

MEETING OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

REGULAR MEETING

February 8, 2006

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, February 8, 2006 in the County Commission Meeting Room in the Courthouse in Wichita, Kansas, by Chairman Ben Sciortino, with the following present: Chair Pro Tem Lucy Burtnett; Commissioner David M. Unruh; Commissioner Tim R. Norton; Commissioner Thomas G. Winters; Mr. William P. Buchanan, County Manager; Mr. Rich Euson, County Counselor; Deputy Michael Littleton, Sheriff's Department; Mr. Ray Vail, Finance Manager, Department on Aging; Ms. Sonja Armbruster, Communications Coordinator, Health Department; Mr. Robert W. Parnacott, Assistant County Counselor; Mr. John Schlegel, Metropolitan Area Planning Department (MAPD); 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. Sheri Schoenebeck, Representative, Girl Scouts of the Golden Plains.
Mr. Chris Sexton, General Manager, Derby Walmart.
Ms. Elizabeth Moler Rindt, 2817 N. Beacon Hill Court, Wichita, Ks.
Mr. David Davis, 1041 S. Seneca, Wichita, Ks.

INVOCATION

The Invocation was led by Reverend Sherdeill Breathett, Sr. of St. Mark United Methodist Church, Wichita.

FLAG SALUTE

ROLL CALL

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

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES: Regular Meeting, January 18, 2006

The Clerk reported that all Commissioners were present at the Regular Meeting of January 18, 2006.

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

Chairman Sciortino said, “Commissioners, I believe you’ve had a chance to review the Minutes of the Meeting of January 18th. What’s your will?”

MOTION

Commissioner Burtnett moved to the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of January 18th, 2006.

Commissioner Unruh seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

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

Chairman Sciortino said, “Next item.”

PROCLAMATION

A. PROCLAMATION DECLARING FEBRUARY 2006 AS “GIRL SCOUT COOKIE MONTH.”

Chairman Sciortino said, “Commissioners, we have a proclamation that I’ll read into the record. It states:

PROCLAMATION

WHEREAS, Girl Scouting builds girls of courage, confidence and character who make the world a better place. The Girl Scouts of the Golden Plains Council serves more than 7,500 girls and 2,500 adults in Butler, Cowley, Harvey, Sedgwick and Sumner counties; and

WHEREAS, by participating in Girl Scout programs, girls learn how to become tomorrow’s leaders and gain invaluable communication, decision-making, goal-setting and business skills that

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

will benefit them their entire lives; and

WHEREAS, through the support of generous donors and annual product-sale activities such as the Girl Scout Cookie Sale, the Girl Scouts of the Golden Plains Council is able to make Girl Scouts available to every girl, everywhere and ensure it will be available far into the future; and

WHEREAS, Girl Scouts is the preeminent organization dedicated solely to girls- all girls who gain strong values, social conscience and conviction about their own potential and self-worth that will serve them well into adulthood;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that I, Ben Sciortino, Chairman of the Board of Sedgwick County Commissioners, do hereby proclaim February 2006 as

‘Girl Scout Cookie Month’

in Sedgwick County and encourage all citizens to support the annual Girl Scout Cookie Sale.

Commissioners, that’s the proclamation. What is your will on this please?”

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

Chairman Sciortino said, “I believe Sheri Schoenebeck and Angela Cato are here to accept the . . .”

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

Ms. Sheri Schoenebck, CEO, Girl Scouts Council, greeted the Commissioners and said, “Commissioners, thank you very much. I’m Sheri Schoenebck and I’m the CEO of the Girl Scout Council here and on behalf of the 7,500-plus girls that we have working very hard right now selling and taking orders and about to be delivering cookies, I thank you for honoring their efforts.

I think, in an entrepreneurial community like this, when girls are setting goals and learning to meet those goals and pay their own way through activities that they enjoy and learn from, it’s a very valuable activity, so I hope you will enjoy the cookies. They’re being delivered at our office as we speak, so it’s pretty exciting. Thank you so much.”

Chairman Sciortino said, “Thank you. We have some comments, so don’t go away. I believe, Mr. Unruh, you were first.”

Commissioner Unruh said, “Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to commend you all for staying with the program and continuing to make this sort of investment in time and energy so this program can go forward. And I wanted to comment on the billboard that I see as I come to work every day. It says ‘Invest in these smart cookies’, so had kind of a cute tag line. Wanted to compliment you on that.”

Ms. Schoenebck said, “Well, thank you. The girls that we’ve got in this program are just terrific and they gain so much from it. It’s really fun to see them grow, as a result of this experience.”

Commissioner Unruh said, “Well good work. That’s all I had.”

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

Commissioner Norton said, “Well, it doesn’t pay to be on the end of the passing of the cookies, I can tell you that, because I got no choice at all. Fortunately, I got plenty of choices in my own neighborhood in Haysville, because the girls are used to coming by our house and we’ve had generations of families sell us cookies and we’re very active in that. I’m real supportive of the Girl Scouts, have been for a lot of years. Back when my girls were going to Camp Wiedeman, I went there several years myself. I’ve sold a heck of a lot of cookies and had a garage full of them over the years myself, and it’s a wonderful way for the girls to be entrepreneurial, to get out into the community, to spread the word about Girl Scouting and I hope, you know, this is a great year for you.

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

It's been pretty tough on a lot of non-profits over the last couple of years, but you know, Girl Scout cookies is one of those kind of iconoclastic things in our society that you really look forward to every year, as a community, so I wish you well but I continue to be very supportive and will support this resolution of course."

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

Commissioner Burtnett said, "Well, I just want to point out that I got one of the reduced-fat cookies, so I saved you from that. Apparently, the Girl Scouts that live in my neighborhood have moved away. If I wanted to get cookies, is there a phone number or website I can go to?"

Ms. Schoenebeck said, "We do. We have a hotline number. It's 1-88MINT . . . 686-MINT, I'm sorry. And also we have girls who will soon begin selling cookies in front of some Dillons stores and other areas of the community."

Commissioner Burtnett said, "So there are opportunities."

Ms. Schoenebeck said, "There are."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Well, I'd like to increase those opportunities. Anyone listening and watching today, if you're a Girl Scout please call the commission office, Commissioner Lucy Burtnett will buy anything that you have to sell. That will help you out."

Commissioner Burtnett said, "Thank you. Thank you so much."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Well, I just . . . you know, this is really . . . you know, every year and I don't have a problem with Girl Scouts in my neighborhood. There's that little girl and there's the caring mom right behind her and I always make them tell me the whole spiel, you know, why should I buy them, what . . . and boy, they've got it down pat, and I sign my name and I check out . . . this will be the eleventh box of lemon pastry crèmes that I'll receive. That's my favorite.

