

## **MEETING OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS**

### **REGULAR MEETING**

**May 24, 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, May 24, 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; Ms. Jo Templin, Director, Division of Human Resources; Ms. Judith A. Venditti, Fiscal Assistant, County Treasurer; Ms. Marilyn Cook, Director, Comprehensive Community Care (COMCARE); Mr. Marty Hughes, Revenue Manager, Division of Finance; Mr. John Schlegel, Director, Metropolitan Area Planning Department; Mr. Ron Holt, Assistant County Manager; Mr. Ray Vail, Director of Finance and Support Services, Department on Aging; Mr. David Thompson, Executive Officer, Sheriff's Office; Ms. Chris Morales, Systems Integration Coordinator, Department of Corrections; Mr. David Spears, Director, Bureau of Public Works; Ms. Iris Baker, Director, Purchasing Department; Ms. Kristi Zukovich, Director, Communications; and, Ms. Kristi Wolf, Deputy County Clerk.

### **GUESTS**

Ms. Phyllis Jacobs, Board Chair, Wichita School of Nursing Faculty Activities Committee.  
Ms. Patricia Harris, Advanced Registered Nurse Practitioner, COMCARE.  
Ms. Mary Jo Hill, 6701 W. Maple, Wichita, Ks.

### **INVOCATION**

The Invocation was observed with a moment of silence.

### **FLAG SALUTE**

### **ROLL CALL**

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

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

**Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006**

**PROCLAMATION**

**A. PROCLAMATION DECLARING THE WEEK OF MAY 21 – 27, 2006 AS  
“NATIONAL PUBLIC WORKS WEEK.”**

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Thank you. Commissioners, I’d like to read this proclamation into the record for your consideration. It states:

**PROCLAMATION**

**WHEREAS**, public works services provided in our community are an integral part of our citizens’ everyday lives; and

**WHEREAS**, the support of an understanding and informed citizenry is vital to the efficient operation of public works systems and programs such as streets and highways, bridges, drainage improvements, noxious weed control and household hazardous waste collection; and

**WHEREAS**, the health, safety and comfort of this community greatly depends on these facilities and services; and

**WHEREAS**, the quality and effectiveness of these facilities, as well as their planning, design and construction, is vitally dependent upon the efforts and skills of public works officials.

**WHEREAS**, the efficiency of the qualified and dedicated personnel who staff public works departments is materially influenced by the people’s attitude and understanding of the importance of the work they perform.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that I, Ben Sciortino, Chairman of the Board of Sedgwick County Commissioners, do hereby proclaim May 21-27, 2006 as

**‘NATIONAL PUBLIC WORKS WEEK’**

in Sedgwick County, and I call upon all citizens and civic organizations to acquaint themselves with the issues involved in providing our public works and to recognize the contributions which public works officials make everyday to our health, safety, comfort and quality of life.

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

**Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006**

**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, “Thank you. And I believe David Spears, our director of Public Works is going to accept the proclamation. Good morning, David.”

**Mr. David Spears**, Director, Public Works, greeted the Commissioners and said, “First and foremost, I would like to thank you for the proclamation recognizing the week of the 21 through the 27<sup>th</sup> of May as ‘National Public Works Week’. The theme for this year is ‘Public Works: the Heart of Every Community’ and it is a celebration of the tens of thousands of men and women in North America who provide and maintain the infrastructure and services collectively known as public works. This is the national poster this year.

Instituted as a public education campaign by the American Public Works Association in 1960, National Public Works Week calls attention to the importance of public works in community life. The week seeks to enhance the prestige of the often-unheralded workers of our society- the professionals who serve the public good every day with quiet dedication. Often, their accomplishments are particularly noteworthy in relation to the limited manpower and financial resources available to them.

National Public Works Week is observed each year during the third full week of May. Through National Public Works Week and other efforts, the American Public Works Association seeks to raise the public’s awareness of public works issues and to increase the quality of life for present and future generations. Thank you for the proclamation.”

## **Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006**

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "David, is it fair to say that good roads and bridges are the mother's milk of economic development?"

**Mr. Spears** said, "That's correct. I had that on my speech, but I marked of the last line."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Anyway, congratulations David. I think your department, although it doesn't get a lot of press, I think is actually really at the heart of people's understanding of what Sedgwick County does. If they're riding on good roads, if the drainage ditches are taken care of, if noxious weeds are taken care of. And what you're doing in Household Hazardous Waste, compared to what was done many years ago, is just very dramatic, so you are to be complimented."

**Mr. Spears** said, "Thank you."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Commissioners, anything else on this item? Thank you very much, David. Next item please."

### **RETIREMENT**

#### **B. PRESENTATION OF RETIREMENT CLOCK TO JUDITH A. VENDITTI, FISCAL ASSISTANT, COUNTY TREASURER'S OFFICE.**

**Ms. Jo Templin**, Director, Division of Human Resources, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Today we are honored to celebrate the retirement of one of our long-time public servants of the county. Judith Venditti, Fiscal Assistant with the County Treasurer, will retire June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2006 after 21 years of service."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Well, Ms. Venditti, this is a proclamation that we're giving you and also, on behalf of all the commissioners of Sedgwick County, we want to present you with this retirement clock. It's heavy. Allow you to say a couple of words and let us know what you're going to do with all this time off if you would like."

**Ms. Judith A. Venditti**, Fiscal Assistant, County Treasurer, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Well, I plan to fix up my house. I just bought a house last year, so I'm planning to redecorate it. I have a few trips, maybe, to Boston where one of my sons live and the other one is a truck driver, I plan to ride with him, over the road for a couple of days."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Well, congratulations."

**Chair Pro Tem Burtnett** said, "Madam Clerk, would you call the next item."

**Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006**

**AWARDS**

**C. PRESENTATION OF “EXCELLENCE IN PUBLIC SERVICE AWARD” CERTIFICATES.**

- 1. MARK BORST, PUBLIC WORKS**
- 2. DON BRACE, COUNTY CLERK’S OFFICE**
- 3. MARK CORONADO, DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS**
- 4. JORGE DELATORRE, PUBLIC WORKS**
- 5. MONIQUE GARCIA, COMMUNICATIONS**
- 6. DEANN KONKEL, DIVISION OF PUBLIC SAFETY**
- 7. JEANNETTE LIVINGSTON – COMCARE**
- 8. WILLIE MACKEY, SHERIFF’S OFFICE**
- 9. GARRY TOLLE, EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICE**

**Ms. Kristi Zukovich**, Communications Director, greeted the Commissioners and said, “Each year I get the opportunity to come up here and to recognize those folks from Sedgwick County who have been nominated by their peers and their co-workers and folks who are part of the Excellence in Public Service award process, and so we have nine nominees from Sedgwick County and the Excellence in Public Service award is sponsored by the DeVore Foundation, as a way to recognize public service employees from not only Sedgwick County, but the City of Wichita and USD 259.

And so the process occurs is that a nomination form is left out for all employees to find someone that they think is deserving, one of their co-workers, and they write up not only what the employee does at work to provide quality public service, but also what they contribute in the community, away from work time, to help make this a better place to live or can play in, so I’m pretty pleased again that we have nine employees that are from our public works, our public safety sector, corrections, COMCARE and our internal support sector who have been nominated by their co-workers, and so we not only want to applaud them today, but again we want to have a little recognition for the folks who took the time to nominate them as well, because that does require some effort to say ‘These people are pretty important to our community as well’.

And so I’d like to take this time to recognize those folks. Some of them are here today and some were not able to join us, but we will recognize all of them. Mark Borst from Public Works is

## **Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006**

nominated. I don't believe he was able to be here today. Don Brace, from Sedgwick County Clerk. Mark Coronado from the Department of Corrections. Jorge Delatorre, from Public Works. Monique Garcia from Communications. Deann Konkel from the Division of Public Safety and Deann was the county recipient of the Excellence in Public Service award this year. Jeannette Livingston from COMCARE. Willie Mackey from the Sheriff's Office and Garry Tolle from Sedgwick County EMS. And again, we would just like to recognize them and their folks that nominated them as well. So thank you very much."

**Chair Pro Tem Burtnett** said, "Thank you, Kristi. Any comments from the commissioners? If not, Madam Clerk, would you call the next item."

### **DIVISION OF INFORMATION & OPERATIONS- COMCARE**

#### **D. RECOGNITION OF PATRICIA HARRIS, ADVANCED REGISTERED NURSE PRACTITIONER, RECIPIENT OF THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF NURSING UNDERGRADUATE OUTSTANDING CLINICAL MENTORING AWARD FOR SPRING 2006.**

**Ms. Marilyn Cook**, Director, Comprehensive Community Care, greeted the Commissioners and said, "We are very proud to have one of our Advanced Nurse Practitioners, Patricia or Patty Harris, who received an award from the Department of Nursing at Wichita State University. I'm going to call Phyllis Jacob, who is our board chair, up to hand that award over . . . or not hand the award. She already got the award on May 11<sup>th</sup>, but to talk to you about the award that Patty got and why she got it.

I do want you to know though that when several of us when to the ceremony on May the 11<sup>th</sup> Dean Koehn, from the College of Health Professions, also told us that there were several people in the room that day that obtained tenure and Phyllis Jacobs was one of those, and he said that it was a seven-step review and approval process and it was a very vigorous kind of thing.

I also would like you to commend her for being a tenured professor at WSU, so here's Phyllis."

**Ms. Phyllis Jacobs**, Board Chair, Wichita School of Nursing Faculty Activities Committee, greeted the commissioners and said, "The Wichita School of Nursing is pleased each year to recognize an outstanding clinical mentor, someone from one of our agencies who has assisted our nursing students, as they go through our nursing program.

These are nominated from students who are in clinical agencies and Patricia Harris, Advanced Registered Nurse Practitioner at COMCARE, was nominated by nursing students who were

## Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006

mentored by Patricia during their mental health practicum. I'd like to read you some of the comments that students said about Patty Harris. 'She has a professional manner while with clients', 'her clients value her advice', 'she gets students excited about learning by listening discussion of individual client cases'. Nursing students find her approachable. Once she figured out it was a student's birthday and she took that student out to lunch during the clinically day. Students also said it was nice to observe a professional nurse working with mental health clients. She is a good role model on how to be therapeutic with clients.

