

MEETING OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

REGULAR MEETING

November 15, 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, November 15, 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. Carolyn Hosford, Environmental Training Specialist, Environmental Resources; Mr. Seth Konkell, Health Department; Mr. John Schlegel, Director, Metropolitan Area Planning Department; Mr. Chris Chronis, Chief Financial Officer; Mr. Claudia Blackburn, Director, Health Department; Mr. Seth Konkell, Metropolitan Medical Response System Coordinator, Health Department; Mr. Ray Vail, Finance Director, Department on Aging; Ms. Marilyn Cook, Director, Comprehensive Community Care; Mr. John Nath, Director, Kansas Coliseum; Mr. David Spears, Director, Bureau of Public Works; Ms. Iris Baker, Director, Purchasing Department; Ms. Kristi Zukovich, Director, Communications; and, Ms. Lisa Davis, Deputy County Clerk.

GUESTS

Ms. Caroline Guaghan, Tobacco Free Coalition.
Mr. Garth Kennedy, Wichita Kiwanis Club.
Mr. Phillip Ruffin Jr., Owner, Ruffin Companies.
Mr. Paul Carey, Grant Township Clerk.
Mr. Jim Means, President, Wichita Area Technical College.
Mr. Harland E. Priddle, Executive Director, K-96 Corridor Development Association.

INVOCATION

The Invocation was led by Pastor Lincoln Montgomery of Tabernacle Baptist Church, Wichita.

FLAG SALUTE

ROLL CALL

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

Chairman Sciortino said, Next item.”

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES: Regular Meeting, October 18, 2006
Regular Meeting, October 25, 2006

The Clerk reported that all Commissioners were present at the Regular Meeting of October 18th, 2006 and October 25th, 2006.

Chairman Sciortino said, “Commissioners, you’ve had a chance to look at the Minutes of the meetings of October 18th and October 25th. What’s your will?”

MOTION

Commissioner Burtnett moved to approve the Minutes of the Regular Meetings of October 18 and October 25, 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. Next item.”

Commissioner Norton left the meeting room at 10:08 a.m.

PROCLAMATIONS

A. PROCLAMATIONS.

- 1. PROCLAMATION DECLARING NOVEMBER 15, 2006 AS “AMERICA RECYCLES DAY.”**

Chairman Sciortino said, “Commissioners, I’ll read this proclamation into the record for your consideration. It states:

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

PROCLAMATION

WHEREAS, Americans generate nearly 232 million tons of municipal solid waste each year, or more than 4.5 pounds per person per day; and

WHEREAS, the average Sedgwick County resident generates approximately 6 pounds of waste each day, and more than one ton annually; and

HEREAS, reduction, reuse and recycling can significantly impact the amount of waste going to local and regional landfills. And buying products that are made with recycled contents is the final and most important step in recycling; and

WHEREAS, participating in America Recycles Day is one way citizens, businesses, industries, government agencies and organizations can raise awareness about the need to reduce waste and protect our environment; and

WHEREAS, by visiting www.AmericaRecyclesDay.org, and making a pledge to increase recycling or buying more recycled products at home or at work, you will be entered to win several prizes including the grand prize of a 7-day Alaskan Cruise for two.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that I, Ben Sciortino, Chairman of the Board of Sedgwick County Commissioners, do hereby proclaim November 15, 2006 as

‘AMERICA RECYCLES DAY’

and urge every Sedgwick County citizen, business, government agency, civic group and every other organization to be a ‘Kansan Making a Difference’ by signing a pledge to renew their commitment to recycling.

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

MOTION

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

Commissioner Unruh seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

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

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

Chairman Sciortino said, “And to accept the proclamation, yes ma’am.”

Ms. Caroline Hosford, Environmental Resource Specialist, Environmental Resources, greeted the Commissioners and said, “With the Sedgwick County Waste Minimization Team, and on behalf of that team, I’d like to thank you for this proclamation. We continue to try to promote the reduction and reuse and recycling of items and since paper is the largest component of our waste stream, I’d like to point out that we have another opportunity besides the recycling boxes in our area grocery stores. There is another way that people can recycle their papers now. Abbot-Tibby Paper Retriever is a company that has now located over 180 recycling boxes in our community and these are located in business and church and school parking lots. It’s really difficult to miss them, once you are tuned in. They’re bright green and bright yellow and they will take newspapers, office and school papers, magazines and catalogs and even mail.

So if people are interested in finding a location close to them, they can go to paperretriever.com and put in their zip code and it will tell you where you can find these locations. And we also want to encourage everyone to renew their commitment to recycling, perhaps by purchasing products with more recycled content. And if someone would like to do that as Chairman Sciortino mentioned in the proclamation, they can go to AmericaRecyclesDay.org, make their pledge and be entered into a contest and the grand prize is a pretty nice little trip, an Alaskan vacation for two for seven days. So I again thank you for the proclamation.”

Chairman Sciortino said, “Thank you. I see a comment. Commissioner Unruh.”

Commissioner Unruh said, “Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Caroline, what’s the motivation behind this new company that’s come in to place 180, you say . . . is that the market driving that?”

Ms. Hosford said, “I think so, and they’re an international company, they’re a very large company, markets are a little better right now and they’re actually able to pay the organizations, the churches

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

or schools, for their paper as well. So it's a really good deal for the people who have decided to locate the boxes in their parking lots."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Okay. Well thank you. I appreciate your efforts on behalf of Sedgwick County and our organization to make recycling a way of life for us, and that's really what it has to be for all citizens. We have to think that's just part of the way we live, is that we recycle as we have the opportunity but I think the real driver behind to make recycling a . . . oh, I don't know, a community-wide reality is those markets have to emerge and that's what makes it reasonable and easy to do, so I'm glad to see that happening, but thanks for what you do and hope everyone will recommit to recycling. Thank you."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Commissioner Burtnett."

Commissioner Burtnett said, "That website for the magazines and newspaper was paperretriever.com?"

Ms. Hosford said, "That's correct."

Commissioner Burtnett said, "Okay, that's good because I know my recycling company quit taking magazines . . . they switched from glass to magazines and back and forth and I have a whole bunch of magazines that are ready to roll, so I'm going to go find where the local place is for me. And then Americarecycles . . . dot org?"

Ms. Hosford said, "americarecyclesday.org."

Commissioner Burtnett said, "Okay. All right, because I'm going to have some time now, I could go on that Alaskan cruise so I think I'll get on that website and try to win that."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Well, let me just make a comment too. I was over at one of the Derby grade schools and Abbot-Tibby was just launching there and they've really hit upon a unique idea and that's to start encouraging school children to recycle and the schools are behind it and they actually get some funding for the amount of tonnage that they bring in.

And the thing that they're selling the children on, I think that it's easy for them to understand, every time they fill up a bin they get the idea that they've saved a tree. And I think they can identify with

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

that, not keeping it too confusing, but ‘oh, I can save that little tree, I don’t have to kill a tree’ and that’s where it’s got to start. And then, through just evolution, these children are going to grow up with recycling maybe being in the forefront of their minds. And you’re right, it’s a three-legged stool, you can reduce, reuse and recycle but the whole key . . . and I have to admit, I’m guilty too. I go into a store and here’s a product made of raw material, and here’s a product made of recycling and the recycling is two dollars more, I have to admit, oftentimes I’ll pick the cheaper of the two, but it takes a . . . unless we can find a market for recycled material, it won’t really jumpstart and really go to the potential it needs, so there has to be a short term commitment to achieve a long-term goal I think. And your vision is right on and I applaud you for that vision and stick with it, no matter what, so very good. That’s it and thank you so much. Next item please.”

2. PROCLAMATION DECLARING NOVEMBER 16 – 30, 2006 AS “2006 ANNUAL GREAT AMERICAN SMOKEOUT.”

Chairman Sciortino said, “Commissioners, I’ll read another proclamation here for your consideration. It states:

PROCLAMATION

WHEREAS, an estimated 46.5 million adults in the United States smoke cigarettes and more than 3 million young people under age 18 smoke half a billion cigarettes each year and that more than one-half of them consider themselves dependent upon cigarettes; and

WHEREAS, the U.S. Surgeon General has said tobacco use remains the leading preventable cause of death in the United States, causing more than 440,000 deaths each year. Tobacco use costs more than \$75 billion in medical expenditures and another \$80 billion in indirect costs resulting from lost productivity; and

WHEREAS, each year, because of exposure to environmental tobacco smoke, an estimated 3,000 nonsmoking Americans die of lung cancer, and 300,000 children suffer from lower respiratory tract infections; and

WHEREAS, millions of smokers participate in the American Cancer Society’s Annual Great American Smokeout, a day on which they give up cigarettes for 24 hours; in the hope they may stay quit for good. This demonstration of success suggests that the Annual Great American Smokeout has potential for improving the health of our community and its residents.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that I, Ben Sciortino, Chairman of the Board of Sedgwick County Commissioners, do hereby proclaim November 16 through November 30, 2006 as the

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

'2006 Annual Great American Smokeout'

in Sedgwick County, Kansas and in so doing urge all cigarette smokers and smokeless tobacco users in Sedgwick County to demonstrate to themselves, family and to their friends that they can quit for the day.

Commissioners, that's the proclamation. What is your will?"

MOTION

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

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, "And someone is here to receive the proclamation."