But anyway, you guys do a heck of a job and it's pretty neat trying to . . . the only way you can get a young person on the path to being a good citizen and being a contributor to our society is to start out young and let them feel that there's . . . and I've also been to Camp Wiede . . . that father/daughter fishing thing or whatever and we're out there catching these little whatever they were.

But anyway, it's a great organization and good luck to you."

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

Ms. Schoenebck said, “Well thank you and I must say, it couldn’t be done without the adult volunteers and parents that are backing these girls up as they go through all these activities. It’s very time consuming for them, but their commitment really pays off.”

Chairman Sciortino said, “Okay. And we have one more comment, and it’s from Commissioner Norton.”

Commissioner Norton said, “Well, just so you know that my oldest granddaughter Kirsten is a Brownie this year and she would be glad to sell you all the cookies you want.”

Chairman Sciortino said, “Yeah, we’ll help you out. We don’t want you to feel . . .”

Commissioner Burnett said, “I’ll let you know if I have any problems.”

Commissioner Norton said, “Don’t think we won’t drag her up here and walk the halls.”

Chairman Sciortino said, “It’s 660-9300 and just ask for Commissioner Burnett. Okay, there we go.”

Ms. Schoenebck said, “Thank you very much.”

Chairman Sciortino said, “Yes, ma’am. Next item please.”

DONATIONS

B. DONATION BY DERBY WAL-MART OF \$1,000, TO BE USED FOR THE NEW OAKLAWN ACTIVITY CENTER.

Deputy Michael Littleton, Community Policing, Sheriff’s Office, greeted the Commissioners and said, “I’m here today to talk to you guys about a donation that we received from the Derby Walmart. The Derby Walmart has been an avid supporter of the Sedgwick County Sheriff’s Department since 2002. From 2002 to 2005, they provided \$500 each year for the awards ceremonies for Oaklawn and Cooper, which provides the prizes for the kids for reading and any kind of academic achievements that they might have.

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

And for the past two years, we've also had a bonus grant of \$1,000 from the Derby Walmart, which . . . for the community policing and the Oaklawn Activity Center, \$1,000 that the Derby Walmart provided to us this year will continue our SCORE program, which the SCORE program is a program where Sheriff's Deputies and other employees of Sedgwick County will take children out once a month for a field trip and that was originally funded by a grant for the last three years, I believe it was. But once the grant ran out, we were . . . you know, we wanted to keep this program alive and with the \$1,000 that Derby has donated is going to be able for us to fund that program for another year. So we're real excited about that.

And today I have Chris Sexton with me. He's the general manager of the Derby Walmart and I also have a certificate that I would like to give Chris from the Sheriff's Department, to Derby Walmart, just one way that we can say thank you for their continued support and keeping our SCORE program and our programs that we have, as far as the programs in the schools, the award assemblies, because we . . . honestly, it would be real tough to do a lot of that stuff without Walmart's help.

At this time I would like to ask the Commission to accept the donation and authorize the Chairman to sign a letter of appreciation."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Certainly. Perhaps maybe Mr. Sexton, would you like to say something on behalf of your employees."

Mr. Chris Sexton, General Manager, Derby Walmart, said, "Not really. I, as always, appreciate the recognition for the store and for the associates at the store. Sometimes confused as to why I need to come down to give away money, to be authorized to receive money."

Chairman Sciortino said, "We'll come to you, no problem."

Mr. Sexton said, "No, that's okay. I'm fine, thank you. But I do appreciate . . . we are limited on the exposure that we have with other parts of the Sheriff's Department, but I do know in the Oaklawn community and Derby community we've been great partners together in that part of Sedgwick County and I can't tell you how much we appreciate their help and efforts, when we have issues on that side of town, so thank you again very much for the certificate."

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

Chairman Sciortino said, “Well Commissioners, before we vote on this, I need to say something about the Derby Walmart in general, but Mr. Sexton in particular. First of all, these employ . . . these funds come from the employees, I mean, because if they weren’t working there and really willing to give back to the community, and treat their customers right, then Walmart wouldn’t have the money available to do this, but I had to . . . Mr. Sexton is, from everything I’ve heard, he’s very, very good to help people in Derby and the surrounding area but he’s not very politically astute. Not once has he let me win on the golf course and that really kind of is dangerous, but continue with that, but he just decides that he’s going to win and I always come in second, or if Skites is playing, I come in third.

But we want to thank you very much because this is very generous and Walmart is again proving to the entire community that you are a good, dedicated corporate citizen and you believe in giving back to the community that supports your organization, so thank you. Commissioners, what is the will of the board on this item?”

MOTION

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

Commissioner Burtnett seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

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

Chairman Sciortino said, “Chris, thanks again. Please pass our thanks on to your employees also. Deputy, you did a fine job. Kristi’s job is in jeopardy, I can tell you. Next item please.”

DIVISION OF HUMAN SERVICES- DEPARTMENT ON AGING

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

C. DONATION BY THE BEVERLY FOUNDATION OF \$500, TO BE USED FOR “THE EXTRA MILE” PROGRAM THAT REWARDS TRANSPORTATION BROKERAGE DRIVERS FOR EXCEPTIONAL CUSTOMER SERVICE.

Mr. Ray Vail, Director of Finance and Support Services, Department on Aging, greeted the Commissioners and said, “I’m here today to present a donation by the Beverly Foundation of \$500 to the Sedgwick County Transportation Brokerage. The donation will be used for the Extra Mile program, that rewards transportation brokerage drivers for exceptional customer service. I ask that you accept the donation and authorize the Chair to sign and I’ll answer any questions.”

Chairman Sciortino said, “Thank you. I don’t see that . . . yes there is one. Commissioner Unruh.”

Commissioner Unruh said, “Thank you. Ray, what is this money split up between several drivers, or . . . ?”

Mr. Vail said, “It’s going to be awarded to the contract drivers that we have that work for the Transportation Brokerage. We only had one driver that is a Sedgwick County employee. The other driver is a Sedgwick County employee and the rest are contract, so if they go above and beyond their normal . . . what they normally do, they pick someone up, then they’ll be recognized for that.”

Commissioner Unruh said, “Okay, so one person or one company will receive this whole award then.”

Mr. Vail said, “I believe the way Valerhy has it set up is that they’ll split up possibly five one-hundred dollar awards or whatever way they chose to recognize that person.”

Commissioner Unruh said, “Okay, I understand now. And these additional awards or anything doesn’t go against any of the contract agreements that we have, I assume.”