I would also like to thank COMCARE for the over 10 years of clinical experience our Wichita State University students have had at COMCARE. It has been a very positive experience and this has helped students understand community mental health nursing and have staff serve as role models. And Patricia Harris is a wonderful role model for our nursing students, and Patricia, if you would come on up."

**Ms. Patricia Harris**, Advanced Registered Nurse Practitioner, Comprehensive Community Care (COMCARE), greeted the Commissioners and said, "I just want to thank WSU, my Alma Mater, for this award. I was pleasantly surprised. The students are great. COMCARE enjoys having students, undergraduate, graduate students and I want to thank Marilyn Cook, Rex Lear and Judy Addison for always supporting all my endeavors and giving me my first job out of graduate school with COMCARE. Thanks a lot."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Wait a minute. We're not done with you yet. Commissioners, if I could, these are one of the occasions that you can't really quantify exactly what that does for the citizens of Sedgwick County, but your dedication and willingness to put in extra hours, just to help somebody else along, that person may start working for COMCARE one day. We don't know that for sure, but I think that's what really tells the citizens that we have very hard, dedicated individuals, 24/7, looking out for their well-being and you are to be very congratulated on what you've done. You've earned that award."

**Ms. Harris** said, "Thank you."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "I don't believe there's any action that needs to be taken, other than what we've done. So Clerk, would you please call the next item."

### NEW BUSINESS

#### **E. REVISED APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE, TO BE SUBMITTED TO**

**Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006**

**THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION, FOR PARTIAL FUNDING OF AN ASSESSMENT AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT CENTER.**

**Mr. Marty Hughes**, Revenue Manager, Division of Finance, greeted the Commissioners and said, “This morning, we have for your consideration a revision in a grant application that we submitted last month to the Economic Development Administration. But before we take action, I’d like to give you a little background on how this came about.

Last month, Boeing Military announced a lay-off of 900 employees with details provided in a newspaper article. Bill Bolin, Director of the South Central Kansas Economic Development District, sent a copy of the article to Paul Hildebrandt, at the EDA office in Kansas City. Paul forwarded the article to the EDA Denver Regional Office, where it was read by the Regional Director Robert Olsen and Maria Sutton, the Division Chief for Economic Adjustment. They wanted to know how EDA could help. They asked for a meeting with representatives from Sedgwick County and the Wichita Airport Authority to discuss how EDA could assist. Both Sedgwick County and the Wichita Airport Authority agreed that the training facility at Jabara Airport was the number one project.

One May 3, 2006 our own Andy Schlapp and Bill Bolin met with EDA representatives in Kansas City to discuss the situation. During the meeting, EDA Division Chief brought up the topic and the amount of \$500,000. By the end of the meeting, Mr. Olsen, the Regional Director, was asking his staff what could be done to increase the grant from the original 1.5 million to 2 million dollars. In the backup for the agenda item, we have the attached letter and the revised SF 424 form and a budget sheet to be submitted to the EDA for approval and an additional award should be issued in October 2006 from 2007 funds and I would recommend that you approve the revised application and authorize the Chairman to sign.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Okay, thank you very much, Marty. Any questions or comments of Marty on this item? Marty, I just have one before we go on. Does this look pretty much like we’re going to go ahead and get this increased award? I mean, that’s tremendous.”

**Mr. Hughes** said, “Yeah, they pretty much guarantee it. They just need the paperwork to be submitted and then they have to wait for the funding to be available, which would be in October. And I did want to mention too that Bill Bolin had intended to be here but he had a conflict in schedule and had to be in Topeka today, so he wasn’t able to make it.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Okay. Well thank you very much. Commissioner Norton, you had a comment or question.”

**Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006**

**Commissioner Norton** said, “Just a comment. Bill has been a good advocate for this project. He’s helped us, as we thought the funds were going to drift away from us. We couldn’t get all the stars to align, the deadline came and went, yet he lobbied to extend it and now it’s even grown a little bit.

I think this adds credence to what we’ve done with Jabara Airport campus. You know, we’ve seen that that’s been important. We’ve been working on it for many, many years but obviously people outside our realm, our community, see the value of career assessment and career development and job creation, workforce development. So I think it just adds another plus to what we’ve been working on, as we try to solve that issue of developing a workforce that will keep companies whole and working and keep people in jobs, so pretty good news.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “That’s great. Commissioner Unruh.”

**Commissioner Unruh** said, “Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just want to add a comment also, not only gratitude for this grant that we’re going to receive to help us proceed with that project, but also want to mention Andy Schlapp’s name as part of the team that helped make this happen. It takes a lot of people working together to make something like this happen, and the more people we let know of it, and the more we explain what we’re trying to do, the more acceptance it has and the more enthusiasm is generated, more momentum is generated and I think that, as we continue, we’ll continue to get this sort of support from other governmental agencies and from the industrial community to help us make this happen for the betterment of our community. So one big step and I’m very pleased with it. Thank you, Mr. Chair.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Thank you. I don’t see that there’s any comments, so what’s the will of the Board on Item E please?”

**MOTION**

Commissioner Norton moved to approve the Grant Application revision and authorize the Chairman to sign all necessary documents, including a grant award agreement containing substantially the same terms and conditions as this Application; and approve establishment of budget authority at the time the grant award documents are executed.

Commissioner Unruh seconded the motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Unruh	Aye
Commissioner Norton	Aye

## Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006

Commissioner Winters	Aye
Commissioner Burnett	Aye
Chairman Sciortino	Aye

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Good work, Marty. Thank you next . . . excuse me. Kristi, if you’re here, I don’t know if it’s getting transmitted, but boy, we’re getting echoes. Okay, thank you. Next item please.”

### **PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

- F. CASE NUMBER ZON2006-00011 – ZONE CHANGE FROM “RR” RURAL RESIDENTIAL TO “GC” GENERAL COMMERCIAL, GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH OF 63<sup>RD</sup> STREET SOUTH AND WEST OF K-15. DISTRICT #5.**

### **POWERPOINT PRESENTATION**

**Mr. John Schlegel**, Director, Metropolitan Area Planning Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, “You can see the application area on the graphic in front of you, near the intersection of 63<sup>rd</sup> Street South and K-15. The property, as you can see on the aerial photo in front of you, is currently developed with a single-family residence. They’re seeking this General Commercial designation in order to develop it as a commercial property.

This graphic shows that the property is located within the Airport Overlay District 3-S, which indicates that it is under one of the approaches to McConnell Air Force Base, and therefore subject to those provisions in the zoning code regarding the airport overlay, and as a result, the applicant has submitted a protective overlay that reflects those restrictions within the airport overlay district.

Going back to the aerial photo, you can see the surrounding land uses, characterized by commercial development and residential development. To the north, we have a GC zone that is developed with the self-service storage and outdoor vehicle and equipment sales. To the east of K-15 is the city of Derby, and there’s a mixture of commercial and residential development, including the new Lowe’s store on 63<sup>rd</sup> Street, near the intersection with K-15.

The subject property is sandwiched between the new Oliver Street extension, that curves around it to the west, and the BNSF railroad tracks, just the east of this site. Now the application area lies within the area of influence of the City of Derby, so this item was set to the Derby Planning Commission for their review. They heard it at their meeting of April 6<sup>th</sup> and unanimously approved the staff recommendations for this item, with two modifications.

## Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006

Their modifications were to items 8 and 9 of the protective overlay, which dealt with sign and landscaping provisions. And in both cases, what the Derby Planning Commission recommended was that the Derby sign code provisions and the Derby landscaping provisions be applied to this protective overlay and so they recommended modifications to those provisions of the protective overlay to reflect the way in which the City of Derby regulates signs and landscaping.

When this case was heard by the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission meeting, at their April 20<sup>th</sup> meeting, the manner in which the item was heard, they did not hear the full staff report on this and did not hear out the staff recommendation on this. The item was, as they typically handle many of the zoning cases at the planning commission meeting, they often will just go through the items on the list to see if any can be handled by consent. As they were doing that, there were questions that were asked by one of the planning commission members and it led directly into discussion by the planning commission of the Derby recommendations.

Ultimately what happened was the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission then voted to approve this request, modifying the staff recommendations to reflect the recommendations that came out of the Derby Planning Commission.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Was theirs a unanimous vote also?”

**Mr. Schlegel** said, “No, it was a very close vote, 6 to 5. So the provisions for the protective overlay that appear in your agenda report reflect the recommendations of the Derby Planning Commission, particularly as relates to provisions 8 and 9.

Now the applicant has objected to the imposition of these, what I would call, higher standards for signs and landscaping and they have written a letter appealing this and are asking you to consider not adopting the provisions, 8 and 9, as recommended by the MAPC. The original staff recommendations were for . . . are contained within the minutes that are attached to your agenda and reflect the way in which signs and landscaping were handled in the CUP directly to the north of this site, across 63<sup>rd</sup> Street South.

I think everybody is in agreement that the rezoning request to General Commercial should be approved. The disagreement is over how to handle provisions 8 and 9 of the protective overlay, whether or not to go with the recommendations made by the Derby Planning Commission and recommended by the MAPC, or to go with the staff recommendations for provisions 8 and 9. And with that, I’ll be glad to take any questions that you might have.”

## Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you. Commissioners, any . . . Commissioner Burtnett."

**Commissioner Burtnett** said, "Can you give me a brief overview of how much more strict Derby's landscaping rules are, rather than ours, Sedgwick County's."

**Mr. Schlegel** said, "Yes. Well, on the signage provisions in Provision number 8, they're the same for both the first two, no rotating signs or signs with flashing lights shall be allowed. Both staff and the Derby Planning Commission agree on that. Also, on the second provision, that now portable signs, offsite signs or billboards shall be allowed.

After that then, the staff recommendation. . ."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "For clarification, are you saying that Items A and B are the same, the county regulations and the Derby regulations?"

**Mr. Schlegel** said, "No. The staff recommendation for provisions 8A and 8B are the same as the Derby provisions. There's agreement on those two."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Got it."

**Mr. Schlegel** said, "Now the staff recommendation was over and above what would normally be required by the sign code, simply because we were trying to match the CUP requirements for the property across the street."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Got it, thank you."

**Mr. Schlegel** said, "However, for Item 8C and 8D of the Derby Planning Commission recommendations, what they're saying is no pole signs shall be allowed and only one monument sign shall be allowed along the 63<sup>rd</sup> Street frontage and that not to exceed six feet in height and 15 feet in width.

