make a decision different than that, you will know why and how that affects how they’ve weighed in on each of those sites.”

Commissioner Norton said, “And that will come to us when?”

Mr. Holt said, “They’re going to meet . . . that will be part of the final . . . when we get before you with a final recommendation on site, that will be part of that presentation. But their meeting is next Monday.”

Mr. Buchanan said, “We would expect you to hear that, whatever was decided and the criteria by which they decided it, we would expect you to hear that Tuesday, November 1st at that joint session, the very next day. They’re meeting Monday at 4:00. You’re meeting Tuesday at noon. You will hear Tuesday at noon.”

Commissioner Norton said, “I just want to be sure that, before I get down to a date where we have to say up/ down, yes/ no, we’re going to agree, I want to have a lot more information. The biggest project that’s ever been done in the downtown, it has implications for 50 years and I still feel pretty, you know, queasy about knowing all the information.”

Mr. Buchanan said, “Commissioners, let me say a couple of things. First of all, I think it’s important to recognize and understand in this process that we have been very careful to let the Downtown Development Corporation, the steering committee, the revitalization committee and city council and city staff understand that your, despite what information you may receive or what recommendations you receive, the decision lies with you. And I think, in this process of engaging folks in discussion and process of making sure that stakeholders are at the table, the only assurance that we have for good processes is that they will be listened to. Not that those people who are giving us advice, that advice will be followed to the letter.

I think all those groups clear . . . I know, all those groups clearly understand that. The second is if

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

in this process and if in this book there are questions that are not answered, I would recommend that you let us know and we will ferret out that information.”

Chairman Unruh said, “Thank you. Commissioner, any . . .? Okay. We do have a few more comments before we go on, so Ron stay close. Commissioner Winters.”

Commissioner Winters said, “Well I just want to echo what Commissioner Norton has said, and again I’m sorry I got in here without my calendar this morning, but after these next series of meetings and after the next Tuesday meeting, if everything just falls into place, then that’s one thing, but when we get to our next commission, that second commission meeting in November, that either needs to me to kind of be a workshop, discussion, study meeting or we have in this series of meetings up to it have refined it pretty succinctly, because the meeting that we go into to make the final decision, I don’t think we can have a lot of questions on our minds. We have to, I think, have it pretty well in mind and whether we need to put a workshop in there for just the commissioners to have that discussion, before we get to a Wednesday morning meeting. And again, all that needs to be done in the open and with anybody there that wants to be there, but I just echo what Commissioner Norton says, we need to have our questions answered before we get into a commission meeting to make the decision, I think. I will echo what Tim said.”

Chairman Unruh said, “And it’s quite possible to use a staff meeting for that workshop type atmosphere to have that discussion, we just need to plan for that, if that’s the way the commissioners want to go and we’ll be working with the manager to make sure that our calendar gives us that opportunity for discussion before we make a decision. Commissioner Sciortino. Excuse me, sir.”

Mr. Buchanan said, “Well, just let me remind the commission that our timetable, we built in at least one week for additional analysis, consideration and thought process. The original plan, the plan currently is for again you to hear from the citizens, need to hear from the downtown revitalization committee. You will get to hear from the city council and then have a workshop on November . . . staff meeting on November 8th it is, and if all things are falling into place, to make a decision on November 9th. If it’s not falling into place, we have a whole nother week to do it till the 16th. Or if that’s not suitable, we can have a special workshop earlier than the day before the 9th.”

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

Commissioner Sciortino said, “Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I echo what my two colleagues before me said. I don’t want to be in a position where November 8th we have a workshop and we have some concerns or something, something and we have to make a decision the following day, I would feel more comfortable if we could have a workshop and a decision to be made a week following, just in case some of us have something that we want to have addressed or some question that maybe

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

. . . staff usually is very good at anticipating questions that we may have and have the responses ready, but just in case there's something that one or more of us is unsure of, to have some comfort of knowing that we don't have to get the questions and answers right . . . sometimes when I receive the answer, I like to mull it around for a day or two, just to make sure that it came out to be the way I thought the initial taste was, so I don't know how we do that.

I don't know if we could change our strategy to if a staff meeting doesn't work, maybe the Wednesday preceding that would be a workshop, as opposed to a regular commission meeting and we sit here and we could ask questions open and above and the media is here also, but I would like to have some leeway between when we have all the, this is what we want from this group and this group, and we're trying to analyze all of it, keeping in mind cost also, get comfortable with what we like and then we can have a more informed vote is what I would hope, that there would be some gap between the final briefing of the commissioners and when we have to make a vote. That's all I had. Thank you."