Mr. Vail said, “No they don’t.”

Commissioner Unruh said, “Thank you, Mr. Chair. That’s all I have.”

Chairman Sciortino said, “Okay. Any further questions of this presenter? What’s the will of the board on this item please?”

MOTION

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

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

Commissioner Burtnett seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

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

Chairman Sciortino said, "All right, thank you very much. Next item please."

DIVISION OF INFORMATION & OPERATIONS – HEALTH DEPARTMENT

D. DONATION BY MARCH OF DIMES BIRTH DEFECTS FOUNDATION OF \$500, AND EDUCATION MATERIALS VALUED AT \$476, TO PROVIDE VITAMINS AND EDUCATION MATERIALS TO HEALTHY BABY CLIENTS AT HIGH RISK FOR POOR PREGNANCY OUTCOMES.

Ms. Sonja Armbruster, Communications Coordinator, Health Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I'm presenting to you a donation that we've received from the March of Dimes, who shares our mission in saving babies and they have provided us with specific materials for our moms that we see through our Healthy Babies program, \$487 worth of materials are expensive, they're comprehensive and the moms really value them and our case workers especially really value the materials.

Additionally, we have received \$500 to spend on vitamins, which include folic acid in the vitamin, to insure healthy pregnancy outcomes and that's how we plan to spend the donations and we ask that you take the recommended action."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Thank you. Any questions of Sonja? What's the will of the Board, please?"

MOTION

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

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

Commissioner Norton seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

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

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

CITIZEN INQUIRY

E. REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS REGARDING "THE POWER OF THINKING BIG."

Mr. David Davis, 1041 S. Seneca, Wichita, Ks., greeted the Commissioners and said, "I've come here today concerning the power of thinking big and potential impact it can have on the lives of other people and if you don't mind, I would like to start with my mother and the vision she must have had to have given me such a name as she did. I can still remember when I was a little boy, my mother telling me how some day it would have a positive impact on my life and because my mother dared to think big, I now have a name that has not only impacted my life, along with a few others, a name I am honored and humbled to have, all because my mother dared to think big while including me in her dream. My name is King David Davis and once again it is a pleasure to stand here in your presence and with all things considered, maybe by the grace of God as well.

Commissioners, as we all know, we live in a community that seemed to have a difficult time with the truth, along with men and women who dare to be honest, honorable and not afraid to speak out, so if I by chance offend, disrespect or somehow come across as uncaring, I apologize to you in advance.

Today, I would like to challenge you and all Sedgwick County as well to think, dream and envision bigger than we are accustomed to, to start reaching beyond the existing boundaries of thought,

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

possibility and belief. I have found in my experience, it takes as much energy to think small as it does to think big, if not more so. I've also noticed when those in leadership dare to dream, envision and think big, and you believe in your dream, while operating in the confidence thereof, you tend to inspire others to do the same. I believe, by setting your sites high and in the best interest of all of our citizens, not just the so called privileged few, you create a synergy of thought, belief and action that they get people excited, willing and eager to do whatever they can to help, once again making the impossible possible.

Already, I've seen the synergy on a small scale and I've seen it in some of my most recent issues. It was most unfortunate we were not ready and the community-wide leadership were not in a position to make such a project a reality. It seems we live in a community where thinking big, operating outside the box and speaking out is shunned, discouraged and penalized.

In light of the recent disappointments, and atmosphere of distrust, both government and political leadership is now a political leadership void in the community, yearning to be filled. Commissioners, overseers, standard-bearers, fathers and mothers of Sedgwick County, I now council you to dream, to believe in the impossible, to envision a future where political leadership of local government operates in the best interests of all our citizens, a restructuring of our economics, so we don't have to devour our own citizens or pose a threat to our surrounding towns just to exist, wherein instead we compliment each other through our strengths and weaknesses.

And while the rest of the world are looking for desperate, economic quick fixes, we will be tapping into our greatest resource, our citizens, the enormous opportunities of wealth already present in our community. I believe the revolutionary impact of such vision of the gross complexity of enormous proportion and this is merely the tip of the iceberg.

And when you take into consideration the restoration of honor and respectability back in the people's institution, healing to our citizens through the power of respect, and the leadership dynamic that rises above the differences, so we as a community can move forward together, respectively.

My dear friends, I believe the sky is the limit and the opportunities will be staggering. What do you say we dare to really start to think big, in the land where you are as big as you think. And let's not forget that it is with God's help that all things are truly possible. I also believe, if you want to hit the moon, you need to aim for Mars. Now, with all things considered, it's time to set our sights on the stars. Thank you."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Thank you. Commissioners, what's the will of the Board? Do we have to make a Motion to receive and file a presentation? Okay, next item please."

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

PUBLIC HEARING

F. PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING A COUNTY APPROVED ANNEXATION.

POWERPOINT PRESENTATION

Mr. Robert W. Parnacott, Assistant County Counselor, County Counselor's Office, greeted the Commissioners and said, "We'll get the map up on the screen. This is a proposed annexation by the City of Valley Center of a 160-acre tract at the northwest corner of 85th Street and Broadway. It's outlined in red. You can see the city development in the area, so it is surrounded on all four sides by cities, three sides by Valley Center and on the east by Park City and we'll take this back down, we can get it back up later if you need to look at it.

This is not a usual type of annexation we have to deal with. We've only done about four of these in the past five years and here's the process. It begins with the city submitting a petition to the county commissioners and a service plan and then, at that point, you have to set a hearing date and provide notice to the landowner. We send it by certified mail, within 10 days and we have to publish notice within two weeks of the hearing.

The petition also has to be submitted to the MAPC for review of conformance with the comprehensive plan. It's not really so much whether the annexation should be approved or not, just whether it's consistent with the growth area of the city. That has to be submitted within a certain timeframe and then there's a review that has to be completed and then we have to hold the public hearing and you have the statutory finding that you need to make at the close of the hearing.

In this case, we've received the petition and the service plan back in November and December, so December 5th is the date that we time everything else by. As you can see, we've met all the requirements, in terms of published notice, mailed notice, the review by the MAPC, so we've met all our statutory requirements to go forward with the hearing.

At the hearing, you're supposed to consider the impact of approving or disapproving the annexation of the entire community involved, meaning the city and also the land proposed to be annexed. The overall goal here is to insure orderly growth and development in the community. We also have to look at the effect of the proposed annexation on the city and the area being annexed, other governmental units, such as fire districts, utilities or other public or private persons.