What we were recommending is only one free-standing sign shall be allowed, that on the 63<sup>rd</sup> Street frontage, not to exceed 30 feet in height and 128 square feet of sign area, so the Derby Planning Commission recommendation, as recommended by the MAPC, would be much more restrictive in the type of sign and the size of that sign on 63<sup>rd</sup> Street.

On the landscaping provision, provision number 9, the staff had recommended just applying the landscaping and screening requirements of the Unified Zoning Code. The Derby Planning Commission recommendations are much more detailed. They would like to see an irrigated street

## Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006

yard at least 10 feet in width adjacent to all street frontages. The street yard landscaped with one shade tree or two ornamental trees per 500 square feet of street yard area. That parking areas in front of the primary structure shall be screened with a solid shrub row or hedgerow with a minimum height of three feet and all abutting residential uses being screened with a solid screening fence or wall of six feet in height, and those requirements are more stringent than what's required under the unified zoning code and would cost the applicant more money to comply with that."

**Commissioner Burtnett** said, "So that would be talking about Oliver and 63<sup>rd</sup> Street would be the streets they would have to . . .?"

**Mr. Schlegel** said, "That is correct."

**Commissioner Burtnett** said, "Okay. Do you have any idea how many feet or yards that is?"

**Mr. Schlegel** said, "I think the applicant may be able . . . if they're here, okay, would know that answer. They've worked all that out."

**Commissioner Burtnett** said, "Okay. That's all I have."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Commissioners, any other questions of John at this time. I don't see any. Okay, this isn't an item that would require public hearing or public input, but it's been our policy that we would like to take some input, so if the applicant is here, and would like to address us, we'd like to hear what you have to say."

**Ms. Mary Jo Hill**, 6701 W. Maple, Wichita, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I do want to take just a couple of minutes of your time. The map, the zoning department has given a very . . ."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Ma'am, if you could, just for the record, give us your name and address please."

**Ms. Hill** said, "My name is Mary Jo Hill and I am one of the owners of the property at 4615 East 63<sup>rd</sup> Street South and I'm a Realtor with J.P. Weigand, so I have some idea of the value of land and what we're asking for."

In the documentation I have given you, probably the most important factor is the fact that the City of Derby informed us on April the 2<sup>nd</sup> that they had no intentions of incorporating our property into the City of Derby, because of the cost of putting sewer and water underneath the roadway.

## Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006

Within a mile of our property, the City of Wichita now has new sewer lines, so we would be able to possibly attach to that at some point in time. I have a graph in there, a survey that we received from Martens Company, regarding the property that we're talking of, and one of my concerns is the cost of the landscaping. On the documentation, speaking of landscaping costs and variants, I'm showing that if we fulfill Derby's requirement for landscaping, we will lose 7,222 foot of usable space on the property."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "How much again?"

**Ms. Hill** said, "7,222 square foot of usable space to fulfill their landscaping requirements, because we would have to landscape on the north, the west and the south. What I'm asking is that the costs, the initial costs which I have projected here of \$16,279 is a lot of money for a startup or something that we're hoping to accomplish. Ongoing costs of the landscaping will be water, electricity, maintenance, those type of things. The business directly across the street, I've provided a picture of it and front of that business there are no trees, there are no shrubs and the road is the boundary, not landscaping area.

What we are asking for, that we be given zoning with landscaping requirements and signage equal to what any other resident of Sedgwick County, not Derby, but Sedgwick County would be allowed for the development of this type of property.

And I have a note here from Scott Dunahay of your planning department and it says 'Staff stands by our original recommendation, which would give you the same use, signage, landscaping requirements as the big tool store'. As a last item on signage, we've kind of passed over that pretty quickly, but the monument sign they're saying we could have could not be higher than six foot tall, and from K-15, that's no visibility at all, and would definitely be a detriment to anyone wanting to develop that as a commercial property. I would be free to answer any questions, were you to have any."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "I think we have one or two. Commissioner Winters."

**Commissioner Winters** said, "Thank you very much. Ma'am, I know it's not necessarily part of the zoning requirements, but a question would be what type of business? Do you have a planned business that you are going to put on this property, or are you leaving that open to multiple kinds of opportunities."

**Ms. Hill** said, "When we began this process, we had a tenant in the house who had an insurance business in the front part of the house and she wanted street signage, and in order to comply we had

## Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006

to get zoning. That was what initiated this request, but I could see a beauty shop or many other small, single home-type operations, as well as something larger.”

**Commissioner Winters** said, “Okay, thank you and do you know how many miles it is from the Derby City Limits to this property here at . . . on 63<sup>rd</sup> Street?”

**Ms. Hill** said, “I can tell you that the big/ little tool store, that’s directly across the street from our property is next to Lowe’s, you know across K-15 next to Lowe’s and Lowe’s is the city limits. There is only one home between the city limits and our property, but there’s K-15 and there’s railroad tracks.”

**Commissioner Winters** said, “Okay, so you’re very close, but Derby has indicated that they have no intentions or annexing this property?”

**Ms. Hill** said, “That is what they stated at their meeting.”

**Commissioner Winters** said, “Okay, thank you very much.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Thank you. I don’t see that there’s any other questions at this time, but if you’ll just keep yourself available, should another question come up, we’d appreciate it. Is there anyone else here that would like to speak on this item. Is someone from Derby or anybody? Okay, seeing none, I’ll just restrict the further comments from the bench.

Commissioners, looking at this, the vote was 6 to 5, if I understand John right. Some of the people voting said they hadn’t heard the full report of the MAPD prior to voting, indicating to me they may have changed their mind. But after hearing what John has said, and the indication that Derby does not have any intension to ever annex it and the financial penalty that these people are having to pay to comply to the Derby requirements, I’m inclined to want to go ahead and try to fix this right here today, if it’s possible, and I would like to hear what others have to say, but I think this is one where maybe the MAPC would have had a different vote and might have sided more along what the MAPD was recommending and not adding the additional ones.

And my understanding from the applicant, they’re comfortable with the restrictions that the MAPD had applied, but not the other ones, but I would like to listen to what you all have to say. I think, Commissioner Burtnett, you were first.”

**Commissioner Burtnett** said, “I do have a question of John. So the Sedgwick County rules on landscaping are zero? They would have to do no landscaping, no irrigation? According to her list, if she had to go by the Derby recommendations or the Derby requirements, she would have initial

## Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006

costs of \$16,279. With Sedgwick County, there would be zero dollars, so are there no landscaping requirements.”

**Mr. Schlegel** said, “Yeah, that’s true. The landscaping requirements that generally are applied are City of Wichita landscaping requirements. In this case, we were recommending that those, as part of our recommendations, that those would be the requirements that would be applied. That was our recommendation, under the protective overlay and we stand by that recommendation.”

**Commissioner Burtnett** said, “Okay.”

**Mr. Schlegel** said, “So . . . and I’m not sure where she came up with the zero on her calculations, because she may have been thinking that we would not be applying any landscaping requirements, but we would be applying the City of Wichita’s landscaping requirements.”

**Commissioner Burtnett** said, “Okay, that’s what I’m gathering. So I guess, do we have in our backup what the City of Wichita requirements are?”

**Mr. Schlegel** said, “I do not know that in precise detail, but they’re not as stringent as the Derby . . .”

**Commissioner Burtnett** said, “But there still would be some.”

**Mr. Schlegel** said, “There would be some, yes.”

**Commissioner Burtnett** said, “Okay. All right. That’s all I had.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Okay. Commissioner Winters.”

**Commissioner Winters** said, “I guess I had two thoughts. John, I’m confused about when the case was before the MAPC if they really heard all the information, and if we made the decision to send it back to MAPC, is there new information that they would have and would be able to discuss and think about?”

**Mr. Schlegel** said, “Well, there’s a possibility, because at the end of their discussion, and after they voted, there was a continuation of the discussion and I think, judging from that, there may have been some of them that if they had had different information, they might have voted differently.”

**Commissioner Winters** said, “Okay, well I think Mr. Chairman, you of course are most familiar with this, being in your district. I think I could support sending it back to MAPC, or . . . and again, my understanding is the applicant was in favor of the original requirements as proposed by the Metropolitan Area Planning Department, and I could probably do that too, so I’ll just look to you.

## Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006

Thank you.”

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

**Commissioner Norton** said, “Well I certainly don’t have a problem sending it back. I’ve got a copy of the zoning district standards and there is a litany of things it can be allowed in that zoning, and it would, I think, be apparent to me that if it’s going to be a business housed in one of the residential homes there that’s one thing, but if it really starts developing into a commercial property that has new buildings being built, that some kind of landscaping standards, to keep it consistent maybe with what Derby is trying to do, and truthfully, what we thought we were trying to do when we improved the 63<sup>rd</sup> Street corridor, because it’s going to go from Broadway all the way to the county line, at Rose Hill and I think there’s an idea that that will become a corridor that’s widely travel. That it will develop into new residential and new commercial and that maybe at some point, some landscaping and some signage standards would be appropriate.

Now I don’t know, for a single business, whether we need to be that stringent with landscaping right now or not, but at some point, if that develops into an office park or whatever, some kind of county standards that are very minimal maybe doesn’t make sense and I don’t know how soon the applicant would be thinking about something like that, but maybe there needs to be a trigger mechanism that as long as it’s a home business, that’s one usage, but once it looks like it’s going to develop, that something else is triggered.

The other part, for me, is 63<sup>rd</sup> Street is a corridor that we’ve put a lot of money into improving, that maybe it should have some standards. Oliver, which is probably a longer portion, I don’t think as the visibility. It’s kind of a side street that takes you back into some residential. Maybe that’s not as critical and that could come off of the discussion right now. I don’t know why you would have to landscape all of that and that’s a lot of their property that they could develop, so just some thoughts, as we try to process this.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Thank you, commissioner. Commissioner Unruh.”

**Commissioner Unruh** said, “Thank you, Mr. Chairman. John, is this typical for a community to want to impose various restrictive conditions on property that they don’t have annexed and don’t intend to annex?”

**Mr. Schlegel** said, “No, it’s not typical. This is unusual.”

**Commissioner Unruh** said, “I realize it’s . . . the proximity is the reasoning for that, but it just seems a little bit of a stretch of authority, if I don’t even intend to annex it, that I would want to put

## Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006

such stringent restrictions on it, but that's just a thought.