Ms. Caroline Guaghan, Executive Director, Kansas Academy of Family Physicians, Tobacco Free Coalition, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Thank you very much. As your proclamation stated so eloquently, the cost of tobacco is very high, both personally and financially. And in the State of Kansas, as well as those figures that you gave that were on a national basis, for the State of Kansas, it's estimated that the cost is \$720,000,000 yearly. That's the direct medical and those indirect costs that you mentioned.

And so tobacco use is the number one preventable cause of death in the United States and obviously in Kansas and here in Sedgwick County, so we commend you for adopting this. We commend all those that we hope will take this to heart and take a day and see that they can stop, they can stop that habit.

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

Part of our plans for this, with the Coalition are to celebrate, encouraging active smokers who want to go cold turkey, to exchange their pack of tobacco products for a turkey sandwich and we'll be collecting the tobacco products and placing them in a wood chipper at Red Hot and Blue up at K-96 and North Rock Road from 11 a.m. tomorrow. It's being sponsored in part by our chapter and the American Lung Association and the American Lung Association, the Wichita chapter.

So we really urge Kansans and Sedgwick County residents obviously to put aside their tobacco for the day tomorrow to prove to themselves that they can. We do have a statewide resource available to them. It's a 1-800 number. It's . . . I should say toll-free number. It's 1-866-KANSTOP, and it's a wonderful way to get started on that plan, a free personalized plan to help kick this nicotine addiction, so thank you very much for the proclamation."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Thank you. I don't see we have any questions, so Clerk call the next item please."

**3. PROCLAMATION DECLARING NOVEMBER 17 - 23, 2006 AS
"NATIONAL FARM CITY WEEK."**

Chairman Sciortino said, "Commissioners, I have one last proclamation today for your review. It states:

PROCLAMATION

WHEREAS, the prosperity and well-being of this community and area is dependent upon cooperation between two great elements of our society, farmers and urban people; and

WHEREAS, Wichita Kiwanis Club (Downtown) Farm City Week provides an unparalleled opportunity through recognition of 'Farm City Week' for farm and city residents to become reacquainted; and

WHEREAS, Doug and Mary Kohls, from Clearwater, Kansas are being honored as the Kiwanis Club of Wichita (Downtown) Outstanding Farm Family in Sedgwick County for 2006; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that I, Ben Sciortino, Chairman of the Board of Sedgwick County Commissioners, do hereby proclaim November 17-23, 2006 as

'NATIONAL FARM CITY WEEK'

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

in Sedgwick County, and encourage all citizens to participate in this worthwhile project to assure a successful Farm City Week in the County.

Commissioners, that's the proclamation. What is your will?"

MOTION

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

Commissioner Winters 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."

Mr. Garth Kennedy, Wichita Kiwanis Club, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I want to thank the commission for your proclamation. This is our 54th year of observing Farm City Week. Chairman Sciortino mentioned, Doug and Mary Kohls of Clearwater, Kansas are our recipient this year of a special award. Each year, we honor a Sedgwick County farm or ranch person. Downtown Kiwanis, like I say, have been doing this for 54 years. The Farm City Week was initially initiated by the Wichita Chamber of Commerce. The Downtown Kiwanis Club itself has been proud to do this and have had many friends and it's a big day for us, because we have members representing agriculture in and it is Kansas' largest industry, you know. And aside from the production of the farm goods and getting it on the grocery shelves, there's storage, transportation by rail and by truck, and thousands of jobs involved.

So Wichita Downtown Kiwanis, just to plug us, we do accept applications for membership from commissioners or politicians. We now in that drive for the year. Downtown Kiwanis is about 80 years old and it has contributed thousands and thousands of dollars to the community. Its past membership has been kind of a whose who in Wichita, along with the other fine clubs. And there are over 4,000 clubs in the world, devoted to community service and we're just one of them, but

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

we're very proud that we built and funded Kiwanis Park on West 2nd Street and we've had major grants made to the zoo and to Cowtown and we thank you very much for your proclamation."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Thank you. And just a second sir, I think we have a comment or question. Commissioner Winters."

Commissioner Winters said, "Well just want to make one quick comment, not really a question. I certainly do want to congratulate Doug and Mary Kohls from the Clearwater area and certainly want to congratulate them. And secondly, want to thank the Kiwanis Club for the continued rural farm/ city recognition ever year over these past years. I know I was involved several years ago in part of that process."

Sedgwick County is a unique county in Kansas, with one of the diverse population from being one of the largest population centers in the State of Kansas, yet having one of the most intense agriculture productions in the same light. So thanks to the Kiwanis Club for continuing this longstanding tradition."

Mr. Kennedy said, "Very well, thank you very much."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Are the Kohls here that we can recognize them?"

Commissioner Winters said, "No, I think there is going to be a luncheon for them later in the week though."

Mr. Kennedy said, "Oh yes, on Friday, Friday we have the official recognition."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Oh, okay, very good. Thank you. Clerk, call the next item please."

APPOINTMENT

B. APPOINTMENT.

- 1. RESIGNATION OF TERRY JACOB FROM APPOINTMENT AS TRUSTEE OF EAGLE TOWNSHIP.**

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

Mr. Rich Euson, County Counselor, greeted the Commissioners and said, “Commissioners, we’ve received this letter of resignation and I would ask that you accept it.”

Commissioner Winters said, “Commissioners, I would make the comment that Mr. Jacob has moved out of the township and that’s the reason for his resignation.”

MOTION

Commissioner Winters moved to accept the resignation.

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, “Next item.”

2. RESOLUTION APPOINTING CHRIS FREEMAN (COMMISSIONER WINTERS’ APPOINTMENT) AS TRUSTEE OF EAGLE TOWNSHIP.

Mr. Euson said, “Commissioners, by statute, you are authorized to fill vacancies in township offices and this will fill the vacancy just created. This is for a term to expire in January of 2009. I recommend you adopt the resolution.”

Commissioner Winters said, “Mr. Chairman, again this is in district. I did neglect to say thank you to Terry Jacob for his work and I’m confident he would have wanted to remain in service, except for the move, so we do appreciate Terry’s serving as a township board member.

I have visited with Chris Freeman and Chris Freeman is willing and able to accept the position.”

MOTION

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

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."

Commissioner Winters said, "Mr. Chairman, he is not able to be here today, and I'm sure . . . Mr. Freeman, you're not here are you? No. He has and will make arrangements to be sworn in."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Okay, great. Next item please."

CITIZEN INQUIRY

C. REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS REGARDING BLOCKAGE OF RAILROAD CROSSING.

Chairman Sciortino said, "Is there someone here that wishes to address us on this item? Because apparently you've requested . . . a Mr. Thomas, Ken Thomas? Okay, I don't see this item, so do we just . . . how do we handle this? Just call the next item, Mr. Euson? Is that what we do?"

Mr. Euson said, "I'd say just call the next item."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Okay, next item please."

NEW BUSINESS

D. RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE WILL OF THE BOARD CONCERNING THE PROPOSED ANNEXATION OF COUNTY-OWNED PROPERTY BY THE CITY OF PARK CITY.

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

Mr. William P. Buchanan, County Manager, greeted the Commissioners and said, "You have before you a resolution that requests that we weigh in on the issue of Park City attempting to annex land that the Kansas Coliseum is located on.

We think there is a couple of reasons why it's necessary for us to oppose that proposal. By the way, we did have a meeting with Mayor Stuart some time ago to see if we could understand the reasons for the annexation and we did notify Park City and her specifically of this pending action today.

On your resolution, there's a bunch of whereas's, but I would point your attention to the fifth whereas, that we think the annexation of Park City, the history certainly has been unwise annexations, including but not limited to inadequate service to land owners of annexed plans, failing to annex public roads adjacent to city limits, they generally engage a pattern of annexation practices that has resulted in disorderly and improper development of the area, also resulting with disputes with neighboring cities and disregard of the letter and spirit of the law.

We also believe that the annexation of this land would be not a natural expansion, as suggested, of the city limits, specifically in light of the unnatural boundaries that have already been created, nor is there any historical connection. Kansas Coliseum and that park were there long . . . and that parcel were long ago county owned land, before the city great out towards us. And finally, the statement that the area could be more economically served is just a misrepresentation of facts.

We believe . . . we understand that the city has prohibited from annexing land owned by the county that has a primary use of county-owned and operated exhibition and sports facilities. We consider this as one parcel and the greyhound park is secondary use to that parcel.

The state legislature, in their infinite wisdom, has created this balance between the city's right to annex property and the individual property rights to be protected, and those protections that the state legislature has put in place asks us to consider . . . asks the governing bodies to consider a number of things and those would include the present cost, method, adequacy of government services are adequate. The current system of providing service to that we believe is adequate. There's been no demonstration that there's a lack of services because this parcel is not in an incorporated city.

The proposed cost that Park City has suggested to provide the services are excessive, about \$34,000 of taxes would be paid to Park City by the Greyhound Park. Their reduction in water and sewer rates would be about \$4,000 and we don't believe there's any substitute of services that warrant that. The tax impact is excessive, since there's no new services. The residents of the area, which there are none, are not dependent on the city for services. The effect of the tax revenues on other government units, and especially Grant Township, is significant and would cause a tax increase in that area.

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

The service plan that Park City has presented, we believe, is inadequate when compared to the service plan requirements in the law. There wasn't sufficient detail for a reasonable citizen, for a reasonable person with full and complete understanding of what's going to happen. The service plan was lacking. Provide a complete picture of cost impact and it would show services will be maintained at a level or equal to better than the service level, so there's no demonstration that the services will be equal to or better.