The statute gives you a series of criteria that we'll talk about in a little more detail in a few minutes, but we'll just take a quick look at them. They deal with factors that you would look at in evaluating whether the annexation should be approved, both physical characteristics, current growth estimates,

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

potential growth in the area, the cost of the services that are provided, tax impact on the city and the area, whether there's any sort of dependency on the area being annexed on the city for services. Again, the effect on the surrounding cities and sewer and water districts, improvement districts, fire districts, whether there's any existing petitions for incorporation, which there are not right now, again the likelihood to significant growth and the affect on utilities.

Because this is part of Fire District #1, we also have to look at these factors, including the response time at the city, versus response time at the Fire District and then the impact of removing that tax base from the Fire District.

So the purpose of the service plan is to provide a reasonable person with a full and complete understanding of the intensions of the city for extending services, one has to provide the estimated cost impact, how they're going to finance any costs associated with extending those services, what the timetable is for extending those services and how they're going to maintain those services, equal to or better than the current level of services.

The Valley Center service plan, here are the highlights of that. Basically, you would have fire services would change from Fire District #1 to Valley Center. Police services would change from the Sheriff to Valley Center Police Department. Road maintenance will continue to be maintained by the cities involved. Valley Center currently maintains 85th Street and Park City maintains Broadway, so there's no change in the road maintenance issue for services.

There's an estimated cost to the landowner in increased property taxes of about \$507 per year and then they would not extend any other services, such as water or sewer until development would occur and then there would be some petition by the landowner for obtaining those services.

MAPD staff also reviewed the petition of service plan and their review was specifically, as professional staff, to determine whether this annexation should be approved or disapproved. And what they did, when they went through their service plan is they noted that there is no evidence submitted to show any significant growth potential for the next five years in the area, there's no plans to extend sewer or water. There's no change, because the road maintenance is going to stay the only real changes in services is with fire and police, so the overall recommendation of MAPD staff is to deny the annexation.

In terms of those factors, we took a quick look at before. We're going to go into a little more detail with them right now and then I'll give you the facts in light of the criteria and then we'll get the public hearing open and you can hear testimony from the city or the neighbors. One of the things we look at is whether natural boundaries or topography suggests this should be part of Valley

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

Center. Broadway is a fairly good natural boundary I think there, so it does indicate and our comprehensive plan does indicate that at some point in the future, when it's developed, it should be part of Valley Center. It's already surrounded on three sides by Valley Center also.

The other factor that might favor annexation is the fact that there's really no effect on other cities or anything. There's going to be a minimal impact if you were to approve this annexation. However there are a series of criteria that really weigh against the annexation. First, it's completely being used for agricultural uses, it's unplatted land. Again, there's no planned development in the area. We do have a subdivision to the east, right across the road on Broadway, that is being built within the last five years and is about 50% completed, I understand, some older houses to the southeast I think, but overall, and as MAPD staff noted, there's really no proposed or projected growth in the area.

There's no current business, commercial, industrial development in the area. Current services and costs for the services being provided for the landowner is sufficient. The city doesn't show any cost to the city for the annexation and they don't show, at least as far as I can tell, they haven't shown any necessity for the annexation to occur right now.

Again, the landowner's taxes are going to go up about \$500 per year, no likelihood of significant growth in the near future and there's no substantial dependency shown by this landowner, the city hasn't shown this landowner is obtaining services that they're not paying for.

As far as fire district factors go, we do have an improvement in response time, it looks like Valley Center of course is a little closer to the area, so they would be able to cut the response time for fire by a minute or so. Other than that, there is really no impact. It is such a small tax base and such a small part of the fire district, that it's really no impact.

So at this point, unless you have other questions, I think these are the steps we'd have to follow. You'd have to open the public hearing, will hear any testimony from the city or from the landowner, any other interested parties and after you close the public hearing, you can make your required statutory findings."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Thank you, Bob. Any questions of Bob before I open up the public hearing? Okay. At this time I'll have public input. I'd like to open the public hearing and say that if there's anyone in the audience that would like to speak for or against this proposal, please step to the microphone and visit with us."

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

Mr. Parnacott said, "I had been told that I.D. Creech would be here from the City of Valley Center, but I don't see him, so I think at this point I think the landowner I do know is here and maybe she should come up."

Chairman Sciortino said, "No one is here from Valley Center to speak on behalf of this? Okay. Anyone here that wants to speak against it? Yes, ma'am. Come forward and state your name and address and you have five minutes to present to us, or up to. You don't have to take it all."

Ms. Elizabeth Mouser-Rendt, 2817 N. Beacon Hill Court, Wichita, Ks., greeted the Commissioners and said, "I'm the owner of the property and I live at 1926 North Parkdale Court. This land my son lives on at the present. It's been in the family for almost 60 years. It's always been a farm. We consider it a farm. We don't consider ourselves part of Valley Center. My brother was a teacher there for many, many years but we just don't understand why we need to be in Valley Center. They have not come up with any good reason why we should and our taxes are going to go up \$500 a year. That's a big chunk and I just . . . I don't see any benefit to us, you know, being a family farm, we're just caught in the middle of Valley Center wanting to expand, Park City wanting to expand."

Two days after this was announced in the paper, I had Dee Stuart on my doorstep wanting to find out if I'd like to be part of Park City. So . . ."

Chairman Sciortino said, "And your response to her was?"

Ms. Mouser-Rendt said, "No. So, I'm just asking that you please, you know, keep us a family farm and not park of Valley Center at this time. Thank you."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Thank you. Anyone else that . . . Excuse me, miss. One of our commissioners would like to ask you a question. Commissioner Winters, I'm sorry."

Commissioner Winters said, "I just wanted to make sure, I mean, you don't have any current plans for development, residential or commercial or you've not made any attempts up to this point in time to develop your property?"

Ms. Mouser-Rendt said, "No. My son lives there with his family. We have . . . we raise soybeans and graze cattle during the summer."

Commissioner Winters said, "Okay. That's the only question I had. Thank you."

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

Chairman Sciortino said, "Thank you very much. Anyone else in the audience that would like to speak for or against this item? Please state your name and address for the record."

Mr. Davis said, "I live in Wichita, Kansas."

Chairman Sciortino said, "And your address in Wichita, Mr. Davis?"

Mr. Davis said, "Thank you, sir. You know, there are some things that are priceless. Things you can't put a price on and someday those things may be gone and we may not be able to replace them, you know. What may not seem like a whole lot to others, there are some of us it's everything we've got and I would hope that the commissioners, the fathers, the overseers of Sedgwick County would honor that which is most precious to these people here and help preserve the family farm.