I guess my real problem with proceeding with this, although, Mr. Chairman, I'd be happy to follow your lead, but a 6 to 5 vote by the planning commission is so close and I really, in reading the backup and the testimony that's written here, have difficulty understanding why the six in favor voted that way and I have difficulty understanding why the five who opposed voted that way. I mean, it just seems like I would like to understand their thinking a little more carefully, along with the fact that in the testimony there's a statement that maybe they didn't get all the information they expected and then discussion after the vote indicated 'Well, I may have changed my mind, if we'd have had . . .'. I mean, it just seems like there's enough cloudiness about it, my instinctive thought is to send it back and say 'You all get a clear recommendation to us' rather than one that is unclear. So that would be the way I'd prefer, but Mr. Chair, this is your district and I'll listen to your argument. That's all I have right now."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you. Well commissioners, I'm not going to try forcing fixing it. If it's the general consensus to send it back, I would be able to support that, because I'm confident, once they get all of the information, I think we're going to see a change in their voting too, because I do believe, in this particular instance, Derby did sort of overstep its realistic authority in imposing these stringent conditions. They have no intension to ever annex it. To just impose something on someone that isn't imposed on some other people in the area doesn't seem to be fair.

With the applicant indicating that they would be agreeable to all of the recommendation of the MAPD, that's why I was thinking 'Well let's just fix it' but I'm comfortable with sending it back, so we could get . . . if that's what the general feeling of it is here, because I'm confident that's what the MAPC is going to recommend back.

Also, even though they're asking for General Commercial, if I'm reading all the exclusivities, in essence they've self-imposed limiting down to Limited Commercial, as opposed to General Commercial and I think that these people need some relief on this, but if the general feeling is that we should send it back, I would not be opposed to that and would entertain a motion."

### **MOTION**

Commissioner Norton moved to return Item F to the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission for reconsideration.

Commissioner Burtnett seconded the motion.

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Now, Mr. Euson, just for my clarification, since there was a protest by the planning commission . . . excuse me, not a protest by the . . . but the MAPC . . . Derby

**Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006**

Planning Commission imposed restrictions. If we were to approve this but take out those restrictions, it would require a super-majority of us voting to affect that change?"

**Mr. Richard Euson**, County Counselor, said, "Yes sir, it would."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "By sending it back to the planning commission and let's say they change their vote to recommend approval without these restrictions. Since that's still flying in the face of what the Derby Planning Commission . . . when it comes back to us, would it require a super-majority also at that time?"

**Mr. Euson** said, "No, then it would just require three votes, and even if they made the same recommendation to you, it would still just require three votes."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "All right, thank you very much. Okay, there's been a motion and second. Any further comment? Commissioner Winters."

**Commissioner Winters** said, "And John, I'm supporting sending this back. If this gets back to our case though I would appreciate maybe if you could have some photos taken of looking from this property, across the road. These are, I think, the photos we've been handed, kind of show a little bit but it's hard to see, but when we get this back, maybe we could have more."

**Mr. Schlegel** said, "I'll be sure they're in the next presentation."

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

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Okay. I don't see that there's any further comment. So we have a Motion and second to refer this back to the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission for further review. Clerk, call the roll."

**VOTE**

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

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

**Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006**

**G. PRESENTATION REGARDING SEDGWICK COUNTY ARENA EXTERIOR DESIGN CONCEPT SELECTION.**

**POWERPOINT PRESENTATION**

**Mr. Ron Holt**, Assistant County Manager, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I'm here this morning to give you an update on the Sedgwick County Arena project, specifically to ask you to select an exterior design concept for the arena and to authorize the architectural and engineering team to proceed with the schematic design phase of the project.

The goal for this project, as we continue to say, is to build a modern, first-class sport and entertainment venue, an arena that seats 15,000 for basketball and to do so within the funding that will be provided by the 1%, 30-month, voter-approved sales tax.

While the January 2006 estimate for the sales tax collections that began on July 1, 2005 and will end no later than December 31, 2007, 30 months, while those new projections, that updated forecast, is that those collections will be \$201,000,000. The project team will continue to manage this project, against 184.5 million dollar budget, which is the June 2004 estimate as to the amount a 1% sales tax that would be collected over 30 months and we will continue to manage that way, certainly throughout the design of the project. That takes us through May . . . April or May of next year.

Commissioners, before I get to the public engagement process that has led to the recommendation staff will be making today, regarding the selection of a particular exterior design concept, and because we've had some recent media exclaiming the more designs are needed, since the people's choice is based on a scant 669 responses during the recent public meetings, I would ask you to please allow me to provide some historical perspective to the public engagement in the development of the Sedgwick County arena in downtown Wichita.

As you know, ever since Century II was constructed and the old Forum facility was taken down, there has been discussion from time to time in the community of the need for a multi-event, sports and entertainment center in downtown Wichita. The possibility of having such a facility downtown was greatly diminished when a group of business leaders joined with the county and after 11 years of trying to identify, plan and develop funding, broke ground on the Kansas Coliseum in August, 1977. And when the Kansas Coliseum opened in 1978, it was envisioned to be a venue that would compliment Century II and only hold agricultural events. However, soon after it was opened, due to the leadership and promotional skills of the first director of the Coliseum, Sam Fulco, the

## **Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006**

complex became and has continued to be a venue for not only agricultural related events, but also for concerts, family entertainment shows, sports events and other uses.

In spite of the success of the Kansas Coliseum, the vision of a downtown arena was maintained by many civic and community leaders over the years. Support for the vision of a downtown arena gained steam in late 1982 resulting in a citywide election regarding a downtown arena in 1993. The vote failed. Again, in 1998, following citizen concerns about ADA accessibility at the Kansas Coliseum and the potential for major renovation of the Kansas Coliseum to address these ADA and other code compliance issues. Community leaders initiated a KPMG study and financial analysis for a proposed downtown arena.

Out of this study, the dinoplex concept was born, including pretty pictures, artist renderings of the proposed facility, and awe. Because of this, the county put renovations of the Coliseum on hold for the downtown arena project. However, for a number of reasons, a vote on the project was postponed.

Again, in 2002, the downtown arena, now clearly called the 'Dinoplex project' was revived and put on the ballot to be voted on, first in May of that year and then moved to August. And however, as you know, due to the 259 school bond issue, the downtown arena effort was pulled from the ballot and put on hold indefinitely.

After some 25 years, throughout the life of the Kansas Coliseum, there has been ongoing talk about a downtown arena, but nothing happened and the downtown arena plans were put on hold indefinitely, it was decided that the county . . . you decided that the county would go forward and develop a plan to renovate and upgrade the Kansas Coliseum.

As a part of that plan, in January 2003, the Board of County Commissioners selected an architectural and engineering consultant to provide architectural and engineering services, project planning and estimating for the renovation upgrade of the Coliseum and after going through a thoughtful and public process, which included a comprehensive technical review and analysis of the facility by the architectural and engineering consultants, as well as presentations to community groups and input from our then citizen design review advisory task team, in August 2003 the Board of County Commissioners approved the hiring of architectural, engineering services to do the design and engineering work for 55.3 million dollar plan to renovate and upgrade the Coliseum.

## **Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006**

That decision was met with a great deal of resistance by community leaders, who still envision the need for a downtown arena. You stated that the county was moving forward and that these plans would be moved forward until or unless a viable plan for a downtown arena was presented. You indicated and directed us to go forward with the renovation of the Coliseum plans. The plans to renovate the Kansas Coliseum was scheduled to be completed in the summer of 2004, with construction bidding to occur in the fall of 2004 and construction to begin in the spring of 2005.

Realizing that the time was drawing to a close for the development of a viable plan for a downtown arena and the county was indeed going to follow through on the renovation of the Kansas Coliseum, which would in fact close the door on the possibility of a downtown arena for at least another 20 to 25 years, the business community along with elected officials of the City of Wichita approached the county and in June, 2004 making a last attempt at a plan for a downtown arena.

After a number of meetings and discussions in July 2004, the county then, with your blessing, the county staff worked on and developed a plan to let the community decide if they wanted a downtown arena, versus the renovation of the Kansas Coliseum. So what occurred? In August 2004, the county engaged the public in the discussion. We held nine open house meetings. Over 800 people participated and helped determined if we should have a vote on the downtown arena.

From these meetings, a ballot questions for November elections was developed and that ballot question, in essence said, 'will you approve a 1 cent sales tax for 30 months to fund an arena in downtown Wichita'. From June through December of 2004, the Visioneering Wichita project was underway and had 8,650 citizens identify the downtown arena as a key strategy for downtown redevelopment and keeping our youth in the area.

In November 2004, there was a vote of the Sedgwick County citizens on the downtown arena, 78% voter turnout, some 88,921 citizens, 52% voted yes, 48% voted no.

In April 2005, the state legislature approved and the governor signed the bill approving the 1% sales tax for 30 months for the arena project. In April 2005, the public planning process for the Sedgwick County arena in downtown Wichita was outlined in a Board of County Commissioner meeting. On April the 12<sup>th</sup>, 2005 the first public meeting about location and arena design was held. Citizen input on what's important in the arena neighborhood, traffic, other buildings and so forth led to the process of revisiting, time and time again in our community meetings what's important in the arena area, where does it need to be in the designated downtown area and what does it need to look like.

In July 2005, as a part of the public engagement process, three different citizen advisory committees were appointed to provide input. The Citizen Tax Oversight Committee, the Citizen Design Review

## **Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006**

Advisory Committee and the city's Arena Neighborhood Redevelopment Plan Steering Committee.

In July 2005, following the county's normal RFP process, the architectural and engineering team was hired, Arena Design Consortium, three highly respected local firms partnered with HOK Sport of Kansas City, a world-renowned arena design firm, and a number of other highly regarded firms, including PEC, local engineering firm and Turner Construction for cost estimating to help us realize the goal, to deliver on the goal of developing a first-class, modern facility that seats 15,000 for basketball and to accomplish that goal within the budget provided by this 1%, 30-month sales tax.

On August 4<sup>th</sup>, 2005 we held our second public open house to get input on arena location and design. Again, we asked citizens to provide input on what's important from a site location perspective, and what arena design styles they preferred. From September 2005 through January 2006, preliminary programming efforts for the arena were undertaken. We met with key stakeholders, users and professionals to determine the operational needs for the arena.