So for those reasons, I would recommend that you authorize us to take necessary steps to go to the public hearing and any other necessary steps we can take so that we can make our objections known to this annexation. We don't believe it's in the best interests of the citizens of Sedgwick County on a county-wide basis."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Thank you. Commissioner Burtnett, do you have a question of Mr. Buchanan?"

Commissioner Burtnett said, "I have a couple of questions. I see that Park City is providing both water and sewer to the site under a preexisting agreement. How long have they been doing that? Do you know?"

Mr. Buchanan said, "I think since . . . I don't know."

Commissioner Burtnett said, "Okay. It's been quite a while though."

Mr. Buchanan said, "Yes."

Commissioner Burtnett said, "As I understand. And do you have any idea how many residents there are in the proposed annexation area?"

Mr. Buchanan said, "There are no permanent residents, human residents, lots of dogs, lots of squirrels, lots of rabbits."

Commissioner Burtnett said, "Well I just noticed that one of their comments was that residents of the proposed annexation area would be eligible to serve on park and recreation board, and I just thought that was kind of odd. I don't think there are any residents."

Mr. Buchanan said, "There are no permanent residents."

Commissioner Burtnett said, "Okay, those are my only two questions, thank you."

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

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

Commissioner Unruh said, “Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well just a comment, it seems to me that there is no progressive reason for this annexation. That there doesn’t seem to be, as part of their plan, any reason for this . . . they don’t plan a development. It’s not going to be any enhancement of the area. It’s not going to be providing any more jobs. It doesn’t seem like there’s going to be any specific community benefit that doesn’t already exist. So it seems, just on the face of it, why are they doing this? It’s owned by Sedgwick County as an entertainment venue, as the manager pointed out in his comments, we have other entertainment venues in this area that are property, that are not being annexed by a municipality. The Sedgwick County Park, the zoo, those ball diamonds that are out there on that property and our extension center, the Coliseum itself, they’re not wanting to annex that. I mean they’re clearly prohibited from doing that I think. But it just seems like a take over of existing resources strictly for the benefit of gaining taxes. Water, sewer, fire, police, all those services are already existent there, so it just . . . it just doesn’t make sense why they try to do this, except unless you consider the fact that they’re just wanting to increase revenue and it appears that should something change in rules regarding gambling in the area, and if at that location there does . . . it becomes legal to put in slots or other gambling things, that should also tend to increase their tax revenue and perhaps they’re looking to the future.

The problem with that is many of the social costs associated with gambling and that sort of thing are going to be borne by Sedgwick County so it seems reasonable to me that revenue sharing that goes along with the plans that we’ve heard talked about to this point, the county needs to maintain strong control of that, because we’re going to suffer the consequences of the social costs. So for all those reasons, it just . . . I mean, it seems like they’re not being real good community partners, so I’m going to be in favor of making it clearly said we’re in opposition to this, so that’s my comments, Mr. Chair.”

Chairman Sciortino said, “I’ll probably have some comments too, but I’d like to know, is there anyone here from Park City that would like to give an opposing point of view? Did you say that you had notified them, Mr. Buchanan, that we were having this in front of us?”

Mr. Buchanan said, “Put a letter in the mail last week, Thursday of last week.”

Chairman Sciortino said, “Okay. Is there anyone else in the audience that would like to talk to us about . . . anybody here from Grant Township? Yeah, would you like to say something to us?”

Mr. Phillip Ruffin Jr., Owner, Ruffin Companies, greeted the Commissioners and said, “I am here on behalf of Ruffin Companies, as well as Greyhound Park. We oppose the annexation of the property that Wichita Greyhound Park sits on. We merely cannot afford the \$40,000 in incremental costs that supposedly will come along with incremental services. We’re unaware what those

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

services would be. We have always called Sedgwick County Sheriff's Department for any incidents at Wichita Greyhound Park. They do provide water and sewer and have, to answer you question commissioner, since 1989, since the inception of Wichita Greyhound Park.

And it is our contention that with the possibility of slot machines at the Wichita Greyhound Park on the horizon, we believe this could possibly be a money grab, because Park City would be entitled, w should they annex this land, to one and a half percent of the future gaming revenues from the possible slot machines at Wichita Greyhound Park, which we think we have a pretty solid shot at this year and that would cost Sedgwick County one and a half percent, which is in excess of \$1,000,000 a year, annually if the projections are right, even though the pie, the gaming pie has shrunk, with the inception of new gaming alternatives surrounding Kansas and the south central Kansas and the Wichita area.

But like I said, Ruffin Companies and Wichita Greyhound Park has not had . . . we have not had any contact with any Park City officials, which there are none here today, so their interest in this may be waning, but they at no time contacted us and told us that they were going to annex this property. The relationship between Park City and Sedgwick County has been a very, very good one and we would not like to venture into the unknown with a new landlord, Park City, especially with the conflict of interest there, that she has opposed Wichita Greyhound Park's proposed expansion in the past. She heavily supported former Mayor Bob Knight's proposal to put a 250,000 square foot casino right across the street, in Park City, which we opposed because the numbers just don't make sense. If you know anything about gaming at all and square footage, that would be larger than the Bellagio on the strip in Las Vegas. Nobody in their right mind that knows gaming or the numbers would ever do anything of that magnitude in Park City. But we opposed it and we will fight it. Thank you for your time, and thank you for your opportunity to speak here today."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Thank you, sir. Is anyone here from Grant Township that would like to speak? Please come forward. Thank you, sir."

Mr. Paul Carey, Grant Township Trustee, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I thank you for hearing us today. Grant Township would oppose the annexation because according to the County Clerk's Office, it's going to cost in the neighborhood of \$8,000 revenue that we would have for the operation of the township, which would result in a tax increase for the residents of Grant Township. Our mill levy would have to be raised to maintain our budget.

Also, we would oppose it just from the standpoint that we drive the roads, which Park City has maintained, and I would invite everyone to drive Broadway from 65th Street to 101st and see the deterioration that has taken place since Park City has annexed the road. Also, 85th Street, from Broadway to Interstate 135 is very rough and breaking up. They're . . . if they don't have the

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

money to take care of these, what would 77th from . . . it would amount to from Hydraulic to Broadway, in addition to the roads they already have. Plus the fact, should we have any snow, which very fortunately we have not had a great amount of in the last few years, they do not have the equipment to remove the snow from the roads and these are main thoroughfares and it makes a real traffic hazard, when that snow is not removed in a timely manner.

Again, I would like to thank you for having us and would want you to know that Grant Township is definitely opposed to the annexation. Thank you very much.”

Chairman Sciortino said, “Okay, is there anyone else here in the audience? Again, I’ll . . . I know I already said it, but no one is here from Park City? Anyone else who would like to address us on this item. Okay, I’ll just limit the comments then to the bench. Commissioner Norton, I believe your light was on first.”

Commissioner Norton said, “Well, I’m probably going to opposed this . . . or support this resolution, for no other reason than that as I’ve observed this area for the last six years, I’ve had extreme difficulty understanding the whole north corridor’s plan on annexation and putting together a reasonable set of boundaries that makes sense for Sedgwick County and the same cities in that area and Park City has been right in the middle of that debate.

I don’t see any reason to add to that or acerbate what the problems we’ve already got up there by taking in this parcel of land that is clearly designated an entertainment venue, a sports arena kind of area and I think all of it is one piece of property. It doesn’t need to be divided up and carved up at this point. And I’m not so sure we shouldn’t have long-term debates about what the comprehensive plan looks like for that whole part of the county. In fact, I think that’s what got us in trouble with all the border wars up there and all the land grabs and annexation that went on that has given us some small cities that have incredibly funky boundaries that don’t make any sense and I don’t think this . . . it’s good public policy to run blindly into the good night and allow this to happen one more time, with property we control this time, so I will support the resolution and it doesn’t make sense to me to have this annexed. That’s all I have.”

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

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

Commissioner Winters said, "Well thank you. I'm also going to be supportive and because of many of the reasons that have been mentioned. I guess I just want to think about the reasonableness of this annexation request. As Commissioner Unruh said, Sedgwick County owns several facilities that are really almost within . . . well, are in the boundaries of a city that we get along very well with operating: Sedgwick County Park, the Sedgwick County Zoo, West Urban Baseball Diamonds, AYSO Soccer Fields, Twin Rivers Women's Softball Field, Sedgwick County Extension Office, Kansas Coliseum and the Greyhound Dog Track. I do respect the members of the Park City City Council and I hope that they would understand our issues in this and I would hope that they too would then come to oppose this, if they look at the bigger picture of Sedgwick County.

I really think that the reason that they're considering this is because of the para-mutual wagering that takes place at the Greyhound Race Track and no matter what you say about gambling, and we're not talking about taking a position on gaming, but the legislature has talked about slot machines at para-mutual facilities. They have other options to talk about para-mutual facilities. If there's any revenue that is to be generated from that for local governments, it appears to me that Park City has taken a move that their local government, their city government, as opposed to all the citizens of Sedgwick County having an opportunity to share in that revenue from any kind of gaming revenue that would come to local government, all the citizens would participate in it. If they move to annex and they become the local government, then Park City would be the sole beneficiary and I assume that that's what their intent is.