You know, and know that there are people in this community that they can come to and turn to for help, you know. Like the way you said, they have not been able to show, substantially, why they have to have the property. Just because. I don't think we should turn it over, just because of one just wants it and I thank you so much and I hope you honor the hearts of these people today."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Thank you, sir. Anyone else that would like to speak for or against this item? Seeing none, I'll close the public hearing and reserve comment to the bench. Commissioners, any further comments on this item? Yes, Commissioner Winters."

Commissioner Winters said, "Well I guess I'd certainly listen to Commissioner Burtnett. You know, just looking at a map, I guess I would want to assure Valley Center that when the time and place is right, it looks to me that this is a fit for Valley Center. I'm just not sure if this is the right time, but as far as saying 'some day in the future', I think Broadway makes that good dividing line. I just don't think this is quite the future yet, but again I listen to Commissioner Burtnett and anything she might want to add."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Commissioner Burtnett."

Commissioner Burtnett said, "Well I'm glad you brought that up because the plan does show the proposed annexation area falling within the future 2030 urban growth area for Valley Center and I think we have, as a commission, made it clear that Broadway is going to be our dividing line between Park City and Valley Center and I agree with you that, at this time, I don't know that it's necessarily the right time for Valley Center to annex this property and Ms. Rindt actually made that

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

comment, 'at this time'. So I'm hoping that down the road, when the time is right, we'll be able to find that Valley Center should be able to annex this property, but at this time I don't know if it's necessarily right, with the manifest injury to the landowner of \$500, which does seem excessive for no new services that would be given to her and that I would entertain any other comments from the commission on this."

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

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am having a hard time getting myself to the point where I could be supportive of this annexation. Although I agree with the comments that it seems like, just looking at the map, the geography and the natural boundary of Broadway implies that it's appropriate at some time to be part of Valley Center. I mean, I think that's very clear to me and I would hope that the Park City folks would also understand, in their planning, that that looks like that is on the other side of the road and giving it to Valley Center.

But you know, that's future discussion. Right now, it seems to me there's no indication of a necessity to approve this annexation. There doesn't seem to be any plan for it. It just seems to be a move to square up their boundaries and that I don't think is sufficient reason to go ahead with approving the annexation. It's unplatted. It's ag use. I think there's just a preponderance of evidence that indicates that this should be denied, so I think that would be my position. That's all I have, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Sciortino said, "All right, thank you. Any further comments? Commissioner Norton."

Commissioner Norton said, "Bob, if we deny this, what is the procedure that would allow Park City to try to do the same thing?"

Mr. Parnacott said, "They would have two alternatives. If they could get consent of the landowner, which we've heard she is not willing to give, but if they could get her consent, they would be able to unilaterally annex that property and the Board of County Commissioners would not have any say in that.

The other alternative, they can't get consent, then they would have to go through the same process Valley Center is going through today, which is to petition you for public hearing and to seek a county approved annexation, and then you've have the opportunity to weigh whether or not this would be a good annexation for Park City."

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

Commissioner Norton said, "Okay, so that would be the only alternative."

Mr. Parnacott said, "Those are the only two ways they can annex this property, either by consent or by getting your approval."

Commissioner Norton said, "Okay, well you know, we talk about logical boundaries and everything. As far as I'm concerned, everything up there doesn't have a logical boundary. I think we found that out over the last three or four years, that it's just been a piece-meal, hopscotch kind of land grab, and certainly I don't see any imperative to do anything with that property right now, until such time that it's divided into smaller parcels or the landowner decides that it's worth more in development purposes than in agricultural use. Certainly, I understand why cities might want to square up a boundary, but I have a hard time with that happening right now. We've had some extremely tough cases in that particular area, up there between Valley Center and Bel Aire, that whole corridor. I don't see any imperative to even move forward."

I certainly understand the landowner's issues with this. They're not wanting to do anything more with it and probably, in years to come, it will have more reason to be within the auspices of the city, as opposed to being just agricultural land. So I probably won't be supportive, unless somebody can show me a real reason to do this right now."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Okay. Any further comments? What's the will of the Board on this item?"

MOTION

Commissioner Burtnett moved to find that the proposed annexation would cause manifest injury to the owners of the land proposed to be annexed and therefore, the annexation should be denied.

Commissioner Winters seconded the motion.

Chairman Sciortino said, "Motion has been made and seconded. Commissioner Winters, you have a comment?"

Commissioner Winters said, "Mr. Chairman, I think it would just probably be appropriate, if anybody looks back at this record, then for us to say that we agreed with the reasons that Bob gave us against the annexation, which would include such things as: the land is currently used for agricultural purposes; the entire tract is unplatted; there's no development in the area and hasn't been; there is no current business, commercial or industrial development; there's no

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

necessity that has been shown; landowner's taxes go up; there's no likelihood of growth any time soon. So those are kind of the things that Bob mentioned and I would assume then that we're all supportive of those kind of things."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Thank you. Any further comments? Madam Clerk, call the roll."

VOTE

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

Chairman Sciortino said, "For the record, this annexation request has been denied. Next item please."

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

- G. CASE NUMBER DR2005-00035 – RESOLUTION AMENDING THE UNIFIED ZONING CODE TO ADD THE PROPOSED CORRIDOR PRESERVATION PLAN OVERLAY DISTRICT (CP-O) FOR THE PROPOSED NORTHWEST BYPASS IN WICHITA AND SEDGWICK COUNTY. THE GENERAL LOCATION OF THE PROPOSED CP-O CONNECTS K-96 TO US-54 WEST OF THE CITY OF WICHITA. DISTRICTS #3 AND #4.**

POWERPOINT PRESENTATION

Mr. John Schlegel, Director, Metropolitan Area Planning Department (MAPD), greeted the Commissioners and said, "What I'm presenting to you this morning is a proposed amendment to the Unified Zoning Code that would create a corridor preservation plan overlay district for the proposed Northwest Bypass project.

I'm sure that you're all familiar with this highway, which would connect from K-96, just east of Maize, over to Goddard, connecting it at Kellogg. This is a part of a long range transportation planning effort, to create a bypass around the metropolitan area and it would compliment the Northeast Bypass that's already been built.

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

You may also recall that some time ago there were several meetings with state Department of Transportation officials that came down here to meet here with you and members of the Wichita City Council, to keep you abreast of their progress in designing this project.

And at one of those meetings, you'll recall the Secretary of Transportation, Deb Miller, was here and urged you at that time to make efforts to try to preserve the right-of-way for the project as best we could. Their original idea was to impose a moratorium on development within that corridor. After careful review by staff, including the legal staff from both the city and the county, we concluded that that was not the best approach to preserving the right-of-way within this corridor. That there were better ways of going about doing that and what we're proposing to you, as the best means, is this overlay district.