Chairman Unruh said, "Okay. All right, well you have taken that in and we may . . . this vote may be pushed back to the 16th of November."

Mr. Buchanan said, "The 16th was the original plan. With discussion with some of you, we've moved it up a week, because we thought that was the right thing to do. It's your schedule. We'll do it any time you want to do it."

Chairman Unruh said, "All right, thank you. We will not establish that calendar today. We'll do it . . ."

Mr. Buchanan said, "I would recommend to let's see how it plays out over the next week and then we can always play with the calendar."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you. All right commissioners, any other comment on this issue, before we go forward? Just want to acknowledge that we did have folks here from the Design Consortium and from the Building Trades Organization and appreciate your presence as we discuss this. All right, no other discussion, we will move to the next agenda item."

DIVISION OF PUBLIC SAFETY- DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

D. PRESENTATION REGARDING UTILIZATION OF JUVENILE DETENTION AND ALTERNATIVES FUNDED BY THE JUVENILE JUSTICE AUTHORITY AND

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

SEDGWICK COUNTY.

POWERPOINT PRESENTATION

Mr. Mark Masterson, Director, greeted the Commissioners and said, “At your meeting on October 12th, you heard a detailed presentation by Dr. Craig-Moreland from Wichita State who evaluated the performance of the 16 prevention and two early intervention programs for the state fiscal year and that’s a very detailed document, per each program, and an overall presentation.

And after you heard that presentation, the question came up and I was asked to come back with information about how the juvenile detention population has changed since the prevention programs were implemented in 1998 and 2000.

I’m here today to provide you with that information to help answer the question. It’s important to understand that juvenile detention population is affected by the entire juvenile justice system. The study in management of population requires close monitoring, careful and timely data collection to figure out what factors are driving changes and a range of options, with regular meetings with key stakeholders to understand those issues and try to respond to them in a timely way.

I’ll begin with this slide that you’ve seen before, which is the Juvenile Justice, what I call the stairway to prison or incarceration. The prevention programs are at the very top and are an important ingredient and they were what is new in juvenile justice, with Juvenile Justice Reform. They represent a more balanced approach and a smart approach to try to get in front of this juvenile crime issue and try to put programs in place to prevent youth from coming into the system. Prevention programs work with youth and families with risk factors that increase that chance of delinquency. Lots of research has been done in the last ten years on risk factors and programs that are proven to work with families to actually prevent delinquency. That research has guided the development of the prevention programs that we have in place here that you have approved and the other juvenile programs that address delinquency in our local plan.

This presentation will focus on the steps just below prevention on this stairway. The juvenile intake and assessment numbers, which reflect arrests in our district, in our judicial district, that includes Wichita, Sedgwick County Sheriff and the municipalities. Locked detention, which I’ll refer to in the vernacular, secure detention throughout this presentation. That just means locked. And the alternatives to locked detention that we’ve put in place when we put them in place and the impacts that they’ve had. Sorry for the busyness of this chart but I wanted to show you the historical growth in the juvenile detention population and our response to it. The colors represent red is our juvenile detention facility, ADP represents the annual average daily population, so the red shows our secured facility.

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

The green shows back in home-based supervision, which is being deferred from the secure population home, with a program we provide that provides close monitoring. That has to be approved by the court and we move youth to it. At the end of 1990, we first created that program, that's why you see a one there. We created it and established it in November. The green throughout shows the growth in that population, the way we've spread that population. The yellow is the juvenile residential facility. That is an unlocked facility, coed, next door to our juvenile detention facility that is less costly to operate for youth that are deemed, by the court, able to be housed in that setting for less cost because they will appear for court and appear for placements without being locked in.

We started work here, you approved the construction of that facility in 2002 and it opened in June . . . or 1992. In June of 1994, that facility opened and represents the yellow throughout, there's 24 beds there.

The blue represents contracting offsite. When we started all of this, there were no beds available in the state, because similar trends were going on across the state, with the growth in juvenile detention and it outstripped the supply of placements that existed, so there was a crisis in the state at the number of beds. In September of 1995, a private operator opened a facility and we were their first customer. We've contracted with them for our male population and continue to do that today. We've done it for the last decade. We've expanded that contracting out to other facilities to be able to house females and some overflow.