So I would hope that we could oppose this and be successful in the opposition, because it just really . . . that's the only reason I can see that they're doing it and I think it's going to be to the detriment of other citizens. Thank you."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Okay, thank you. Any other questions or comments? I'm going to support this resolution because . . . I've got a question though. So a city can annex county owned property and then does that no longer become county owned property, it's city property? I mean, they can just take . . . I mean, the actual land would then go off of our books as far as our land is concerned and become City of Park City?"

Mr. Euson said, "It would just be in their jurisdiction. We would continue to own the title. The county would continue to own the title."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Okay. Well, it would have been nice if we could have heard from Park City why they thought it was logic, but for whatever reason they didn't show up here, so I'm going

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

to support this resolution. I'd like to . . . it seems to me like I agree with my colleagues that maybe the motivation is not improvement of services to the area but maybe it is financially induced. I don't know for sure, but I'm going to support this resolution. Okay, if I don't see any other comments, what's the will of the Board on Item D please?"

MOTION

Commissioner Burtnett moved to adopt the Resolution.

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. Next item."

E. WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT UPDATE.

POWERPOINT PRESENTATION

Mr. Buchanan said, "We've been talking about this agenda item for a number of months and we inadvertently, on the agenda, have it listed under workforce development update, when in fact we're going to request that you adopt a resolution at the end of this presentation.

It's been clear to us, over the last several months, that we need a new course, a new direction in workforce development. The need for change is evident and critical. There's a high level of need for skilled workers in aviation and aviation related companies. We have a declining workforce population. We know that the demographic tsunami is coming with the aging baby-boomers who

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

are going to retire and increased competitive global economy, which create an enormous conundrum with us, with which we need to deal.

The aviation jobs alone in the community are about 5,000 now. We know that we're going to need about 1,000 each year for the next several years, and you can see which of those jobs are needed by the aircraft aviation companies. We know that because they've told us that. We know that because the studies indicate that that's what's going to occur.

We need to continue to meet the business needs of the community and the business needs of our large employers. The technical education, we're behind the curve, not just in the community but I would suggest statewide, that this has been an issue that has not been a priority, that there were no systematic approach to technical education, statewide, that has had any meaningful impact.

Locally, we've created a Kansas Technical Training Initiative, the Kansas Institute of Technical Excellence, and the Sedgwick County Technical Education and Training Authority. And so we need to go at a different pace than we have in the past. We have been trying to go through the mud and the muck and mire of these issues and we need to figure out and I think we have, a different way in which to approach this problem.

The current situation looks like this, as best we can determine. It is chaotic. It would appear random, although some maybe think there's some wisdom in this. The difficulty for you and I it seems and difficulty for the whole system is that there's no one that has the authority and there's no accountability. We have pieces of accountability, but not for the entire system, and that makes for not a particularly good product.

We need to change the model and we need to do that by assessing the system that's in place. We need to deal with Wichita Area Technical College, one governance and leadership structure, a business approved program and development and a world-class facility.

Assessing the system is in place and we had workforce solutions for business that includes Sedgwick County as a key ingredient. Marv Duncan spends all his time working with that, for business. Other partners are the Chamber of Commerce, Kansas Department of Commerce and Workforce Alliance, which are combined to make a one-stop shop for business training needs. The one-stop Workforce Center is for students and job seekers are clearly the Workforce Alliance and again, these two places and emphasis are up and running and are in place.

The Wichita Area Technical College, we need to redefine a mission. We need to make sure that the workforce development is focused mission to serve short term and long term business needs in businesses in the region. Recently, we tried to deliver a product regarding sheet metal and we learned lots of things from that and what we've learned most of all is that we need more business involvement in the process and make sure that if we need to, to make mid-course corrections.

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

We need a business driven, approved curriculum and deliverer of training and delivery system of training and what I mean by that is to make sure not only the curriculum is in place by some experts in the field from business, but make sure that they understand how it's going to be delivered and if there's issues about delivery, to make course corrections.

We want the Wichita Area Technical College to continue accreditation process. Sedgwick County has been very effective in making sure that our departments, fire department, EMS, the lab at the Forensic Science Center, the Forensic Science Center itself, 9-1-1, all go through an accreditation process and we know that time and effort has been spent by WATC and that needs to be pursued. And we also need for, and I'll talk about later, WATC to help manage the campus at Jabara.

This changing model of one governance, we're combining the leadership team from all boards, and all board we mean by KTTI and the authority and Wichita Area Technical College into one board with one mission. They're charged with the governance of WATC. They're charged with the implementation of this vision that we've all had. We've not disagreed about the vision, but we think this one board now has the authority and the horsepower to implement this business driven technical education in Sedgwick County.

And the board would consist of folks from the aviation, manufacturing, general business, healthcare, IT, Information Technology and government to accomplish that implementation process.

The model would look like this. This is the new leadership model. We still have, in the top left is the Board of County Commissioners involved with the board and currently on the top right hand side is the Board of Regents, because of the funding and because of some rules and regulations involved in the board.

And the board's responsibility, as we go down on the right hand side of this chart, appoints the CEO and president of WATC, whose primary function is two functions. One is making sure that the WATC operations are up and running and working, work well and the second is the training at Jabara Campus and being the managing partner with WSU and KITE partners and other providers at the table. We know that we have lots of partners at the table to provide service there.

On the left hand side, the Board of County Commissioners, the Executive Director of the Workforce Development also involve the training at Jabara Campus and this model becomes a little cloudy, but I think it's absolutely critical and necessary for us, until the \$40,000,000 investment that you have invested in is up out of the ground, until it is not only up out of the ground, but operating and until it's up out of the ground and operating and operating as a world class facility, I think we need to make sure that our investment is protected. And so, that model continues to be one that I prefer.

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

The changing model, changing the model, number five, is business approved program development, I talked about this a little bit and instruction. The model team for each program would be used lone professionals from the general aviation, from general manufacturing and aviation companies. The programs are incubated, like the AP program now. Cowley County is doing a superb job of that, that's been incubated elsewhere and we would continue that program until the building is complete and move that program into the Jabara Campus and the curriculum review. Currently what's being taught at WATC what other programs are needed, are they effective, are we using business partners and industry need/ trend information to create those programs and create those activities at the college.

Finally, the world-class facility at Jabara Campus, it's going to be business driven aviation and manufacturing training. We need to have this narrow focus on what this purpose is and until that is up and running effectively, then I think we in a position to think about some other things, but these are all our immediate needs. We're going to have a real life work environment there. We're going to have inter-active, hands on and it's going to be a dynamic curriculum and dynamic means to me just not a fancy word but in fact one that is alive and vibrant, so that we are absolutely meeting the critical needs of our aviation partners.

So we you need to hold us accountable for those six items, as the short term, and short term is over the next couple of months. And the mid term goals of this Kansas Technical College and Vocational School Commission that the state has appointed and the governor has appointed and George Fahnestock from this community is the chair, we've had a conversation with George Fahnestock and assured him that we are not creating a model that needs to be replicated by the state. We are not creating a model that we think is the best for the state. We're creating a model that meets the needs of our region, meets the needs of Sedgwick County residents and we cannot wait another year till the end of 2007 for their report to be complete to decide how we need to proceed.

He understands that. That's occurring in other places around the state. We have talked to him that if and when that report is completed, we are prepared to examine it and adjust our process if necessary to meet the needs that make sense to us.

The other immediate goal, term goals are certainly the branding and marketing plan for the Jabara

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

Campus. We need to continue to build capacity for program instruction and we need to structure program review after the state commission report, as I have suggested just a second ago.

The long-term vision is other industry clusters. Again, I want us to stay focused on the aviation and manufacturing. We need to make sure that that investment is up. We need to make sure that the infrastructure is in place to deliver the service before we can expand our horizons for other industry clusters.

The system that best utilizes public dollars and assures business needs are met, we need to make sure that occurs and to build on the success of our aviation cluster, the National Institute of Aviation Research and this wonderful idea about composites and how this community might be involved in those. So we do have this technical education in Sedgwick County. It's changing the model of how we meet those community needs.

Our vision for this community and for this county has always been how do we provide quality public service that meets the changing needs of our community. Well, I think this plan does that and lays out a step by step approach how we go forward.

Accessing the system, it is in place, with this new board model, I think the Wichita Area Technical College, which has the foundation to deliver services here, can be . . . deliver services in a different way than we have in the past, that's more business friendly. The one governance eliminates a number of different turfs. The new leadership structure makes business driven concepts a reality. The business approved program and development and instruction helps not only us deliver product but the bottom line is it helps the economy of this community. Without this kind of instruction, we are going to be facing an uphill battle about how to retain those companies and of course building of the world-class facility.

We know that the future of aviation in Kansas is critical. We are the leaders in aviation manufacturing. We are the leaders in aviation research, we know that. We don't say that enough. We can become the leaders in aviation training and that three-legged stool really will assist and help us in propping up the economic foundation of that, the aviation industry has provided for all of us.

We want the companies to stay here, clearly. We want Kansas to have high-paying jobs and we

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

want the vibrant economy for future of Kansas. I think this plan does that. I am confident that we will have the right people in place to do that and we have a new and invigorated folks who want to move forward and start implementing the ideas that we've been talking about for four and five and six years.

Before you, you have a more detailed technical education of Sedgwick County chartering course, which lays out in a much more elaborate sense than this PowerPoint and we have in front of you the real action today, is the resolution amending Sedgwick County Resolution #173-04 and restructuring the Sedgwick County Technical Education and Training Authority.