It's a tool that has been used here frequently. We feel that, with what's being proposed, it strikes a balance between protecting the rights of these property owners that would be within the proposed right-of-way for the highway and the need to try to preserve that corridor for this very important highway project.

In essence, what this overlay district would require is that within this corridor and the overlay district would be a corridor 150 feet on either side of the preliminary center line that has been proposed by KDOT for this highway, so you have basically a 300 foot wide overlay district, where the highway is proposed to be located and anywhere within that overlay district, whenever a change in the use of that property would be proposed, that property owner would be required to go through a review process very similar to what is currently required for a conditional use and would require a review by the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission and then ultimately a review by the governing body, either of City of Wichita or by this board.

The idea is to put property owners on notice that they have a property that may be impacted by this proposed highway. It would allow them to make better investment decisions, if they are impacted by the highway in locating any proposed buildings or changes in use of the property. And it would also give us, the local entities, an opportunity to work with those property owners in locating any additional structures that they might want to put on their property in such a way that they could avoid putting it within the proposed right-of-way.

Then ultimately it gives us the opportunity, where the overlay district or the proposed right-of-way for the highway may unduly impact somebody's use of their property by going so far as to constitute a taking, that then we could open negotiations with that property owner to purchase the property, and as last resort, to use eminent domain in order to preserve the highway corridor.

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

So I think what we've done, staff . . . the planning staff and legal staffs from both jurisdictions have done is to create a balanced approach to protect both the rights of the property owner and the need to preserve this important highway corridor.

This proposed overlay district was heard by the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission and, after doing some minor revisions to it, they did approve what is in front of you today at their meeting on December 8th. There was no one at that meeting to speak in opposition to this. We have received some phone calls from property owners, mostly wanting to know when right-of-way acquisition would start, not so much in opposition to this.

Now having said all that, this proposal does stand ready for your approval, if you are so inclined to do so today but I want to call to your attention that we do have a meeting scheduled with the State Department of Transportation for Monday afternoon, at which time they are going to update us on the current status of the project. And I'd like to suggest to you that this item . . . you might want to defer taking any action on this item until you hear from the KDOT officials on Monday, so that you have a full understanding of where the project is going, before we take this important step."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Thank you, John. Commissioner Winters, you have a question for John?"

Commissioner Winters said, "So John, what action did the City of Wichita take yesterday?"

Mr. Schlegel said, "They deferred the item, at my recommendation, until after the meeting on Monday, so that we have a full understanding of where things are going."

Commissioner Winters said, "If Monday's meeting results in the conclusion that we're on a go-forward track, this could be back on the city's agenda and our agenda in a matter of a couple of weeks, right?"

Mr. Schlegel said, "Yes. Yeah, it would not take us long to put it back on both agendas."

Commissioner Winters said, "Okay. Well, commissioners, I think particularly in light of John's recommendation and visited just briefly with David Spears and he concurs and the City of Wichita did defer yesterday. I think we should defer until this meeting with KDOT takes place, but certainly would be interested to hear any other comments."

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

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

Commissioner Norton said, “Well, deferral is okay with me, but do we have any idea that anything is going to change, as far as the boundaries, I mean, there’s been extensive study. I can’t believe that the overlay district is going to be shifted, one way or the other. It’s really a matter of dollar and cents as to whether it’s going to move forward or not, not conceptually where it will go or whatever. Is that correct, John?”

Mr. Schlegel said, “Yeah, I think you’re correct in that assessment, but out of prudence, it would do no harm to wait until we find out more on Monday.”

Commissioner Norton said, “Okay.”

Mr. Schlegel said, “Commissioner Unruh.”

Commissioner Unruh said, “Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think, John, you just answered the question I had. Are there any pending applications or changes that are in this area that we need to be aware of and that a deferral would cause harm to the concept here?”

Mr. Schlegel said, “No, there are none that are pending in this area, within either the City of Wichita or the unincorporated areas. I can’t speak for the portions that go through Goddard and Maize, but at least in the areas over which we have jurisdiction, there aren’t any pending applications.”

Commissioner Unruh said, “Well, I would think that deferral would be the appropriate thing to do, so I would be supportive of that.”

Chairman Sciortino said, “All right, thank you. I have a question. I believe I’d like to direct it to Mr. Euson. If and when we were to approve this proposed corridor preservation overlay district, does that then mandate that the owner of the land within that corridor, if they’re wanting to sell it, does that mandate that they have to disclose that, either directly or through their broker, to a proposed buyer of that land?”

Mr. Richard Euson, County Counselor, said, “Commissioner, I don’t know that there’s any requirement that that be disclosed. It’s kind of like any other zoning. You normally don’t disclose your zoning in a typical Real Estate contract and so, no, I don’t think there’s any requirement for that.”

Chairman Sciortino said, “Okay, but the owners of the land, presently, when that is . . . they’ll get notice that this overlay district is now in place and then if a seller . . . purchaser wants to do their

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

due diligence and check they would find that 'yeah, there's a little sticky thing here, I better make a decision here', so the onus is kind of on the seller . . . purchaser, but the owner will know, when we take this action, they'll be notified. I guess I'm back to you now, John, they'll be notified that we've taken that action and that overlay district . . . or their property now is within that overlay district? Is that correct?"

Mr. Schlegel said, "I'm not quite sure what you just asked me."

Chairman Sciortino said, "If we were to approve this overlay district, would that then trigger a requirement by us or by the . . . to notify the homeowners, the present owners of land in that district that they're now within an overlay district?"

Mr. Schlegel said, "No, we would not send out a letter of notification, like we might do for a zoning hearing, after this action was taken. However, what would happen is in GIS systems, all these properties would be tagged so that if they came in for any change in use of the property, whether it's a building permit or for platting or for a rezoning, then we would be alerted to the fact that this overlay district exists on that property and then we will notify that property owner, as they were making application for whatever change in use that the overlay district did exist."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Okay. Well, I don't know if this is something that we could discuss at a later date, but I would be more comfortable, I don't know what it would require to physically notify owners so they can't say 'well I didn't know about it and gosh, this surprised me' and I don't know how much expense that is and that's probably not something we want to, you know, work on today but maybe in the future if it makes sense, I don't think it would be that much more costly, that we change our policy to include our responsibility to notifying existing owners of any action that we take that may or may not impact their property, positive or negative."

Mr. Schlegel said, "Well, we would do that, at your direction."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Okay, all right, thank you. What is the will of the Board on this item?"

MOTION

Commissioner Winters moved to defer this item until such time as Planning Department or Legal Staff brings it back.

Commissioner Norton seconded the motion.