September 2005 through November 2005, we continued with the site selection process, which included two additional public open houses: September the 29<sup>th</sup>, and October the 27<sup>th</sup>. September 2005 through January 2006, to get information on arena operations to ascertain what contributes to the fan experience and to get a physical view of other arenas, we took tours of some other arenas. We went to Des Moines, we went to Salt Lake City, Little Rock and Oklahoma City.

In late December 2005 and throughout January 2006 we spent a great deal of time and energy responding to an artist drawing, not architectural design concepts, but an artist drawing of the 'Arena over the River' concept. February 2006, the architectural and engineering team used input from these various meetings and from you and from county staff to create fan amenity options for the interior bowl of the arena.

In February 2006, you approved a two concourse arena and approved the architectural and engineering team to move forward with developing three exterior design concepts for the arena.

April 2006, at a Board of County Commission meeting, you were presented with three exterior design drawing from the public input, from input from professionals, from other arena experiences, from information we've gotten relative to the location, the seating bowl, all of that was taken into consideration, as the Arena Design Consortium designers worked on these concepts that were presented on April 26<sup>th</sup>. What you were presented on April 26<sup>th</sup> were architectural design concepts, not artist's drawings or renderings. Now they're not final, but they certainly have a tremendous amount of input from various considerations, not only from a visual and aesthetics point of view, but from a functional point of view, relative to the preliminary programming efforts that went into developing these plans.

April through May, 2006 there were nine public meetings, over 1,000 people attended and 669

## **Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006**

completed surveys. People came out, they were engaged, they spent time, they were interested and they responded through the surveys. During that same timeframe we had seven presentations about these three designs, formal presentations to other groups.

Now before I go on with the results of the public input on the arena design concepts, let me just take a pause and offer here a summary statement regarding why we've gone back and looked at the historical perspective and talked about what we're doing from the public engagement process. The difference between the Sedgwick County arena process and other downtown arena processes is the involvement of key stakeholders and the public. When the county's plan was developed in July 2004, under the leadership of the county manager and at your direction, we were committed to taking the time to listen to the citizens. As you have all, in the public arena, come to know this is not always a pretty process. It's not always fun. Many times the process is a bit chaotic, but you believe and we believe that it is important and necessary.

We believe the success we experience with the Coliseum renovation project in 2002, where you agreed to spend 55.3 million dollars to renovate the Coliseum was a success, because of community engagement. Again, in 2004, with the county's plan for the downtown arena, we think the success to date can be directly attributed to the leadership that's been provided by you and the county manager in directing me and the rest of the county staff to go through this public engagement process.

Also, let me take a minute or two to talk about next steps in the arena project process and do a quick recap of the project budget. Property appraisals and acquisition, relocation, demolition are underway, they're in process and will continue through February 2007 if we . . . and hopefully we'll have all of that done sometime prior to that.

Naming rights, sponsorships, premium seating, both the evaluation and the marketing is in process. It started in February and the marketing piece of it will go through December of '08, unless we have everything completed and sold out before that time.

The next phase of the design process is the schematic design phase. It will start after we get approval beyond this process and will go through early September '06. An integrated parking plan will be developed and we're using the word 'integrated' now because we want to join with and have agreement from other people from the city, to join with the arena project, the Water Walk project, what's going on with the Arena Neighborhood Redevelopment Plan, how Century II is being used now and in the future and taking all of those things into consideration and the impact parking will have in all of downtown, including Old Town, we will begin in earnest in August to develop an integrated parking plan and we'll spend more than a year to develop that plan, and it too, the intent

## Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006

would be to engage the public in the development of that plan.

Following schematic design, the next step in the design process is design development. If we remain on schedule, that would start in September. It would go through January of '07. Following that phase, the next step in the design process would be construction documents development. That would start in September and would go through January of '07. Following that phase, the next step in the design process would be construction documents development. That would start in January and go till March or April. Construction bid period would be the March/ April timeframe to July and construction then would start in July and go through early 2009. Sales tax ends in December '07 at the latest and now the plan calls for the arena to open in early 2009.

Very quickly, just a quick recap of the budget, 11.7 million dollars for site acquisition, demolition, 5.5 million for off-site infrastructure improvements, 5.3 for on-site utilities, this is the updated budget numbers we presented to you in February. Arena facility would be 119.8 million and you see what makes up that. Only 111 million is actually building construction, then there's food service, the ribbon signage and soft costs included in that number. Design permitting, furnishing and equipment, 14.5, other- 1.5 for a subtotal of 158.3 million. Improvements to the pavilions, 9.1 million and a parking and operation and maintenance reserve fund, 17.1 million for the 184.5 million. We are working against that budget and will continue to work against this particular budget, over at least the next year.

So let me get back to what input we've gotten, what feedback we've gotten to the design concepts that were presented to you on April the 26<sup>th</sup>."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Ron, before you go any further, could you go back to that one slide where it showed the money breakout. Not included in this, if I'm correct, is any additional funds we get for naming rights or suite sales or what have you, would go into that parking and/ or maintenance reserve fund. Is that correct?"

**Mr. Holt** said, "That is correct. This only includes what we're working against on the initial forecast of the 1% sales tax for 30 months of 184.5 million."

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

**Mr. Holt** said, "As I mentioned, a couple of slides back, since April 26<sup>th</sup> when the architects presented the three exterior design concepts, we've held nine public meetings, over 1,000 people attended and 669 surveys, usable surveys were completed. Now these surveys were not designed to

## Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006

have citizens vote for just one design over the other, but to respond to the same five questions for each design option and to rate each design or to rate each one of those questions for each design option on a scale of 1 to 6.

The five questions were: arena design has an impressive wow factor, orientation of arena entrance to the surrounding area is convenient, the arena entry plaza is inviting to guests, arena blends into the surrounding neighborhood and arena design can stand the test of time, 20 years from now. Again, response were based on a 1 to 6 scale, with 1 being strongly disagree and 6, strongly agree. The results you see reflected here are the overall results for all five questions. Option A ended up with an overall result of 3.8 out of a 1 to 6 scale. Option B, 4.4 and Option C, 2.9. Again, we have provided you a more detailed breakdown of those responses from the surveys.

You were also provided a copy of the comments that we received and I think it's fair to say that from meeting to meeting, all nine meetings, there was not significant difference found in responses from the various meetings. I would also say that we had, even at our if you will publicly announced meeting . . . two of these meetings were done with specific groups. We had about 30 employees from the county who voluntarily attended a meeting and responded to the survey and we had around 100 young professionals of Wichita, we attended one of their meetings and got them to respond. The other seven meetings were publicly announced. One was at WSU. The point I wanted to make is that we had all age ranges, folks involved in providing input.

The other point is, I would like to point out that only eight respondents out of those 669, only eight ranked every question on each design as one, or strongly disagree, only eight.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “So would that mean only eight were ‘none of the above’? Is that kind of what you’re . . .”

**Mr. Holt** said, “My interpretation of that would be those eight said none of the above.

On May the 16<sup>th</sup>, the city’s Arena Neighborhood Redevelopment Plan steering team met to discuss the arena design options. On April the 26<sup>th</sup>, in the afternoon, we gave them the same presentation we had given to you that morning. The 19 members on that board, about 15 have been active, 11 were at the meeting. Out of the 11, six indicated a strong preference for option B, two a strong preference for option A, one a strong preference for option C, Commissioner Burnett and I are on that committee and we both abstained.

The support for option B was generally based on the ‘wow factor’ question, the orientation of the building to Kellogg and the ‘stand the test of time’ question. The support for option A was the ‘wow factor’, from those folks perspective, but most significant the orientation of the entrance to the west and what that might do for a downtown redevelopment and the ‘stand the test of time’ question

## Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006

The support for option C was a statement something to the affect that was the most complete or finished design and a belief that it would support or withstand the test of time. On May the 18<sup>th</sup> . . . again, option B was the preference.

On May the 18<sup>th</sup>, the Arena Citizen Design Review Advisory Committee met and I should note that ahead of time members were provided an opportunity to fill out the survey that had been taken at all of the public meetings. They were provided that opportunity ahead of the meeting, but then when we came to the meeting, we then talked about each of the designs and the people present weighed in based on what they had been hearing from their friends and neighbors and interest groups relative to the designs.

From the results of the surveys that were filled out ahead of time and for those at the meeting, they overwhelmingly indicated a preference for option B. A number of reasons were given, but most often cited was the contrast in the building views of the south side to Kellogg, versus the north side to the Douglas/ Old Town neighborhood. In addition . . . and again B was the preference there.

In addition, we made seven presentations to various groups. On April 27<sup>th</sup>, we made a presentation to the Wichita Downtown Development Corporation. On April 28<sup>th</sup>, we made a presentation to the Wichita City Council. On May the 4<sup>th</sup>, we presented to the Great Wichita Area Sports Commission. The afternoon of May the 4<sup>th</sup>, we presented to the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission. We have the group in town for a convention called the Real Estate Marketing Exchange Group, people from all over the country, and we were given the opportunity to present to that group, and we did that on May the 6<sup>th</sup>. On May the 8<sup>th</sup>, we made a presentation to the Historic Preservation Board and on May the 18<sup>th</sup>, presentation was made to the city's Design Council.

Now at these meetings, we were not asking specifically for feedback. We were providing these for informational meetings. However, you got a letter from the Wichita Downtown Development Corporation, which weighed in and gave their preference for option A.

I believe you all received an e-mail from Bob Hanson of the Greater Wichita Area Sports Commission and indicating that while not all of his board would opt for B, that the majority of that board would opt for B. The informal feedback from the city's Design Council was B and then I need to clarify for the record, we did not get, formal or informal, any feedback . . . they elected not to provide feedback, that's the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission and the Historic Preservation Board. I may have mislead folks the other day, when I talked about presenting to those groups, but I need to clarify the record. The Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, nor the Historic Preservation Board elected to take any action, formal or otherwise, or informal."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "But they were given the opportunity to do so. Is that correct?"

## Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006

**Mr. Holt** said, "They were asked and they elected not to do so.

In all of the discussions leading up to a final discussion here, from the surveys, the advisory groups, the public input, both show options A and B are very viable options. Based on feelings and sentiments of the community however, option B if we had to give you a preference, would be the preferred option. And as such, in consultant with the county manager and absent any compelling reasons to the contrary, staff is recommending you select option B as the preferred exterior design concept and authorize the architectural and engineering team to proceed with schematic design phase of the project.