I will let you know that KTTI has endorsed this resolution. Yesterday, the Sedgwick County Technical Education and Training Authority unanimously endorsed this resolution. And so with those two endorse . . . and they were also set as . . . the same people were there for the meeting of the WATC board, but they were there as the authority.

I would, because of those endorsements and because I absolutely believe that this is the way we need to proceed in moving forward with technical education, I would recommend you adopt the resolution. I'm prepared to answer questions, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Thank you, Mr. Buchanan. Commissioner Burnett."

Commissioner Burnett said, "Well, I'm very supportive of this new one board, because after watching this unfold with so many boards, I think it's got a little mumbled, jumbled through the last year and a half. One of my questions, was becoming one board, are these going to be new members, a mix of new and old members or the same members that have been on this board since the inception of the Sedgwick County Technical Education and Training Authority?"

Mr. Buchanan said, "It will be some new members, it will be some old members, so it would be a combination."

Commissioner Burnett said, "Well, because I understand that you . . . it says that the county manager will be appointing nine members and then one member will be appointed by the Board of County Commissioners and one by the city council. So it's going to be in your hands and I would like to be assured that there's going to be some new members on that."

Mr. Buchanan said, "There absolutely will and I absolutely know what the resolution says, but I

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

know how this system works and I will bring you some suggestions and only until your satisfied will, you collectively satisfied, will I move forward.”

Commissioner Burtnett said, “Another question I have is reading the resolution, it says the sole purpose of the Sedgwick County Technical Education and Training Authority is to be the official governing body of the Wichita Area Technical College and to assume all legal and fiduciary responsibilities thereto. So how does this effect the vocational classes at WATC, since I know we have kind of a narrow focus here on the Jabara Campus? If we’re going to have all the legal and fiduciary responsibilities of the WATC, where does that leave the other classes?”

Mr. Buchanan said, “This board is not much different from the existing WATC board. What we . . . what this board responsibility will be, it would seem to me, would be to not only focus in on the aviation and technical education opportunities and business driven products but also to examine what vocational classes are being taught, are they effective, do they produce employment, are they needed and how do we know that.”

Commissioner Burtnett said, “Okay. Because when I think of workforce development, I think of also the vocational classes, not just the technical.

And then the last question I have is how does that also effect the process of accreditation that WATC has been going towards, moving towards? Is that still going to happen, or is that going to become something different?”

Mr. Buchanan said, “Constituting a new board may adjust that. I can’t answer that. All I have suggested is that accreditation is impo . . . if it’s to become a college, it is critically important. We have a deadline of 2009. Sedgwick County has, if you examine our past, has been supportive of accreditation in our own . . . the departments that report directly to this organization. So I don’t know the specifics of how this might affect it. I’ve been assured that on the surface, it would not have much effect.”

Commissioner Burtnett said, “Okay, those were my only questions. Thank you.”

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

Commissioner Unruh said, “Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Manager, I see that there’s representatives from the Wichita Area Technical College here and I’d ask if you would yield the microphone, perhaps they could speak just a little bit to this.”

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

Mr. Jim Means, Interim President, Wichita Area Technical College, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I would like to tell you that we're very excited about the potential that this plan has, not only for the college and for the county, but for private industry and for the citizens of this area as well. I think there's real power in the unification of the board, as we . . . as you've just been discussing. I've seen from direct experience in working with the board on the college side, how difficult it can be for that group of people to meet on the second Thursday of the month and discuss an issue that's important to the college and then meet on the third Thursday of the month and tackle that same issue with a broader perspective of the region, and how it might impact other institutions and I think the ability to have one clarified mission on how those issues can be addressed can be a great thing for the efficiency of that organization.

I also think that clarifying the role that WATC will have in the Jabara Campus, not only strengthens the position of the college, but also brings clarity to understanding of this plan. There are times that I've been asked questions, not only from internal stakeholders of the college, but just people out there generally in the community well, why are you doing this if you have a WATC? Or if they're doing this, what's going to happen and oftentimes when those answers aren't provided, people generate their own, and so I think that bringing this clarity in this plan will just peel away some of that confusion and allow us to move forward as well.

And also a renewed platform to interact with business and industry has huge potential for the college as well. There certainly have been sectors that we've been effective in engaging and others that we haven't and I think this holds the opportunity to strengthen those good ties and establish ties where we haven't had that kind of involvement and again, I think that just will be very powerful for the community.

There certainly are uncertainties, because all the details of this plan haven't yet been developed and we look forward to being a part of developing that plan. As I shared this information with employees of the college yesterday, you would understand one of their responses is 'well how does this effect me?' and I believe I have a lot of confidence of the employees there and when I share with them that we don't know all of the details yet, but we're working on it, we're engaged in the process, there's a trust level there that comforts them in knowing that someone's looking after those details and right now I just concentrate on the students that I have in class, the businesses I'm currently working with, and so we, I think, are well positioned to continue to meet the needs that we currently have and the charge that we currently have in working on this as well.

Some of the accreditation issues that were just asked about, I think there isn't anything in the resolution itself that's problematic, but there will certainly be details, as they're worked out, that we'll want to make sure that, as we move forward we don't undo some of the things that we've done in the past that positions us well in the accreditation process thus far. And I'm working on trying to identify, for the authority board, what some of those issues are. Lori Usher and I have discussed that many times and I think that, with some careful thought and consideration and input

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

from individuals who are well versed in accreditation, we can navigate most of those and still achieve a goal of accreditation, which certainly has been ours and I'm glad to hear remains a goal of the county as well."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Okay. Well thank you Jim. I appreciate your comments. I think it's important that the commissioners and for the public at large to hear your perspective. I mean, this is another strong change about the college and you all have been involved in change since you were spun out of the school district and set up your own board and we've had some changes so it's been a difficult time for you and for all of the staff at WATC, so hearing your statement of optimism and wanting to go forward with this I think is helpful and impressive, so thank you very much."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Any other questions? I see no other questions."

Commissioner Unruh said, "If not, I wanted to ask Bill another question. On the appointments, what is a timeline that you foresee? I kind of was looking through here to see, this becomes effective as soon as it's published and that sort of thing, but I didn't see a timeline for board appointments or I overlooked it?"

Mr. Buchanan said, "We're thinking December."

Commissioner Unruh said, "So quickly."

Mr. Buchanan said, "Yes."

Commissioner Unruh said, "All right. That's all I have for right now, Mr. Chair."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Okay. Commissioner Norton."

Commissioner Norton said, "Well, as we move forward, the one thing I want to be sure of is that we still understand that we have a regional focus. I mean, we've talked and talked and talked for six years now that through Visioneering and through REAP that we want to have a regional focus. We want to make sure this is good for Sedgwick County, but it's good for all of our partners and the ten or eleven or twelve other counties that draw from this region. And you know, I don't want to continue to draw in our horns and draw in our horns and eliminate good partners that are at the table now that provide great services that can be part of the solution, so the one thing I haven't heard a lot about in this whole dialogue is to make sure that we're going to continue a regional focus, that we're going to have partners, that whether it's KITE or a new institution that looks like KITE, that we're still going to have partners that draw the best and the brightest of programs where there's not duplication and we deliver the absolute best programs, regardless of who is going to deliver it, because sometimes we get myopic and we get back to looking only at Sedgwick County and forget that there's a lot of players that have been involved in this and that we also, through Visioneering,

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

espouse regionalism and we can't now put up Chinese walls around Sedgwick County and make sure that we don't have the power of one. And the power of one is all of those entities being laser focused on what our mission is. I just want to be sure that that's said and we talk about that at some point, because that's the one thing I don't see in this proposal."

Mr. Buchanan said, "I think, commissioner, it's implied, because if we take the approach that we're going to deliver a system, deliver a product that's business driven, the curriculum is created by our business partners and that the curriculum will be adjusted to meet their needs, that focus of the board is going to be who best can deliver that system and that calls, just by its very nature, for a variety of entities to do that, depending upon the product."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Okay, is that it? Commissioner Unruh, another comment?"

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Bill, this doesn't affect the KITE partnership in any way?"

Mr. Buchanan said, "No."

Commissioner Unruh said, "I mean, those are the people who were going to deliver in the area and that's a significant part, I think, of the regional focus that Commissioner Norton was concerned about. It seems to me that you know one of the main things we're wanting to do here is to get this thing customer driven, business driven and this is really a way to accomplish that and maintain success. You know, I don't want to make a pejorative comment here about the boards that have been in existence, but we have been somewhat fragmented. Everyone has been trying to do the right thing, but I think that in itself has a tendency to promote different agendas, because we've got so many different people and organizations here who say 'well, this is who I'm working for, who I'm working with'. So we've had KTTI and the Board of Trustees and the Authority Board and I really am convinced that by bringing these together and having one line of authority, will in fact promote the regionalism and really take us to the goal of having a business driven technical education and training capability so I understand your comments and in one on one conversations, commissioner, you and I have talked about this issue, so I understand what you're saying but I think this gets us where you want to be, so I'm going to be very supportive. That's all I had, Mr. Chair."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Okay. Any other comments or questions? I think, in order to keep this technically correct, since there wasn't a recommended action to approve this resolution or disapprove it, I think we probably have to take this resolution as an off agenda item. So I'd like to see if there's a will to have an off agenda item to consider this resolution that's before us. Is there a

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

Motion to that effect? Is that correct, Mr. Euson?"