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

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

VOTE

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

Chairman Sciortino said, "Thank you, John. Next item please."

NEW BUSINESS

DIVISION OF INFORMATION & OPERATIONS – HEALTH DEPARTMENT

H. AGREEMENT WITH KANSAS UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF MEDICINE-WICHITA FOR THE CHILDREN'S PRIMARY CARE CLINIC AT THE SEDGWICK COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT.

Ms. Armbruster said, "I'm presenting to you today an agreement with the University of Kansas School of Medicine, Wichita. They provide physician oversight for our Physician's Assistants and Registered Nurse Practitioners and also the residents of the program provide support for our children's primary care clinic. We've had this contract with the university for 16 years and we're just continuing our standard practice with them. We ask that you take the recommended action. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Thank you, Sonja. Yes, we do have some questions or comment. Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Sonja, is this program carried out at the new clinic or at our current site?"

Ms. Armbruster said, "Yes, children's primary care is at the 2716 West Central clinic."

Commissioner Unruh said, "All right, and so anyone that wants to take advantage of this service, that's the location."

Ms. Armbruster said, "That's correct. Any child, zero to 21, can receive primary care services at our Children's Primary Care Clinic."

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

Commissioner Unruh said, “Okay, thank you.”

Chairman Sciortino said, “I see no other comments. Commissioners, what’s the will of the Board?”

MOTION

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

Chairman Sciortino said, “Thank you very much, Sonja.”

I. RESOLUTION DESIGNATING AND CLASSIFYING CERTAIN STREETS TO THE GYPSUM TOWNSHIP SYSTEM. DISTRICT #5.

Mr. David Spears, P.E., Director/County Engineer, 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 ‘Linden Street’ located in the subdivision of Prairie Breeze Estates,

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

will become the responsibility of Gypsum Township. The Gypsum Township Board was notified by letter that this resolution would be on the county commission agenda on January 4, 2006. I recommend that you adopt the resolution.”

Chairman Sciortino said, “Thank you. Any questions of David?”

MOTION

Chairman Sciortino moved to adopt the Resolution.

Commissioner Norton seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

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

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

J. REPORT OF THE BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS’ REGULAR MEETING OF FEBRUARY 2, 2006.

Ms. Iris Baker, Director, Purchasing Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, “The meeting of February 2nd results in five items for consideration today.

1) CLEANING PRODUCTS AND DISPENSING SYSTEM- JUVENILE DETENTION FACILITY
FUNDING: JUVENILE DETENTION FACILITY

First item, cleaning products and dispensing system for the Juvenile Detention Facility. Recommendation is to accept the proposal of Southwest Paper and execute a one-year contract, not to exceed annual expenditure of \$8,000, with two one-year options to renew.

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

**2) FIBER CABLING- JUVENILE DETENTION FACILITY
FUNDING: FACILITY PROJECT SERVICES**

The second item is fiber cabling for the Juvenile Detention Facility. The recommendation is to accept the proposal from Cox Communications and execute a 20-year contract in the amount of \$175,000.

**3) REMANUFACTURED TONER CARTRIDGES- VARIOUS COUNTY DEPARTMENTS
FUNDING: VARIOUS COUNTY DEPARTMENTS**

Item three, remanufactured toner cartridges for various county departments. The recommendation is to accept the proposal from KK Office Solutions and execute a one-year contract with two one-year options to renew.

**4) MEDICAL BILLING SERVICES- EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES
FUNDING SOURCE- EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES**

Item four, medical billing services for Emergency Medical Services. Recommendation is to accept the proposal from Southwest General Services of Dallas and establish and execute contract pricing for two years, with three one-year options to renew.

**5) CHANGE ORDER- A & E SERVICES FOR THE JUVENILE COMPLEX-
FACILITY PROJECT SERVICES
FUNDING: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT**

And the fifth item is a change order for architectural and engineering services for the Juvenile Complex for Facility Project Services and the recommendation is to accept the change order for item one as a not to exceed cost of \$20,000, not accept item two and acknowledge change order for item three for \$4,534 for total change order cost of \$24,385. Would be happy to answer any questions and I recommend approval of these items.”

Chairman Sciortino said, “All right, thank you. Any questions? I have a question. Mr. Euson, on item two, where we’re talking about entering into a 20-year agreement, does that have to be reviewed by the Board of County Commissioners annually to re-approve it, or how does that work? I don’t know how . . . I mean, can we commit new commissions to a contract or how does that work?”

Mr. Euson said, “That’s a good question and we do have long term contracts, from time to time,

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

and some of them are subject to commission review and some of them are not. I'm really not exactly sure how this one would . . . how the terms of this one are set out, but as to the cash basis law, we always put a provision in these longer term contracts that makes it subject to the ability of us to fund it in the future and certainly if future commissions decided they could not fund it, that would be . . ."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Okay, but you haven't reviewed this contract? I thought you review all of our contracts."

Mr. Euson said, "I don't know. Some times these are done . . . we would have reviewed the request for proposal, but sometimes the contract follows the request for proposal."

Ms. Baker said, "This contract has been reviewed, it was put together by Legal, so it has been reviewed and it's ready."

Mr. Euson said, "Someone from Legal. I did not."

Chairman Sciortino said, "So I assume if it's been reviewed by Legal, they're comfortable that what we're committing to we legally can commit to. Okay, that was my only question. Thank you. Commissioner Norton."

Commissioner Norton said, "On item number four, I've read the backup but just for the public record, it's a large amount of money and we didn't take the supposed low bid. Would you kind of explain the nuances there real quick, Iris?"

Ms. Baker said, "Yes. The low proposal was primarily a software company and they had proposed to offer us the software to be able to do the work. Our solution was seeking somebody to actually do the billing services for us, so that proposal didn't fit the need."

The next low proposal, when we did reference checks, reference checks weren't favorable, so we opted to not go any further, interview them, consider them for the work. The third lowest, Southwest General Services of Dallas, it was a well thought out proposal. They offered all of the information we asked for. They were very, very detailed in their methodology and performance, how they were going to do things for us and one of their strengths in the proposal, in reference checks was technical support to carry out these services.

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

When it looked like this was the favorable proposal, based on that information, we did go ahead and interview and speak with Management Services Network, because they're the current provider, and had discussion with them about the proposal, if there was any new services they had to offer and then told them, at that time, that there was a possibility that they would not get the next award. And then we talked about transitioning the business, so the decision was made on methodologies to the approach of work, the quality assurance, the business that they're in and cost as well."

Commissioner Norton said, "Okay. Southwest General is well known in this field of billing?"