That represents our continuum, but what I want to point out is that everyone in that continuum, in that growth line, has met the criteria to be detained in secure detention, so without those alternatives, those would have been the numbers that we would be dealing with to pay for secured detention.

When I take out the alternatives, here's the trend line for locked detention. Taken together with off-site housing, you can see that we've managed to stop the growth in demand for detention through the use of alternative and a range of options. Those needing locked detention, in order to protect the public and insure their appearance in court and for future placements have it and have had it throughout.

And those the judges believe can be safely housed at home were in our residential center have had that option and those are better options than spending a long time in locked detention. This has represented a great cost savings to our county to do it this way.

At the bottom, you can see our juvenile detention facility capacity has been 33 throughout that period. In 1996, the facility was studied by the Kansas Department of Health and Environment,

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

which licenses the facility, and the capacity was increased temporarily from 33 to 45 to permit us time and you time to approve to study and approve a long range plan to address the detention needs in our community and that's what's been done.

You can see in red the numbers, the annual averages at our current populations have stayed under 45 since 1996, when that agreement was put in place and that's been done through paying for the additional beds at other facilities. We've had no violations. We have a three-day window when we go over 45 to work hard to bring that number back down and we have had no violations or citations at all since then, so this has worked very well for our community.

Sorry for the small detail, you do have copies of his chart before you, because I want to show you, it was the first step in the planning process, the projections of what our detention needs would be for locked detention in our community. In 1996, we contracted with the National Council on Crime and Delinquency to come in and project the long-term secure detention needs for our community. The table shows the annual average population projections of bed demand by the low month, the high month and the average daily population. The table runs from 1997 through 2005 and the columns show the projection and then where it says average, that was our actual average for the year.

Here's where you begin to see the prevention . . . the impacts of prevention and early intervention on these projections, but I need to also point out that it isn't just prevention and early intervention. It is also the addition of other placements to be able to move people to that has an impact on this too, and that's been an important contribution.

But looking at the bottom line, shows a projected increase at the right for our high month average was projected to increase by 55 beds, from 67 in 1997 to 122 in 2005. When you look at the right-most column, you see that our averages for the high month each of those years has been in the range of 80 and that is where it is today, and that's year to date through September, so you can get an idea of that trend.

You look back at the annual averages and you can see the change in demand was projected to go up by 45. We've actually gone down by three. So the management of this system has had positive results on the population and on the cost.

I'd also direct your attention to see the change at about 2002, where we begin to depart from the projections downward, and if you look at 1998 for the prevention programs and 2000, giving them some time to work, I think they have an important impact on those population projections.

Now we move to the specific elements, to show the changes since 1998, to get really at the root of your question. Juvenile intakes, when juveniles are arrested for juvenile crime in this community, they are brought to sites. Misdemeanor persons are brought to the intake site. Persons with violent

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

charges are brought directly to the detention facility. But at both of those sites, intake and assessment is done and those are reflected in those numbers. We start in 1998 where the number of intakes was 6,826 and you can see the downward trend through calendar year 2004, at 4,503 this year, is reflective of that same level. Now we go to juvenile detention admissions and you can see in 1998, there were 1,514 admissions. In calendar year '04 there were 1,175, a dramatic decline in the number of admissions.

Key variables in addressing juvenile detention population are reduction in admissions and reductions in lengths of stay. It's important to know that while the county has to pay and provide for prevention, we don't control who we get or how long they stay, and so collaboration is a key to managing these systems.

Next slide will take a little bit of explanation but this gets to the issue of length of stay of our population and looks at the population that stays the longest in juvenile detention and the percent of our annual resident days that that population used in our facility and that's the population that comes in, is held for court and then they're held for out of home placement, so they go through the whole court process and then the wait to go to placement, for a slot to open.

You can see that in calendar year 1998, 49% of our resident days were occupied by that population. That population increased to 53 and it's directly related to the number of available placements to move to. If there's no slots that are open, there's no where to move to. If there are, you have a real opportunity to work hard in reducing that length of time from when the courts decided and said this person is going to an out of home placement and they move. You can see the decline to where we are today, with 39% of our resident days occupied by a population. The low was 32, in calendar year 2002 and what's happened since then is we've had a reduction in the steps of our graduated sanctions, due to funding decreases, federal and state, day reporting program went away and a multi-systemic therapy program went away. Both have direct impacts on the detention population and you can see that we've gone up somewhat in that population, because there's fewer options.