We've had a lot of discussion, what happens next. In all of the discussions, leading up to option A versus option B, as the preferred exterior design option, with either of those options, there is much more work to be done. As we work on the further development of the interior of the building, tweaks, refinements, enhancements will be possible. The building design that's selected, whichever one, I think Dan Wilson is responsible for this wording 'It will blossom'. And so, the question to you, in whichever one you select, is what do you need to see to make it blossom, and that you will have opportunity, various opportunities to have input to the enhancements of these designs.

In addition to the other public input, I've mentioned citizens can get information or offer comments on the county website, at [www.sedgwickcounty.org](http://www.sedgwickcounty.org). I would be happy to answer any questions. Also here this morning, representing the Arena Design Consortium, is Wes Darnell from Wilson Darnell Mann, Dan Wilson from Wilson Darnell Mann, Jeff Vansickle from McCluggage Vansickle Perry and Bill Livingston from Gossen Livingston. That's the presentation, commissioners. What are your questions?"

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Well, first you're assuming we might have some from such a thorough presentation, but you are to be complimented. You really took the time to really give us everything. I also appreciated the timeline, from 1977 to present. I think that was very informative. Commissioners, any questions of Ron on his presentation? Any comments in general, or is it time for us to kind of do our 'abc's. Okay I see that there are no comments. Aha, I knew if I begged long enough. Commissioner Unruh."

**Commissioner Unruh** said, "Well, I'd be happy to start some discussion, if now is appropriate. Ron, I'd also say that I appreciate the chronology that you've presented to us, both past and projection into the future, but as we consider this evolving history of the development of Sedgwick County arena and downtown Wichita, I guess we've come now to an historic moment, and decision. It's a decision about a community project that has had high visibility and high interest, represents a high community investment in it and it's a decision now that we're faced with that's going to be a permanent decision to a great degree. So I just say that to emphasize the fact that I understand what we're doing today is truly important to our community.

## Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006

I would not want to, in any way, diminish the significance of this design decision, but I do think we have two designs that have been left standing that would undoubtedly produce the results that we have all anticipated and hoped for. We want a facility that would make us all proud and I think we have two designs that will do that.

We want a facility that will be a catalyst to stimulate economic development in downtown Wichita and I truly believe that it's going to do that and our citizens will find that there is definitely a positive cost/ benefit ratio in this project. And we want an entertainment and recreational venue that will enhance the quality of life for our citizens. So if I've summarized what some of our goals are, I think we have two designs that will accomplish that, so in that sense, I don't think we can go wrong, whatever we do.

But we have established a process that you've very clearly rehearsed for us here, and it includes not only the public, but key stakeholders. It has been open. It has been transparent. We did not enter into it with any sort of a sales effort, where we're trying to sell a perspective and it definitely was not a sham, as you know some folks might suggest. And I think that I can be a personal testimony to that, in the fact that I declared three or four weeks ago that I liked number A, but as I've seen the results, as you've given them to us, of what all the input is, I'm quite comfortable in being very supportive of option number B. I think it does present a modern, progressive look to our community. It does have a 'wow factor'. And while presenting that on one façade, that the north side I think remains very compatible with the Old Town architecture. I don't see any problems with this design housing the programs that we've established and I don't think this design would present any problems unique that would eliminate it from contention.

So, I'm going to be supportive of the recommendation and cast my vote for option B, knowing that there will be some changes and as the word that we're using, I think Dan Wilson, he probably didn't know we were going to say 'blossoming' so much when he first said that word, but . . ."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "What was the word again?"

**Commissioner Unruh** said, "Blossom. There you go. And you know, there are some things I think we can talk about. I prefer to have that north entrance moved a little further east, so it does line up more directly with St. Francis Street, but I think that can be accomplished, as they consider it and I want to make sure that that directly west entrance, as it . . . or west façade, as it looks down William Street, does have an attractiveness that will help enhance that downtown development down that corridor. So I think those things can happen. I'm confident in this decision. I'm satisfied, optimistic, ready to go forward, so I'm glad we're at this point.

And Mr. Chairman, if you . . . if I can say a couple of more words, I've been going on here for a while, but I just want to congratulate Mr. Holt and Stephanie Knebel for their leadership in taking

## Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006

us through all these steps, up to this point. I know that you guys have worked really hard and I appreciate it. The Arena Design Consortium, you all have been open and helpful every step of the way and so I just want to recognize the fact that we have not been kept in the dark and we have not been blindly led somewhere. We've had our questions answered and you all worked very hard to make sure that we are up to speed, so thank you all for that and we've already recognized the fact that we've already had very good citizen input into this process. So very good so far and I'm happy to move forward and that's all I have, Mr. Chair."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "And if you notice, Ron's hair used to be really dark black about eight months ago. Look how gray it is. More importantly commissioner, we haven't been kept in the dark. We tried our best not to keep the public in the dark on this project. That's the one thing that I'm very, very proud of the fact, regardless if we get any credit for it or not, is that we are, as I understand it, probably the only arena process entity that has gone to these lengths to try to engage the public every step of the way, including this task force for oversight, including asking the architects to come up with three concepts, as opposed to one and regardless of the one we pick, I am very proud of this entire board in the manner in which it has conducted this process.

Commissioners, unless some of you or any of you have a compelling reason why we can't go forward with a vote, I would like to entertain a motion, but if there is some compelling reason why we shouldn't, I'd like to hear it now. Commissioner Norton."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "I don't know that I have a compelling reason why we shouldn't move forward, but I do have some thoughts. The first thing is I want to talk about just kind of my thought process through this whole thing, personally. I think my fellow colleagues will know that all along the process, from the time we got engaged in this, I've tried to continue to think outside the box. I pushed the envelope. I've thrown additional, alternative suggestions on the table. A lot of them fell away as just chaff in the wind and that's okay. I think that's part of the process. I've continued to challenge the process that we've gone through, because I knew that ultimately, at the end of the day, it was going to be five county commissioners making the final decision, regardless of what all the input is and everything, that it will come down to us.

And I feel like it's been important to have that kind of dialogue, to continue to talk about is the process the right thing, are we making the right decisions along the way, are there alternate ways of thinking, so that we haven't done this in a vacuum. It hasn't just been a neat little package thing that somebody was going to come and tell us 'do option B' and then we signed off on it and that was the end of it.

I think, all along the way, we've pushed the envelope and I've encouraged myself to be that person, to just continue to do that, and I think we've come to this day with a lot of people involved, the community, but also not just relying only on the process to make the final decision.

## Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006

You know, when we talk about the ‘wow factor’ one thing that’s always come to mind there is that when I thought about my . . . meeting my wife, you know there was a wow factor. That’s what I fell in love with. But 20 years later, what I really love is the familiarity.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “I don’t know, later on, was that reciprocal or just you had that?”

**Commissioner Norton** said, “Probably not, but there was a wow factor. There was something that got the heart beating and we all want that. But at the end of the day, 20 years later, familiarity is important, something you’re comfortable with, something that has become a part of your life. Memories are going to be important. The experience that people have in this downtown arena and conjure up. I mean, we have people talk about the Forum still. We have people that remember their first concert at the Coliseum. And it’s not about the building, it’s about the experience you have inside, so those memories are important.

The warm feelings that are conjured up about your community and what you’ve participated in is important. Obviously, the whole experience of whatever we end up with is going to be more important, probably than the bricks and mortar. And then it’s going to evolve, there’s going to be continuing excitement, so yeah the wow factor of the building is important but that is going to be what it is. There’s going to be debates from time immemorial as to whether we picked the right design and it’s going to be an icon.

Truthfully, 40 years from now, somebody else is going to be having that discussion. I probably won’t be, and they’ll say ‘Wow, your grand . . . you know, my grandkids will be talking to their grandkids and say ‘Gee, paw-paw did a pretty good job, we really like that building’, or ‘Boy, he must have fallen off the turnip wagon and bumped his head, why did he pick that?’ So I think history will tell us if he’s got the wow factor, not today.

I think there’s three things that I still worry about and we’ll move onto them. I think we’ve got to get the exterior taken care of and move onto the next three important things. The exterior on the interior, what’s that going to be because truthfully 3% or 5% of your time is going to be walking up to the building and looking at it and go ‘wow, isn’t this pretty’, 95% of your time is going to be inside, at the concert, at the event that happens inside and that experience is going to be so critical to whether people have those warm feelings and memories and have the wow factor, because you know, if you can’t buy a hotdog or foodstuffs quickly, if there’s not enough restrooms, if the crowds crunch on you in the concourses, if it’s not easy to get in and out, if the seats are not comfortable, on and on and on, then I don’t know that it matters what kind of glass we used on the exterior, so that going to be very important.

Parking I continue to hear about over and over and over and over. I was at a neighborhood

## **Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006**

association meeting last night, 50 people there, and as we talked about the arena I think they're okay with the way we're going, except they're still worried about parking and how that affects that overall experience.

And then finally, we talked about economic development, neighborhood revitalization and what that's going to end up looking like. Those three things, I think, are where we need to spend our time and concentrate, after we've moved on. So probably the only little caveat I have about the exterior design is I'm still concerned about that northern exposure. The treatment on option B, to me, is great facing south, is Spartan facing north as far as I'm concerned. That's just my opinion. I can sign up for option B pretty easily, but the north exposure, towards Douglas and Old Town, which is one reason we, I think, picked the east site is its confluence with Old Town. I just don't think it fits in. I don't think it has that little . . . that feeling that it ties in as well. It's pretty Spartan and I think we should look at that. Otherwise, I'm ready to move forward."

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

**Commissioner Winters** said, "Well thank you very much. Ron, thanks for the presentation, as usually just an excellent job and I certainly want to thank all of the individuals and organizations that have weighed in, those that have weighed in in a positive manner have been very helpful and the majority of them have been in a positive manner. And it certainly is not . . . the problem is not a lack of information. Probably the problem is shifting through a lot of information, but I certainly appreciate all of the people that have weighed in, committees and/ or individuals in the public meeting process.