Mr. Euson said, "Yes, that would be consistent with what you've done in the past."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Okay."

MOTION

Commissioner Norton moved to consider an off agenda resolution.

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, "Now, ladies and gentlemen, we have the resolution before us. What is the will of the Board?"

MOTION

Commissioner Unruh moved to adopt the resolution amending Sedgwick County Resolution #173-04 and restructuring the Sedgwick County Technical Education and Training Authority.

Commissioner Norton seconded the motion.

Chairman Sciortino said, "Commissioner Winters, you have a comment."

Commissioner Winters said, "Yes, I just have a procedural comment. Mr. Euson, I have in the past acknowledged that my wife is an employee of the Wichita Area Technical College. We did ask for clarification from the state ethics about my voting on such as this and they indicated that it was perfectly okay. So am I still in a position of being able to clearly vote on this resolution?"

Mr. Euson said, "Yes, you are commissioner. The commission concluded, in an opinion,

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

concluded that there was no legal conflict of interest, and so you are free to vote for the resolution if you wish and if you have other reasons to abstain, then you're free to abstain also."

Commissioner Winters said, "All right, well commissioners, I'd just acknowledge for the record that my wife is an employee of WATC but I do plan on voting on this resolution."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Okay. Any other questions or comments? Seeing none, 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 very much, Mr. Buchanan. Next item please."

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

F. METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING DEPARTMENT (MAPD).

1. CASE NUMBER DR2006-10 - K-96 CORRIDOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN.

Mr. John Schlegel, Director, Metropolitan Area Planning Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, "What I'd like to do is have Harland Priddle, the Executive Director of the K-96 Corridor Development Association give a presentation on the plan and then when he's done, I'd like to present the recommendation of the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission to you. So with your permission, can we have Harland come to the microphone?"

Chairman Sciortino said, "Fine, certainly."

POWERPOINT PRESENTATION

Mr. Harland E. Priddle, Executive Director, K-96 Corridor Development Association, greeted the Commissioners and said, "As I start, I would like to say that it's been almost two years since we talked about the beginning of this and I would express, on behalf of the board, and the members that

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

we appreciate the Sedgwick County Commission and establishing their support early and also comment Commissioner Winters on being very dedicated on attendance and also thanks to Irene Hart. I don't think she's here right now, but she's been a great partner in this, as well as the Planning Department staff.

Today I will very briefly move through the areas listed on this chart. First we'll define what the K-96 corridor is, we'll talk briefly about the background and how it began, the current status of the plan, briefly on the plan contents and talk briefly about the K-96 Development Association and its purposes.

First let's define the corridor, because K-96 extends a long way, from Colorado to the eastern edge of Wichita. But of course the section we're talking about is from the east edge of Maize, as listed on this chart, around Hutchinson, South Hutchinson, to a point just west of Hutchinson. The corridor itself, although there is a definition of one mile south and to the river, it's basically a general area in that area, so that's basically the plan.

Let's look a little bit of a background, as I mentioned in my opening comments, that in 2004 a coalition consisting of the counties of Sedgwick and Reno, and the communities of South Hutchinson, Haven, Mt. Hope and Maize grouped together to identify the need to establish a coalition and this was one of the pillars of a Reno County program called 20-20 Vision. The purpose of the coalition was to really develop an economic development plan along the corridor and also provide guidelines, a very important point, for orderly development along the corridor and it was discussed that nodal development, in other words from a beginning out, should be the concept and it was funded by the counties and the cities along the corridor.

Basically, the plan has been completed. It is an 83 page document and the coalition has approved the plan, as well the cities along the coalition of the corridor have approved the plan. The Wichita/Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission has completed their review and held public hearing on October the 19th and as a result, John Schlegel will present the recommended resolution to you today.

Let's talk a little bit about the plan itself. We certainly will not go through all 83 pages, but I'm going to talk about basically two sections. Number one, development and design, and number two, section seven, an implementation of the plan itself. This is just a sample out of the plan which outlines the kind of development that might occur in these cities. Now this certainly isn't proven, but it gives you an example of what might be retail or what might be industrial. Here's a specific chart, so each community can look at this and say this is what we might expect, but the important

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

thing really basically is how the community plans to accept that.

Let's talk a little bit about of what the examples in the plan. Here's the City of Mt. Hope. Interestingly enough, this one is right on the corridor. You can see K-96 and that area of purple and red just north is basically what they had plan for the initial, actual expansion of industrial and commercial and retail. I might say that the large piece, 62 acres, is available by the landowner, who I talked to just this week. The purple area and red area just to the right of that is already subdivided and I'll show you a slide, the next slide will show you that, and the 52 acres down below, purple, has now been declared available by the City of Mt. Hope for industrial development.

Even though the plan is just being implemented, things are already happening. This basically is the first building on that Highland Subdivision just north of Mt. Hope built by Mr. Vernon Plew and will house a facility that's now in the process of moving in.

Let's look at another community, just to give you an example of what's in the plan. This is Haven. Haven basically . . . each of these communities, by the way, has their own personality and advantages. Haven, by the way, has access to rail right next to it. The other communities don't, so each one of them has their own personality.

Let's talk a little bit on moving to close today, of what the association's purposes are. As the coalition developed and supported the development of the plan, it became necessary then to establish an organization to implement the plan. That basically is the first purpose of the K-96 Corridor Development Association. It is a not for profit organization and we are in the process of implementing, and this slide just illustrates the basic status. Again, this is to support and promote the orderly development within the corridor, by establishing relationships with public and private sectors along the corridor.

One of the interesting things that's happened with this planning system is that communities like Haven and Mt. Hope have had extensive visioning exercises. Mt. Hope, for example, had 137 people attend their first one. That happens to be 18% of that population. Haven has had four different visioning things. They're now moving into action. So that's sort of a byproduct of this particular program and quite frankly is probably one of the most valuable things, is that they're talking control and planning for their own destiny.

We also, the association wants to act as an advisor to communities. I've been asked on several instances to visit with the communities about their plans, their economic development structure. We also want to provide a marketing function, but I would emphasize that this will be done with existing organizations. We're not establishing, we the association, a separate organization. The Greater Wichita Economic Development Coalition, of which I participate in their partnerships program, we look to them. If something happened in Mt. Hope, we'll work with them. Something happens in Haven, we'll work with the Hutchinson and Reno County Spirit of Success.

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

The last thing of these purposes is to establish a membership program. That's the phase we're in now, because we want to transition and have this be a partnership, among the public entities like yourselves and the private individuals and organizations.

So in summary today, we've basically given you some background information on the K-96 Corridor Plan, it's purposes, intended use, implementation and again, the orderly development. The next point is basically Commissioner Norton mentioned this earlier, and Commissioner Winters had talked about this a couple of years ago. This is a perfect and a unique example of regionalism, where they learn from each other. I can guarantee you that the new sign in the City of Mt. Hope is being talked about in Haven, because Haven doesn't have one. That's the kind of friendly competition that this basically is fostering.

The association encourages and recommends that you favorably support the resolution and adopt this plan, because this plan basically will not stand along, but is an element of the comprehensive plan, not only in Sedgwick County but in Reno County and the communities along the way. I would stand for any questions."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Thank you. I don't see that there are any."

Commissioner Winters said, "Mr. Chairman, I don't have any questions now. I'd like to hear from John again, but I may want to ask Harland a question later."

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

Mr. Schlegel said, "Well, as has already been mentioned, this has been a long time in coming before you. We've been waiting for some endorsements to be made by the cities that were involved in this collaborative effort and we can report to you that both the City of Maize and Mt. Hope have endorsed the plan and also that Reno County has endorsed the plan and intend to include the plan as part of the comprehensive plan update that they're undertaking.

Again, as Harland mentioned, this was reviewed by the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission and they are recommending adoption of the plan, as an amendment to the Wichita/ Sedgwick County comprehensive plan. However, they are making some recommendations for modification to the plan, as it was originally drafted that they feel would make it more consistent with the comprehensive plan.

Their recommended modifications are listed out on attachment A, which is part of your agenda backup. And basically what those modifications would do, in their option, would be provide greater flexibility by having you adopt as part of this plan general policy positions as opposed to adopting regulations that would require compliance with the plan's policy direction. So the recommendation

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

of the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission is for adoption, but with the modifications that are outlined in attachment A. I'll be glad to take any questions you might have."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Thank you, John. We do have at least one. Commissioner Winters."

Commissioner Winters said, "Well, thank you. Maybe before I get into some specific questions, I do want to say how much I've appreciated the opportunity to work with this group of folks from Sedgwick County, myself and Irene, from Reno County, from the City of Maize, City of Mt. Hope, City of Haven and South Hutch and Harland Priddle, who really came together to play some attention to what's happening along K-96 highway and help promote it where appropriate and try to help it be a better place 20-25 years from now than it could be if it were all haphazard.

We've been extremely fortunate to have Harland Priddle, who is a resident of Haven and I think grew up in Haven, Kansas, retired military with a high rank, has worked in Washington and the White House, has been Secretary of Commerce for the State of Kansas, has been Secretary of Agriculture for the State of Kansas, is a very successful business person and we have just been very fortunate to be able to utilize him as a resource. So Harland, thank you very much for all the work you've put in on this project.