What was done to produce these results? One component is that prevention and early intervention programs were established. Second, that admissions were reduced in a safe way without jeopardizing public safety. How was that done? An objective risk screening tool was implemented and put in place at intake and assessment, approved by local court rule and is in place today. That tool was put in place in 1997 that limits admission based on objective factors that are proven to relate to risk and that tool was validated then, in a subsequent study by Wichita State in 2000 and that tool is in place today and has served us very, very well in reducing those admission numbers to

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

juvenile detention.

In the area of reducing length of stay, the detention alternatives have played a huge impact. We've expedited movement through the court process. Yesterday in your workshop, you heard about bringing in the judicial team to look at case processing and identify any opportunities that would reduce case processing time for court hearings. That had an impact. Placements were added. We expanded JRBR, the Salvation Army opened up placements for juvenile offenders. Kings Camp opened up placements, so we had additional options to move people to. That helped.

Juvenile Justice Reform put the state responsibility for movement of that population, the in custody population, under our control in 1998. In our department, we operate the juvenile case management program. That change gave us direct opportunity to manage and prioritize that and regularly measure the length of time that it takes to move people to placement. We do that. That's had a positive impact.

And in 2000, you funded a detention advocacy program that provides specialized legal representation at detention hearings, with case management services to be able to offer the court alternatives to address the needs of youth, and legal representation to present their case as convincingly as possible, to provide the court with an option of supervision and access to treatment that could give them the option to release a youth from detention, and if they decide to not release the youth at that time, something needs to change to work on it and then bring it back to court when that change has occurred and offer a plan and that's been a very successful program.

Another thing that was done was the information is critical and real-time information about this population and what's going on in your system is absolutely critical. We developed an integrated, computerized information sharing system here in our community, in the juvenile side that does two things. Real-time, it provides case level information for those individuals in the DA's Office, in the court, that have to work with information to make decisions, so it facilitates rapid gathering of the information to complete their recommendations to make more rapid decisions. Two, it provides policy makers with information, with management reports to know profile-wise, what's going on with this population to identify changes and bring those for discussion with the key stakeholders to look at ways we might address that and figure out what's going on. That's an important piece of this whole puzzle, good information.

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

How were decisions made to keep this moving from the last decade, and to make continuous improvement? And I contend that the collaboration and cooperation, leadership and planning of the key stakeholders that began back when we had that sudden peak in 1994 and 1995, but continues today, monthly to be committed to developing a good system here of options and managing those well has been key. Most importantly, the District Court, the DA's Office, this board, county manager, our department and corrections, Kansas Department of Health and Environment that licenses these facilities, JJA, Wichita State and Kansas Legal Services that provides the defense, they all have a stake in juvenile detention and producing positive results takes continuous work with all of them on multiple levels.

The consent agreement that was agreed to with KDHE back in 1996 did a couple of things that helped a lot. One, the capacity of our facility was 33. You came in and looked at that and we brought in people to look at it and said the facility capacity could be increased to 45, while a planning process went on and could be safely done, but it was capped at 45 and when the population goes over 45, I told you before, we have three days to bring it back down.

Two, it established a planning process to deal with the short-term needs, as well as the long-term needs, which has been done. Three, it provided an emergency protocol, when all else fails and the population is over capacity, to have an emergency group to pull together, which is the District Court, DA's Office and the Populations Management in Corrections, to look at what can we do to relieve the population and there are multiple things that can be done and have been done.

And last, it provided penalties for violations, and we have had none, so it kept the focus on maintaining that continuous addition and effort on this. The detention utilization committee was established and is a monthly group that regularly reviews the use of the juvenile intake and juvenile detention resources. All four juvenile judges attend, the District Attorney's Office always attends, and our staff always attends with the intake and assessment, juvenile case management and juvenile detention information to look at what we're doing on a monthly basis and very importantly, Wichita State has made a continuous commitment to this process and attends every meeting and helps to bring what's being discovered in the research to this group that is very receptive to putting the research into practice. They've also provided numerous studies, when we can't figure out what's going on, to dig into the data and get good information for this group to be able to make decisions on how to proceed.

Second, a population management committee meets every Tuesday morning at 9:00 and has for the last decade of the people that really work with the youth that have a role in expediting movement.

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

Every one of the cases is reviewed. They don't fall through the cracks and where there's opportunity to move, they move rapidly. So that model has worked very well in the juvenile system.