And I certainly want to say thank you to the design team for going through the effort, at our request, to present these three designs and of course we've got three local firms involved, McCluggage Vansickle Perry, Gossen Livingston, Wilson Darnell & Mann. They've all done a very good job, along with Brad Clark and Rich Martin from HOK Sports in Kansas City, who is a worldwide builder of sports arena.

I also am going to support the B concept, but I would like to say that there were some very positive, strong features to the A concept and I am not about to suggest that we try to build the blended arena, but I don't think we can just throw away the good aspects that were in the other options, and particularly were in Option A.

## Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006

I think that, you know, so of the things that stood out about it, the grand entrance, the hall inside could very well be looked at. And I agree with Commissioner Norton, I'm not clear on the north side and what that north connection to Douglas and to Old Town should actually be like. I think somebody is going to have to really spend some time thinking about that north side.

I think there are connections, every place around this building. I think there needs to be concentration on the English and William side of the building. We had a presentation just a few weeks ago, by City of Wichita's Public Works Department on their Waterman project and that is going to become a major arterial street that is going to be different than it is today, so there's going to be this Waterman aspect that really needs to be thought about. One of the strong points for A, I think, was the concept of this urban design. It really started me thinking about the building being close to the street, the entrance close to the street, close to the activity, and I think that's a positive urban design that needs to be, again, continued and looked at.

So with all of those links and of course Century II and Water Walk, and Water Walk beginning to develop, I mean there's links to be looked at on at least three sides of this building and I hope we can do that.

So commissioners, I think those are kind of my concluding comments, but again I hope we're able to take part of the good parts, not a blended arena, but part of the good aspects from what we've seen so far in each one of the options.

Thank you, commissioner. Commissioner Burnett."

**Commissioner Burnett** said, "Well Ron, I want to thank you also for your presentation. Just getting on the County Commission Board in January of 2005, I didn't have all of the timelines understood, like you brought them out today. I luckily have always liked every single one of the options. I thought A, B or C I'm fine with. I was a little disappointed that C . . . I always thought C was a little more unique and I really liked it too, but again, I was so happy with all of the designs, that I don't mind any of them. And I believe that the blossoming of the north side will really help alleviate some of Commissioner Norton's concerns. And I think we will be spending . . . we have spend an inordinate amount of time visiting with people, trying to find out what they do like and dislike about the different designs and I think we will continue those discussions into your programming and so forth, so I really feel good about the whole process and will be happy to support option B, even though I liked them all, so I'm ready to go forward with this also."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Great. Well, a couple of things, I agree with Commissioner Norton too. That's three of us agreeing with Commissioner Norton, which is kind of scary of itself, but the real

**Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006**

wow is going to come when the interior programming and fan experience and that's where we're going to proceed to the next step.

The only caution I throw out to the board is we have to be a little careful not to get out too far ahead of the neighborhood area redevelopment group, especially like we're talking about we want to do something maybe major on the north side entrance or what have you for Cowtown, . . . Old Town I mean, excuse me, I have that in my head for some other reason, but there's also been talk about maybe a hotel going right in front of it, which would then negate the attractiveness of expanding of an entrance on the north side of that facility.

So I think that, as we go through the blossoming effect, I think it would be very important for our staff to work with these other folks, keeping in mind that the very reason we're down there is to assist the city in redeveloping that entire area and getting some heads-up on what some plans, if they know of any, that are going to happen, that could alter our ideas on how this options should be blossomed.

But I think it is time for us to make a decision on it, go forward so that the public knows that that's one more decision we've made and this is not the end, this in not even the beginning of the end, it's not going to end until 2009, but I think now, by settling on a concept, it's the end of the beginning and I'm stealing these words from Winston Churchill, so I'm old enough to understand that. Commissioners, I would entertain a motion, if any of you are comfortable in making one."

**MOTION**

Commissioner Burtnett moved to approve the designers go forward with Option B.

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, May 24, 2006**

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “And now that we’ve made our decision, why don’t we ask the manager to speak.”

**Mr. William P. Buchanan**, County Manager, greeted the Commissioners and said, “I just wanted to take the opportunity because Commissioner Norton raised some issues, and I wanted to assure you that those issues were going to be dealt with in a timely fashion and in an appropriate way.

Again, we’re going to go through a very thorough process that engages citizens and we will be responsive to your needs. We try to continue to use the process of being very thoughtful, very open and very transparent and that’s how we will continue to operate with this process, from this point forward.”

**Mr. Holt** said, “And Commissioners, I beg your indulgent. You’ve mentioned my name and Stephanie’s name specifically, relative to this project. We do have other people, but I’m not going to try to list everybody, but I just want to say that we have an excellent internal, County team. We have an exceptional Arena Steering Team, which includes city staff and county folks, as well as Ed Wolverton, from the Wichita Downtown Development Corporation, John Rolfe from the Wichita Convention and Visitors’ Bureau, Bob Hanson from the Greater Wichita Area Sports Commission. And again, as you’ve said, we have a design team that listens and responds and we could not be more pleased with the effort and we’re going to continue to be listening, as we move forward in the development of this project. Thank you.”

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “Thank you. Commissioners, before we go on to the next item, let me suggest maybe we take a five minute recess.”

**The County Commission was in recess from 10:51 a.m. until 11:05 a.m.**

**Chairman Sciortino** said, “We’re back from our little recess, so Madam Clerk would you call the next item please.”

### **H. DIVISION OF HUMAN SERVICES**

#### **DIVISION OF HUMAN SERVICES - COMCARE**

**Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006**

**1. AGREEMENT WITH COWLEY COUNTY MENTAL HEALTH AND COUNSELING CENTER (CMHC) FOR COMCARE TO PROVIDE EMPLOYEE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM SERVICES TO CMHC EMPLOYEES AND THEIR IMMEDIATE FAMILIES.**

**Ms. Marilyn Cook**, Director, Comprehensive Community Care, greeted the Commissioners and said, "This agreement is with Cowley County Mental Health Center in Winfield, Kansas. We've had this agreement for a couple of years, where we agree that if any of the Cowley County employees, full and part time, or their family members have a mental health or substance abuse concern, that they'll come to us to be assessed for that and we'll make some recommendation. That way it keeps that information confidential from their own center staff. Got to say we've, in two years, not had anybody come but they wanted a formalized agreement in place. Be happy to answer any questions that you have on this."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you. Marilyn, I don't see that there's any questions. So commissioners, what's the will on this item please?"

**MOTION**

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

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, "Marilyn, thank you so much. Next item please."

**DIVISION OF INFORMATION & OPERATIONS- DEPT. ON AGING**

**2. AGREEMENT WITH KANSAS DEPARTMENT ON AGING FOR CLIENT ASSESSMENT, REFERRAL AND EVALUATION PROGRAM.**

**Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006**

**Mr. Ray Vail**, Director of Finance and Support Services, Department on Aging, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I'm here to ask you to approve the care service agreement, the renewal of it. The care program provides assessments to those people seeking long-term care services. There's no funding required by Butler, Harvey or Sedgwick Counties. It has been approved by Legal and Finance and I ask you to approve the agreement and authorize the Chair to sign and I'll answer any questions."

**MOTION**

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

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, "Next item please."

- 3. AGREEMENT WITH CITY OF WICHITA, KANSAS FOR SEDGWICK COUNTY TRANSPORTATION BROKERAGE TO PROVIDE SPECIALIZED DEMAND RESPONSE TRANSPORTATION SERVICES TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC RESIDING IN HAYSVILLE, MULVANE, DERBY, BEL AIRE, PARK CITY, KECHI, MAIZE AND VALLEY CENTER.**

**Mr. Vail** said, "Commissioners, this agreement with the City of Wichita will provide rides to those cities under the newly urbanized area. It has been reviewed by both Legal and Finance and I ask you to approve this agreement and authorize the Chair to sign."

**MOTION**

**Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006**

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

Commissioner Burtnett seconded the motion.

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Before we vote though, could I just ask you a question on it?"

**Mr. Vail** said, "Sure."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Is this where the city drives in a city bus, on a regular route basis, or what is the city's involvement?"

**Mr. Vail** said, "These areas used to be the rural areas, under the new designation they fell under the City of Wichita and they're contracting with our brokerage for rides with our buses and contractors."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Got it. Okay, thank you very much. There's been a Motion and a second. I don't see that there's any further questions or comments, so Clerk call the roll on this item please."

**VOTE**

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

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

**I. OFFICE OF COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES GRANT APPLICATION IN THE AMOUNT OF \$49,361 FOR FUNDING OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A DIGITAL FORMAT PHOTOGRAPHY SYSTEM FOR THE SHERIFF'S OFFICE.**

**Mr. Dave Thompson**, Executive Officer, Sheriff's Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Through the efforts of Senator Brownback, the Sheriff's Office received a \$50,000 award to assist us in our digital photography conversion project. This funding was passed through to the Office of Community Oriented Policing for management and this is the formal application that we need to complete so that we can receive the funding from the senator."

**Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006**

If you have no questions, I would ask that the grant application be approved and the Chairman authorized to sign all necessary documents.”

**MOTION**

Commissioner Norton moved to approve the Grant Application and authorize the Chairman to sign all necessary documents, including a grant award agreement containing substantially the same terms and conditions as this Application; and approve establishment of budget authority at the time the grant award documents are executed.

Chairman Sciortino 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 Burnett	Aye
Chairman Sciortino	Aye

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

**DIVISION OF PUBLIC SAFETY- DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS**

**J. JUVENILE ACCOUNTABILITY BLOCK GRANT FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR 2005 APPLICATION TO KANSAS JUVENILE JUSTICE AUTHORITY FOR FUNDING OF JUVENILE JUSTICE PROGRAMS.**

**Ms. Chris Morales**, Systems Integration Coordinator, greeted the Commissioners and said, “I’m here today seeking your approval on our Juvenile Accountability Block grant application for state fiscal year 2007. This is a federally funded state initiative that is administered by the State of Kansas Juvenile Justice Authority. This grant program give an opportunity to local units of governments to develop programs that are going to promote greater accountability within our Juvenile Justice System.

This is our eighth year of funding with this initiative and Sedgwick County is eligible to receive

**Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006**

\$91,827. That is for the fiscal year beginning July 1. They do require a 10% match that we have planned for in the county budget. With this match, the available funding is \$102,030. We are asking to fund two components. That is continuation funding for the Diversion Manager position, which is within the District Attorney's Office and also an allocation of approximately \$39,000 to help cover next year's budget shortfall in our state mandated juvenile case management program. We're asking that you approve this grant application and authorize the Chairman to sign."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you. Any questions, commissioners? Seeing none, what is the will of the Board on this item?"