Ms. Baker said, "Yes, they are."

Commissioner Norton said, "Okay. And Management Services, how long have we been under contract with them?"

Ms. Baker said, "I believe three years and there is a plan in which we will transition to the new vendor. We'll extend the current contract a couple of months to meet the 60-day start up implementation process."

Commissioner Norton said, "Okay. That's all I have, Mr. Chair."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Thank you. Seeing no future questions or comments, what's the will of the board?"

MOTION

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

Commissioner Norton seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

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

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

Chairman Sciortino said, “Thank you Iris. Commissioners . . . excuse me, Clerk would you call the next item please.”

CONSENT AGENDA

K. CONSENT AGENDA.

1. Right-of-Way Easements.

- a. One Permanent Easement for Drainage and one Temporary Construction Easement for Sedgwick County Drainage Project, channel realignment and improvement at 55th Street South and Oliver. CIP# D-14. District #5.
- b. Temporary Construction Easement for Sedgwick County Project 821-AA, Cowskin Creek. District #2.
- c. Right-of-Way Easement for Sedgwick County Project 588-25, 26, reconditioning of roadbed plus 6” bituminous surfacing and replacement of bridge 588-26-574 on 125th Street North between Meridian and Broadway. CIP# R-255. District #4.

2. MAPD - extensions of time to complete platting requirements for zone changes. District #1.

- a. Case Number ZON2000-00062 - “SF-20” Single-Family Residential to “LI” Limited Industrial for approximately 26 acres located north of K-96 and east of Greenwich Road.
- b. Case Number ZON2004-00069 - “SF-20” Single-Family Residential to “LI” Limited Industrial for approximately .6 acres located north of K-96 and east of Greenwich Road.
- c. Case Number ZON2000-00023 - “RR” rural residential to “LI” Limited Industrial, generally located at the southeast corner of 29th Street North and Greenwich Road.

3. Amendment to the 2006 Capital Improvement Program to reallocate funding within CIP# R-253, widening of 13th Street from K-96 to 159th Street East and increasing the Right-of-Way phase.

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

- 4. Order dated February 1, 2006 to correct tax roll for change of assessment.**
- 5. General Bills Check Register(s) for the week of February 1 – 7, 2006.**

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

Chairman Sciortino said, “Thank you. Commissioners, what’s you will on this?”

MOTION

Commissioner Winters moved to approve the consent agenda as presented.

Commissioner Burtnett seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

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

Chairman Sciortino said, “Thank you. Well, commissioners we’re at the line item called ‘Other’. Do any of you all have things that are going on this week or have gone on last week that you’d like to visit with us about? Commissioner Unruh.”

L. OTHER

Commissioner Unruh said, “Well I’d just like to make a couple of comments. One, we’ve received another unsolicited congratulations and comment about the work at the Household Hazardous Waste Facility that a personal friend of Commissioner Winters and myself just wrote and said, ‘Great service’, was able to get rid of all his hazardous material down there so want to congratulate those folks and also put a plug in for the rest of our citizens to take advantage of that

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

facility.

And then secondly, I was privileged to attend a pray luncheon out at McConnell Air Force Base yesterday and Bishop Jackels gave the keynote address at that and was well attended and was very impressed by the bishop for our area. He did a very good job.”

Chairman Sciortino said, “Great. Commissioner Norton.”

Commissioner Norton said, “Just one thing. Yesterday, I took the opportunity to stop by the new juvenile detention facility and take a quick walk through with Marla Sutton and Larry Ternes and got to look at the whole project. It’s not quite finished yet, but you can really start to see the substance of what we’re investing the taxpayers’ money in. I think it’s going to be a wonderful facility and I’m hopeful, as we move closer to that time when they’ll start transitioning young people in there, young adults in there and start opening the facility that we’ll be able to have some open houses for citizens to take a look at what a great facility we’re offering to the community. As we know, we’ve got a lot of old facilities that are overcrowded and we’re sending a lot of our young adults to other places, throughout the state, which isn’t really the best for families and young people to be moved away from the community so pretty exciting, it’s a beautiful facility, right off . . . I think the address is going to be on Hydraulic. It really kind of faces I-135, but it’s a beautiful facility and I’ve got kind of the cook’s tour yesterday to take a look at it.”

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

Commissioner Burtnett said, “Yesterday, I had the opportunity to speak to the Midtown Historic Association citizens’ group and they wanted an update on the arena and we had very good discussion. They had some great ideas for parking that I will be talking to our architects and designers for, but overall they were very pleased with the way things were coming around and they enjoyed the public meetings we’re having and look forward to the pretty pictures that we’re going to have, so everything went very well last night.”

Chairman Sciortino said, “Good. Commissioner Winters.”

Commissioner Winters said, “Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As you all know, the Kansas Legislature is in session. Next Tuesday, the 14th, the Kansas Association of Counties will be hosting county officials from all over the state, as we gather in Topeka to spend the day and listen to legislative leaders talk about things that are going on in the session that will affect cities and counties, principally. So several of us will be in Topeka a couple of days next week and I think it should be very informative for everyone that attends and we continue to appreciate the work that the Kansas Association of Counties does and it really sparks the relationship that we have with, particularly,

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

our neighbor counties here in south central Kansas, so look forward to being with that group next week. Thank you.”

Chairman Sciortino said, “Thank you. Well since none of you mentioned places to go, specifically, I’d like to just encourage all of you that there is a gastronomic event happening in the Oaklawn area tomorrow night. It is their inaugural Fire House Chili Cook-off and our Station 36 is pitted against one of the City of Wichita’s fire stations to find out which fire house cooks the best chili and we need participation to make sure that the best fire house actually wins and you do that by voting. I don’t know if they’re going to have little peas in a cup or whatever, but it’s going to be a nice event and Mary and I are going to plan to be there and would encourage anyone that’s watching, and encourage everyone in the audience that would like to come, it will be fun, it will be tasty and I think everybody would enjoy a fun night. It’s from six to eight at the Oaklawn Community Center, so if you have a chance, come on out.

Okay, that’s it. Anything else to come before the board? Seeing none, this meeting is adjourned.”

M. ADJOURNMENT

Regular Meeting, February 8, 2006

There being no other business to come before the Board, the Meeting was adjourned at 10:14 a.m.

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

BEN SCIORTINO, Chairman
Fifth District

LUCY BURTNETT, Chair Pro Tem
Fourth District

DAVID M. UNRUH, Commissioner,
First District

TIM R. NORTON, Commissioner
Second District

THOMAS G. WINTERS, Commissioner
Third District

ATTEST:

Don Brace, County Clerk

APPROVED:

_____, 2006