Impacts: stopped the growth in demand for secure detention, we've . . . the projected bed need was originally 130 to build a facility. That was reduced down to 108, which should last us well into the next five to ten years. Reduce construction costs for the new facility by reducing that size, reduce long-term operating costs and reduce the number of youth in state custody, since all this has been done, by 100. That's the deep end of the system that's expensive, that has served the taxpayers well in this district, and it produces better outcomes for youth, having a range of options. I think Dr. Craig spoke to the latest research on social contagion, which is keeping people exposed to juvenile offenders for a long period of time is the greatest predictor that they'll end up in prison, and so trying to minimize that with early intervention and options is smart and better for youth and families. And that concludes my presentation. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Chairman Unruh said, "Okay, thank you Mark, very good presentation. We do have a comment from Commissioner Winters."

Commissioner Winters said, "Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'd remind the commission, you know one of the reasons we wanted this presentation is after we had a review of the prevention programs a couple of weeks ago, you know we said, you know what's really happening and you know, here is a perfect example is you can't look to one thing, one specific group, but it's this whole Juvenile Justice Reform that was started by our partners really in the state legislature in 1997 and '98, but when you just think about did the system and is the system working and I'd be interested to hear just a brief comment from Mark if it's working in other places in the state. But when you think that back in 1996 we had a national organization come in and make projections about what kind of secure detention and now we're almost 40 people under that projection that was made in 1996.

When you think about the intake numbers, and those are the young people that are arrested, in 1998 there was 6,826 arrested and in 2004 there were 4,403. When you think about admissions into the facility, in 1998- 1,514, 2004-1,175. So something is happening in the right direction and whether it's one prevention program or one intervention program, it would be hard to determine, but overall this system for Sedgwick County is, in my estimation, working and I think Commissioner Sciortino asked is there a good news story here. I think there is a good news story here about the way these numbers are going.

Mark, are other judicial districts having similar kinds of numbers as these, or in some places, is it

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

still a pretty big struggle?”

Mr. Masterson said, “We’re the model in the state, particularly with the way this has been set up, with outside evaluation annually by Wichita State of the programs, regular contract monitoring that you all have put into place that occurs to make sure the programs that are put in place one, are proven to work and two, that they’re being done in the way they’re supposed to be done, so you can get those results. The biggest difference, in looking at the state numbers, in 2000 the case load for those in state custody statewide was 1,824 and it’s gone up to 2,097 through 2004. Ours has gone down by 100.”

Commissioner Winters said, “All right, well I certainly, you know, would want to acknowledge Mark and all of his work in a leadership role, but there are lots of others. The district courts have been helpful, the DA’s Office, and all those working in prevention, so Mark again, thank you for this report. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.”

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

Commissioner Norton said, “I think it would be interesting if we also grabbed this somehow with not just the raw numbers, but with also what’s happened with the population base of that group of young people. I don’t know what you would measure, what you’d measure, age 10 to age 18, but I’m sure the population has gone like this, and all this data has gone the other way and if you just baseline it from what we’re looking at it looks great, but if you also understand that the population base per thousands, admissions, arrests, intakes, whatever per thousand has probably dramatically gone down, that would be some compelling information that maybe we could . . . I don’t know if you can package it that way.”

Mr. Masterson said, “When I pulled up the National Crime and Delinquency numbers, they packaged it that way, of course as one of their projections, and the 10 to 17 at-risk populations, as projected at that time in 1996, is going to increase from 1990 to 2005 by 28%. Now, having gone back and checked the 2000 census to see if that’s what’s happened, but that’s what was in their projection.”

Commissioner Norton said, “I think that would be some interesting numbers to start looking at, for us to benchmark every year or every five-year period, how many of all these things that we measure per thousand people, because Sedgwick County is growing and that population continues to get larger and the numbers get smaller and how would that graph on a national scale, a state scale. It

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

looks like to me that per thousand population of that group, 10 to 17 I guess is what you measure, it looks like even more dramatic results than even we can interpret here if we saw it in a different manner, so just a challenge for us.”

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

Commissioner Sciortino said, “Well, everything I think that needs to be said about this report has been said. I do think that this is one of the examples that we can point to with pride that this isn’t handouts that we’ve been doing. Apparently, we’re seeing some very dramatic results. When I looked at them, some of those bar charts, as we’ve stabilized out the number of people that we have to put in our facilities, and there’s always going to be that faction. There’s always going to be some young person that did something so traumatic or what have you that there’s no other real alternative for them but incarceration. I have kind of guarded optimism that maybe we are making a difference. That maybe we are slowly saving a young person from this anti-social behavior and maybe getting that person on the road to being a productive citizen. So, I’m glad we had the report and I think the taxpayers can look at this as one example that this county has decided to be proactive in trying to be part of a solution to a problem that is always going to be with us.