One of the things that, again as Harland mentioned, orderly development was on everyone's mind. And as I read through part of the comments, or as I read through the comments from the planning commission, the Wichita Metropolitan Planning Commission, there was some comments that would lead one to think that this was trying to be prohibitive or detrimental to growth. There is nothing that any member of this organization has talked about that is an anti-growth mode comment. But it is a com . . . there are concerns that if no one pays attention to this heavily traveled corridor, it could become a striped out corridor. I mean, it could be an inch wide and 45 miles long. And I think what all of these folks were attempting to do was to encourage folks, as they look at this corridor, to get up close to one of the cities that can provide them services: sewer, water and whatever else they need to make their project work. And so the changes that have been recommended, and I'm agreeing with these changes, they're on page 59 of you backup and the original plan had words in it such as 'adopt or amend zoning regulations that promote' whatever it is, normal growth. The changes have been to promote compact, nodal development. So those words of 'to adopt and amend zoning' have been changed in our recommendation to 'promote'.

So I guess I have two questions and Harland, I believe that you're in agreement that those are still workable? And then I'm going to ask John Schlegel if he believes that those will be an asset."

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

Mr. Priddle said, "I have checked with the other members of the association directors. They are very appropriate and it also brings up the point, commissioner, that this plan was certainly never meant to be directive, but it was meant to be considered as a part of another plan. And so these are very . . . I personally like those, because there will be times when you've got to discourage every time. For example, a hog thing south of Mt. Hope might not be what you want, that kind of thing. So I don't think there's any problem."

Commissioner Winters said, "Okay, thank you very much Harland. John, do you believe that this plan and then with these attachments, will give you and your staff, as you see things happening between Maize and the Sedgwick County line, do you think these will be helpful?"

Mr. Schlegel said, "Yes, we think these are very appropriate changes, very good recommendations being made by the MAPC."

Commissioner Winters said, "And so again, you're not out to discourage growth or discourage development, but there are ways to plan for things that in the future, hopefully, we'll have a better, more attractive quality of life in these smaller communities and along this corridor."

Mr. Schlegel said, "Yes, sir."

Commissioner Winters said, "Okay. Also want to thank Scott Knebel, who is here. Scott, I know you worked on this plan a lot, so appreciate your help also. Commissioners, I'm going to be supportive of this. If anyone has any other questions, I'm sure John or Harland would be glad to answer them."

Chairman Sciortino said, "I don't see that there's any other questions or comments, so now would be an appropriate time to take action. What is the will of the board on this item?"

MOTION

Commissioner Winters moved to adopt the K-96 Corridor Economic Development Plan, with recommended modifications, as an amendment to The Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan, and adopt the Resolution.

Commissioner Norton seconded the motion.

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

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

VOTE

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

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

Commissioner Winters said, “Harland, thank you very much for attending our meeting today.”

2. CASE NUMBER DR2005-21 – MCCONNELL AIR FORCE BASE JOINT LAND USE STUDY.

POWERPOINT PRESENTATION

Mr. Schlegel said, “I’ve already briefed you in some detail in a workshop setting on the recommendations of the implementation coordinating committee. I’d like to just give you again a very brief overview to remind you and also to inform the general public about what this was all about and then get right into the specific recommendations that have come out of this implementation coordinating committee.

Just to remind you that the joint land use study for McConnell Air Force Base was completed in May of 2005 and one of the recommendations of that study was to create the implementation coordinating committee. That committee was composed of two representatives each from one elected official and one staff member from each of the three jurisdictions involved, Sedgwick County, City of Derby and City of Wichita, plus representatives from McConnell, from the Wichita Area Builders’ Association, Wichita Area Association of Realtors and the GWEDC.

That group has been working over the past year to review the consultant’s recommendations that were contained in the joint land use study and they have completed their work and have put together their recommendations. Just very briefly, I’d like to review two graphics with you, just to remind you and others watching this of why this is so important. When the current mission of McConnell was changed to be the KC-135 Tankers, the noise impact zone for that aircraft shrank considerably.

What’s called the ICUZ, or the Installation Compatibility Use Zone around the base and that contrasts, that graphic contrasts dramatically with this one, which shows the noise impact zone for

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

the previous mission to the base, which was the B-1 Bomber, much noisier aircraft, much broader zone of noise impact. And really that change in mission then raised some concerns that with the much smaller ICUZ boundary, which the current one with the current mission there, that there might be a rush to develop up against the base and which might impact any future missions that might be assigned to McConnell.

The recommendations of the implementation coordinating committee are outlined in your backup. I'd like to review those with you just briefly. First recommendation is that you direct the staff of the Metropolitan Area Planning Department to initiate an amendment to the zoning code text for the airport overlay district, that's an existing overlay district, to bring the list of allowable uses into closer conformity with uses recommended in the Federal Land Use Compatibility Guidelines.

Second recommendation is to direct the staff of the Metropolitan Area Planning Department to initiate an amendment to the zoning code text and zoning map to create a new district called the Air Force Base District to replace the existing residential zoning of McConnell Air Force Base. Recommendation number three, direct the staff of the Metropolitan Area Planning Department to initiate an amendment to the zoning code text and zoning map to create a new overlay district called the Anti-Terrorism Force Protection Overlay District that would restrict the height of new buildings to a maximum of 25 feet in the area surrounding the base.

Number four, direct the staff of the Metropolitan Area Planning Department to initiate an amendment to the zoning code text and zoning map to create a new industrial park district that would replace the existing zoning on many of the agricultural, vacant and undeveloped parcels in the area surrounding the base.

Number five, direct the staff of the Metropolitan Area Planning Department to work with the Wichita Area Association of Realtors to establish a voluntary real estate disclosure related to potential noise impacts from the base.

And then finally number six, direct your Code Enforcement staff to work with area building officials and representatives of the local building industry to develop noise mitigation standards for new construction in areas surrounding the base.

Those are the six recommendations of the implementation coordinating committee and we are recommending to you that you direct the appropriate staff to implement these recommendations and authorize initiation of the recommended amendments to the zoning code."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Thanks, John. Commissioners, you granted me the privilege and the honor of acting as our representative on this joint use study and I have to tell you that it was a very collaborative effort, the Wichita Area Builders, the Wichita Area Association of Realtors, the City of Derby, City of Wichita. Everybody went into this exercise with an idea of how can we make this

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

happen and not cross your arms and say 'well, this won't work' type thing.

Some of the developers that actually had land that would be affected, one of which is in the audience right now, Mr. Russell, really understood the need to protect the missions of McConnell Air Force Base and work proactively, which you could argue maybe was diminishing perhaps maybe what an individual developer might be able to do to the land, but they were looking at . . . even Mr. Russell was looking at . . . even Mr. Russell was looking at what's best for the entire community, so this is a result of the effort and I definitely I'm going to be very supportive of it, because I think it makes a lot of sense, not only to protect the existing missions of McConnell, but within reason leave the options for other missions that this air base could perhaps maybe undertake.

And one thing I will . . . is there anyone here in the audience that wants to speak to this? I didn't know, Mr. Russell, did you have anything that you wanted to say? No. Okay. Well anyway, it was a good effort. It was long. It was . . . Mr. Schlegel acted as the moderator. Very seldom did he have to act as referee but his entire staff supported this effort and what you see right now is the culmination of that work and I for one am going to be very supportive of it, but if you all have any individual questions of John, please feel free now to ask them. Mr. Norton."

Commissioner Norton said, "I don't have any questions, I'm just going to be supportive of this. I think it's smart to revisit this and understand that we don't want to diminish any ability to grow and to build in some of those areas, but that we have to know, if you've watched the history of McConnell Air Force Base, that the missions do ebb and flow and change and if you restrict down to a certain level of one mission, it doesn't mean in two years or three years from now, when BRAC Commission is upheld again and some things change, that missions could change and we don't want to restrict the ability of that base to be here for many, many more years by doing something today that really limits their ability.

So I'm glad we put together this commission. It looked like they did the arduous work of trying to figure that out and not be onerous to development and growth, but to also understand that an economic driver in our community is McConnell Air Force Base and you can't diminish that. So good work, as far as I'm concerned."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Thank you. Any other comments or questions? What is the will of the Board on Item F-2?"

MOTION

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

Commissioner Winters moved to direct appropriate staff to implement the recommendations of the Implementation Coordinating Committee, and authorize initiation of recommended amendments to the zoning map and zoning code text.

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, John. Next item.”

- 3. CUP2006-38 (ASSOCIATED WITH ZON2006-39) – CREATION OF DP-301 NORTH 45TH PLACE COMMUNITY UNIT PLAN (CUP); ZONE CHANGE FROM “SF-20” SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL TO “LC” LIMITED COMMERCIAL, GENERALLY LOCATED EAST OF RIDGE ROAD BETWEEN K-96 AND 45TH STREET NORTH. DISTRICT #4.**

POWERPOINT PRESENTATION

Mr. Schlegel said, “In this particular case, the applicant is asking to create both a commercial Community Unit Plan and rezone the property to LC. It’s approximately 55 acres in size. You can see its location just north of K-96, at Ridge Road, on the graphic in front of you. The CUP would allow all uses permitted by Limited Commercial zoning, except for the usual prohibited uses that we see in CUPs such as adult entertainment establishments, sexually oriented businesses and the list goes on.

The most intensive development that’s being proposed would be focused along the southern edge of the tract, along K-96. Buffer zones would be created around the existing residential zoning that’s

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

not included within the property and the intensity of development toward the northern part of the tract, as you approach 45th Street North, would be reduced by limiting those uses to those that are permitted in the NR, Neighborhood Retail district.