**MOTION**

Commissioner Norton moved to approve the Grant Application and authorize the Chairman to sign all necessary documents, including a grant award agreement containing substantially the same terms and conditions as this Application; and approve establishment of budget authority at the time the grant award documents are executed.

Chairman Sciortino 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 please. Thank you.

**K. RESOLUTION DESIGNATING AND CLASSIFYING CERTAIN STREETS TO THE ATTICA TOWNSHIP SYSTEM. DISTRICT #3.**

**Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006**

**Mr. Spears** 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, Highview Drive and Leo, located in the Subdivision of Marie’s Meadow North, will become the responsibility of Attica Township. The Attica Township board was informed that this resolution would be on the county commission agenda, by letter, dated April 13 and I recommend that you adopt the resolution.”

**MOTION**

Commissioner Winters 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, David. Next item please.”

**L. REPORT OF THE BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS’ REGULAR MEETING OF MAY 18, 2006.**

**Ms. Iris Baker**, Director, Purchasing Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, “The meeting of May 18<sup>th</sup> results in three items for consideration today.

**1) CORRUGATED STEEL PIPE- PUBLIC WORKS  
FUNDING: IMPROVEMENT DRAINAGE ROAD**

First item, corrugated steel pipe for Public Works. Recommendation is to accept the low bid from Welborn Sales Incorporated in the amount of \$47,174.75.

**2) GENERATOR HOOK UP, FOR MULTIPLE PUBLIC WORKS’ SITES- PUBLIC WORKS**

**Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006**

**FUNDING: PUBLIC WORKS EQUIPMENT RESERVE**

Item two, generator hook up for multiple Public Works' sites for Public Works. Recommendation is the low bid meeting specification from Atlas Electric LLC for a total of \$23,800.

**3) SIRENS/ POLES/ INSTALLATION- FACILITIES DEPARTMENT  
FUNDING: INSTALL OUTDOOR WARNING DEVICES**

And item three, sirens, poles and installation for Facilities Department. Recommendation is to accept the low bid from Safety Comm Incorporated for an initial purchase of \$38,021.64 and to establish and execute contract pricing for one year, with two one-year options to renew. Would be happy to answer any questions and I recommend approval of these items."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Thank you, Iris. I don't see that there's any questions, so what is the will of the . . . I'm sorry, did you have a question?"

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Yes, I do. Are the sirens going to be replacements, or are they new?"

**Ms. Baker** said, "They're new."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "They'll have new locations and we'll be briefed on that at some point."

**Ms. Baker** said, "Yes."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Because I don't think we have been."

**Ms. Baker** said, "I'll send you that information."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "We're going to wind up with more sirens this season than we did the last season."

**Ms. Baker** said, "Correct."

**Commissioner Norton** said, "And will they be installed pretty quickly? Because we're kind of in the throws of tornado season right now."

**Ms. Baker** said, "The installation process takes a couple of months, so by the time they get in, the season will be winding down but they'll be installing as soon as they can."

**Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006**

**Commissioner Norton** said, "Okay."

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

**Commissioner Winters** said, "Do you know, the new sirens, will they be directly hooking into all the rest of the sirens? Or as we install new, can we disconnect them from the entire system?"

**Ms. Baker** said, "I'll have to investigate that. I think the process is still the same."

**Commissioner Winters** said, "I'm sure it is, I just want to keep saying that there is a way we could change that, buy new sirens, we ought to consider doing that."

**Ms. Baker** said, "Okay."

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

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "You don't want all the sirens to go off, if it's not going to be anywhere near your area."

**Commissioner Winters** said, "That's correct."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Boy that's radical thinking."

**Ms. Baker** said, "That's a little different than just purchasing the sirens in the current form and plan that we have, but I'll bring it up."

**Commissioner Winters** said, "Well, I just thought maybe if we were purchasing new sirens, we could purchase the new technology or a different technology so they had their own switch."

**Ms. Baker** said, "I understand what you're saying."

**Commissioner Winters** said, "Thank you. That's all I had."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Okay. Commissioners, what's the will of the Board, if there's no further questions, on Item L?"

**MOTION**

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

**Regular Meeting, May 24, 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, “Thank you very much, Iris. Next item, Madam Clerk.”

**CONSENT AGENDA**

**M. CONSENT AGENDA.**

- 1. Two Easements for Right-of-Way for Sedgwick County Cold Mix Project R-175D on 87<sup>th</sup> Street South between Meridian and Broadway. District #2.**
- 2. Plats.**

Approved by Public Works. The County Treasurer has certified that taxes for the year 2005 and prior years have been paid for the following plats:

BSF 2<sup>nd</sup> Addition  
Hedgcreek Estates Addition

- 3. Waiver of policy to hire a Project Manager for COMCARE’s Mental Health Justice Collaborative Program at Step 10.**
- 4. Adjustment to the District Attorney’s Staffing Table to include one Investigator position, B218, previously grant-funded.**
- 5. First quarter 2006 range reallocations.**
- 6. Resolutions (four) authorizing destruction of records.**

**Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006**

- County Treasurer Motor Vehicle Records for 2002
- County Treasurer Balance Registers for 2000
- Division of Human Resources Employment Applications for 1997-2000
- Division of Finance Banking Records, Imprest Fund Records and Journal Vouchers for 1996-2002

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

<u>Contract Number</u>	<u>Rent Subsidy</u>	<u>District Number</u>	<u>Landlord</u>
V06021	\$282.00	Butler	Knoop Apartments
V06022	\$300.00	Butler	Lawndale Senior Residences
V06023	\$215.00	Butler	Andover Crossing Apartments
V06024	\$328.00	2	Main Street Place
V06025	\$339.00	2	Chapel Ridge Apartments
V06026	\$316.00	Butler	Darrel McAtee
V04032	n/a-new landlord is the only change	Butler	W&M Enterprises, LLC
V05106	n/a-new landlord is the only change	5	Brady Acorns, LLC

**8. The following Section 8 Housing Contracts are being amended to reflect a revised monthly amount due to a change in the income level of the participating client.**

**Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006**

<u>Contract Number</u>	<u>Old Amount</u>	<u>New Amount</u>
V05029	\$358.00	\$341.00
V020030	\$241.00	\$263.00
V03050	\$169.00	\$155.00
V04036	\$515.00	\$316.00
V2038	\$203.00	\$281.00
V05028	\$249.00	\$249.00
V03046	\$321.00	\$332.00
V05027	\$224.00	\$224.00
V99036	\$223.00	\$241.00
V05032	\$561.00	\$576.00
V04033	\$317.00	\$317.00
V05031	\$245.00	\$262.00
V03043	\$82.00	\$79.00
V99035	\$178.00	\$168.00
V01098	\$409.00	\$350.00
V04040	\$271.00	\$266.00
V05034	\$183.00	\$170.00
V05045	\$207.00	\$88.00
V05009	\$647.00	\$667.00
V04090	\$575.00	\$310.00
V05010	\$321.00	\$165.00
V06001	\$375.00	\$325.00
V20138	\$256.00	\$154.00
V05096	\$196.00	\$200.00
V05039	\$550.00	\$600.00
V05098	\$615.00	\$615.00
V05100	\$451.00	\$476.00
V05091	\$473.00	\$510.00
V03059	\$575.00	\$575.00
V04086	\$230.00	\$000.00
V05074	\$343.00	\$313.00
V04005	\$249.00	\$210.00
V05068	\$535.00	\$535.00

**Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006**

9. **Order dated May 16, 2006 to correct tax roll for change of assessment.**
10. **Payroll Check Register of May 19, 2006.**
11. **General Bills Check Register(s) for the week of May 17 – 23, 2006.**

**Mr. Buchanan** said, “You have the consent agenda before you and I would recommend you approve it.”

**MOTION**

Commissioner Norton 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. Commissioners, we’re now at the Item N, which is ‘Other’. Do any of you have things going on this weekend, or things that happened last weekend, or anything ‘other’ that you wish to talk . . .? Commissioner Burtnett.”

**N. OTHER**

**Commissioner Burtnett** said, “Well actually, last week what I think was a really big week for Wichita and Sedgwick County. With the River Festival going on, there was a lot of people in town,

## **Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006**

but also the European Nations group was here, with the Kansas World Trade Center. There's 25 European Nations that were here and leaders that were here in Wichita and really seems to enjoy their trip here. They were very complimentary of the hospitality and the events that they had going.

And then this last week end, the Chinese delegation from the sister city of Wichita, Henan, . . . I'm probably pronouncing that incorrectly, they were here and were able to take a short tour of Cowtown and they also had a banquet at the art museum and they did a lot of tours around the town, so it was a very big week for a lot of international guests in our county and I was able to go and present some county pins to most of them and hopefully they will go back and remember us."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "We're you able to share with them that you were in their country recently?"

**Commissioner Burtnett** said, "Yes. Unfortunately we didn't have enough interpreters for all the tables."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Oh, you don't speak Mandarin Chinese?"

**Commissioner Burtnett** said, "I don't speak enough Chinese, but I was able to at least visit with the Germans and the Austrians at the European Trade, because I do speak enough German to get along, so it was very nice to see these people and listen to how much they enjoyed their visit here."

**Chairman Sciortino** said, "Okay. What I did this weekend was something I'm starting to do every weekend. We had the Oz Bicycle Club's annual Wicked Wind 100, but the wind was not very wicked and we all met down at Lake Afton Park and there was 820 of us and we started out a 52-mile ride by riding around the park. That was kind of neat and all the campers waving at us and then we got off on some really nice roads. We road kind of a rectangle, but we went 8 or 10 miles west of Cheney and then circled around and came back and had a nice lunch and then it rained, so we had a nice ride and that was the longest I've ever ridden. There were some people that actually did the 100-mile loop and that's maybe some time way in my future to try 100, because there wasn't too many miles left in my buttocks after sitting on that bike for four hours, but it was fun, I enjoyed it, meeting a real great bunch of people. That's all I did, and I guess if there's nothing else, then I can just say this meeting is adjourned."

## **O. ADJOURNMENT**

**Regular Meeting, May 24, 2006**

There being no other business to come before the Board, the Meeting was adjourned at 11:18 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