And as Commissioner Norton indicated, the more dramatic impact is because this demographic population, from 12 to 17, is really increasing, yet we’ve been able to keep our hard numbers down. So as a percentage of the population base, we’ve done a really good job, so congratulations Mark. You’re doing good work. Thank you.”

Chairman Unruh said, “Commissioner Norton.”

Commissioner Norton said, “Just a thought, based on the conversations we had yesterday, is there starting to be any information of how many people make it into our adult incarceration process that come out of juvenile detentions and everything? Because as we see this good news in the juvenile area, the adult doesn’t look good for us, and I’m wondering if there’s any correlation that I’m wondering if at some point what we’re doing at the very early levels is going to have some impact at the adult level. So are there numbers of young people that have been through the juvenile system that went on to do . . . have adult problems? Are there numbers?”

Mr. Masterson said, “I don’t have those at hand, but I can sure ask.”

Commissioner Norton said, “Well, I guess as we study the adult part of it, maybe we need to start thinking about that whole continuum and is what we’re doing in juvenile going to eventually affect

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

what happens at the adult level. I don't know if it is or not, but if we keep going with this adult level and it isn't getting any better, at least we don't think it is and maybe we need to think about that."

Chairman Unruh said, "Commissioner Winters."

Commissioner Winters said, "Well the only thing, yesterday at our workshop we talked about some of the things that we could start to build a continuum on, whether it be drug court or mental health court or if there could be a more defined system that everyone could participate in. I mean, it's like criminal justice reform has answered part of that on the juvenile side. Now I think even our workshop yesterday, on talking about it on the adult side with the more alternative things for different kinds of things besides just 'Okay, you're going to the adult detention center, end of story'. I would hope that we would begin to see what juvenile justice reform has done on the adult side, eventually. And even on the juvenile side, we still had to build a facility. I mean, we're still involved in the process of building a facility, but I would hope there are some correlations here."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you. Well Mark, we are very excited and appreciative of the results that we've gained out of this program and I would also want to add my congratulations and thanks to you, as you've been very instrumental and catalytic in developing this whole continuum of sanctions and your leadership is appreciated.

I think probably, one of the . . . just besides looking at statistics, I think we can probably come to a conclusion that this actually has helped change the character of our community, these prevention programs have. I mean, these numbers don't stay low without meaning that we've got folks not committing crimes and that we're actually able to influence someone's life, so that's very positive and really appreciate your efforts in that."

Mr. Masterson said, "Thank you very much."

Chairman Unruh said, "Commissioners, we need a motion to receive and file."

MOTION

Commissioner Norton moved receive and file.

Commissioner Sciortino seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

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

Chairman Unruh said, "Next item please."

CONSENT AGENDA

E. CONSENT AGENDA.

- 1. Budget authority transfer from Public Safety Contingency to Sedgwick County Sheriff's Office for Out of County Housing and Inmate Medical Services.**
- 2. Notification to City of Wichita, Kansas to terminate a lease agreement for space used by Emergency Communications for a radio shop at 1905 North Market, Wichita.**
- 3. Amendment to Agreement with Wilson Darnell Mann, reducing compensation by \$1,309,321 for work related to improvements to Kansas Coliseum.**
- 4. Waiver of policy to hire a grant-funded Water Quality Specialist, Code Enforcement, at B321-12.**
- 5. Application for License to Retail Cereal Malt Beverages.**

<u>Applicant Name</u>	<u>Business Name</u>
Mark O. Branham	Quik Trip West Inc. #392
- 6. Order dated October 19, 2005 to correct tax roll for change of assessment.**
- 7. Payroll Check Register of October 21, 2005.**
- 8. General Bills Check Register(s) for the week of October 19 – 25, 2005.**

Mr. Buchanan said, "Commissioners, you have the consent agenda before you and I would recommend you approve it."

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

MOTION

Commissioner Sciortino moved to approve the consent agenda as presented.

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, “Commissioners, we’ve come to the end of our agenda, but we need to have a Fire District meeting, so I will adjourn the regular meeting of the board of county commissioners.”

F. OTHER

G. ADJOURNMENT

Regular Meeting, October 26, 2005

There being no other business to come before the Board, the Meeting was adjourned at 10:54 a.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