You can see on the aerial photograph the way the property is being used now, it's agricultural in nature with one non-conforming commercial activity along Ridge Road. The site is irregular in size, in its frontage along both Ridge and 45th Street and it does . . . the CUP would surround several outlying residential properties.

The area surrounding this parcel is SF-20 predominantly, and consists of mostly single-family homes on small acreages, or agricultural land with farmsteads. The property immediately to the east has been platted for a church but the church hasn't been built, as of yet.

The item was heard by the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission at its meeting on October 5th and they voted unanimously to recommend approval of the request, subject to the recommendations that are outlined in your agenda backup report, with the addition of a condition for bike and pedestrian connections. There were no citizens present at the public hearing. However, we do have a . . . we do have protest petition from just less than 7% of the landowners within the notification area.

So the recommendation of the MAPC is to approve the zone change to limited commercial and to approve the Community Unit Plan as amended by the Planning Commission."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Okay, thank you. Commissioners, any questions or comments? Seeing none, what's the will of the board?"

Commissioner Winters said, "I'd like to know if there's anyone here."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Okay, fine. Is there anyone here in the audience that would like to speak on this item? Okay, seeing none, what's the will of the board on this item."

Commissioner Burnett said, "Commissioners, this is in my district and I've had no calls on this. John, I do have one question I guess. The property directly west of this, is that where that paintball . . .?"

Mr. Schlegel said, "Yes, on the other side of the bridge. The access to that paintball."

Commissioner Burnett said, "All right."

MOTION

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

Commissioner Burtnett moved to approve the zone change and CUP, subject to platting within one year and the recommended conditions; adopt the findings of the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission; direct staff to prepare an appropriate resolution after the plat has been approved; and authorize the Chairman to sign the resolution.

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."

G. RESOLUTION DECLARING IT NECESSARY TO CONSTRUCT IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING ROADS IN THE COUNTY; PROVIDING FOR THE ISSUANCE OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS TO PAY THE COSTS THEREOF; AND PROVIDING FOR PUBLICATION AS REQUIRED BY LAW (119TH STREET WEST, 61ST STREET NORTH BRIDGE, AND RIDGE ROAD BRIDGE).

Mr. Chris Chronis, Chief Financial Officer, Division of Finance, greeted the Commissioners and said, "The Capital Improvement Program that you have adopted includes, among many other projects, three that are to be funded partially with proceeds with general obligation bonds. Those projects are 119th Street West between 29th Street North and 53rd Street North, a bridge on 61st Street North between Broadway and Seneca and another bridge on Ridge Road, between 61st Street North and 69th Street North. Collectively, these three projects are estimated to have a total cost of \$5,550,000, of which in the CIP \$4,000,000 is proposed to be funded with general obligation bonds. The remainder of the project costs would be funded with sales tax revenues.

The resolution that's before you authorizes the sale of those general obligation bonds to provide permanent financing for those costs and it also establishes the county's right to fund certain

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

expenditures of the projects with cash on hand, and then reimburse those cash accounts with the proceeds of the bonds when we sell them. That effectively provides a mechanism through which projects can be expedited and we can delay the financing, the sale of the bonds, until the most appropriate time in the marketplace.

The \$4,000,000 worth of debt fits within the ceilings for debt capacity that are established by the county's debt policy. You're aware that we measure debt capacity in a variety of ways and we've included in the agenda summary estimates of the ratios that will exist after the issuance of debt that we plan to sell yet this year and these bonds that we plan to share in 2007 and we compare those ratios with the maximum that are stated in the policy and you'll see that in each instance, after the sale of these bonds, we remain under those policy limits.

Upon approval of this resolution, it will be published twice consecutively, in consecutive weeks, in the Derby Reporter and upon conclusion of the second publication, a 90-day protest period will be initiated. If there is a valid protest petition filed with the Clerk within that 90-day period, then the bonds cannot be sold unless and until they are approved at a public referendum, assuming we go through the 90-day period without a valid protest petition being filed, then we have full authority to proceed with the sale of the bonds.

The resolution that's before you was drafted by the county's bond counsel, Joe Norton. He's is unable to be here today. He had a touch of food poisoning, and so he's holed up, probably watching on TV and we wish him well. But the resolution also has been reviewed and approved by the county counselor, Rich Euson, and I'm sure he'll be happy to answer any questions that you might have about the technical aspects of the resolution. If you have any questions about the proposed sale of bonds or the projects, I'll be happy to attempt to answer them. If you have no questions, then I recommend you approval of the resolution."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Thank you. I do have one question here. Commissioner Winters."

Commissioner Winters said, "Just two quick questions. Rich, you are in agreement that you or your office has reviewed this and everything is proper and in order."

Mr. Euson said, "We have and we agree that it's in order, yes."

Commissioner Winters said, "Thank you. And David, on the project on 119th Street, when does that project actually . . . what's the timeframe on that one?"

Mr. David C. Spears, Director, Public Works, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Commissioner, it's our main project next year and it will be let next year and construction will begin on it. Now, we are also adding to that, you know it actually says goes to 63rd Street North.

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

We're going to also include the intersection at 53rd because that's where we've had the accidents and we're going to put signalization there, so it's going to take a little bit longer than we originally anticipated. But our hope is to get it finished next year."

Commissioner Winters said, "In 2007."

Mr. Spears said, "That's correct."

Commissioner Winters said, "All right, good, well that is right on the border of Commissioner Burtnett's and my district and that intersection at 53rd and 119th Street is the bad intersection, had several accidents there, so this ought to really fix that in 2007."

Mr. Spears said, "Yes sir."

Commissioner Winters said, "Okay, thank you very much."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Okay, I don't see any other questions or comments. So commissioners, what's the will of the Board on this item?"

MOTION

Commissioner Burtnett moved to adopt the Resolution.

Commissioner Winters 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."

H. RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE OFFERING FOR SALE OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS, SERIES A, 2006, OF SEDGWICK COUNTY, KANSAS.

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

Mr. Chris Chronis, Chief Financial Officer, Division of Finance, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Commissioners, this resolution pertains to the sale of bonds this year to fund roads that were in this year's Capital Improvement Program, and in addition to fund some special assessment projects that have been previously approved. The resolution authorizes the public sale of slightly more than \$5,000,000 of general obligation bonds and we plan to conduct that sale on December 6th of this year and close the sale later in the month of December and obtain the cash at that time.

The projects in question include six special assessments, which collectively require debt financing of approximately \$1,000,000 and a road improvement on 13th Street North, from K-96 to 159th Street East and the cost of that project is estimated to be 6.9 million dollars, of which \$4,000,000 of project costs are to be funded with bond proceeds. We've had some difficulty pinning down the precise sizing of the bond issue. What you see in the agenda summary that is before you is \$4,997,926 to be financed. As I explained to you yesterday in your staff meeting, that was revised late last week, and we received new information from bond counsel indicating the amount was \$5,135,000. In fact, just this morning we've received yet additional information and now we think that the size of the bond issue will be \$5,110,000.

The reason that it's fluctuating has to do with mixing in the prepaid assessments on special assessment projects and computing accurately the costs of issuance for the bonds and the amount of accrued interest that we might have to pay on those bonds. We estimate that the bonds will carry a true interest cost of 4.15% when they're sold on December 6th. You will notice in your agenda summary that at the time that document was written, a couple of weeks ago, we were estimating that the interest cost would be 4.33%. We're in a favorable market, interest rates are going down and that bodes well for us.

The annual interest cost on these bonds will be approximately \$400,000. The property tax rate, if we are to pay all of the debt with property taxes, the property tax rate that would be necessary to repay the debt is slightly more than one-tenth of one mill. As you know, we will determine how to repay the debt in each annual budget cycle, and we'll make that repayment from a combination of special assessments that are repaid by property owners, sales taxes that are dedicated to road projects and debt service on road projects and property taxes.

Once again, the debt policy that you've adopted provides a set of criteria that establish the debt capacity of the county, the limits on the amount of debt that we can issue and as we show in the agenda summary, in each instance the sale of these bonds will not cause us to exceed those limits.

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

If you have any questions about this transaction, I'll be happy to try and answer them. Once again, the resolution was drafted by bond counsel, Joe Norton, who is not here. It has been reviewed and approved by the County Counselor as well, and I'll be happy to try to answer any questions that you have about this transaction and if you have none, then I recommend your approval of the resolution."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Okay, I don't see that there's any questions. What's the will of the board on this item?"

MOTION

Commissioner Unruh moved to adopt the Resolution.

Commissioner Winters 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, Chris. Next item please."

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

I. PRESENTATION REGARDING HEALTH DEPARTMENT'S MASS VACCINATION EXERCISE FOR THE SEDGWICK COUNTY PANDEMIC INFLUENZA PLANNING PROCESS.

Ms. Claudia Blackburn, Director, Health Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, "The Sedgwick County Health Department has received funding from the Kansas Department of Health and Environment for at least four years to plan for public health emergencies. Part of that planning process is actually exercising our plans. And on November 4th, the Health Department Public Health Emergency Management Team coordinated a mass vaccination exercise at the Kansas

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

Coliseum and here to tell us about that this morning is Seth Konkell. He is the Metropolitan Medical Response System Coordinator for the county and he has a short presentation for you.

POWERPOINT PRESENTATION

Mr. Seth Konkell, Metropolitan Medical Response System Coordinator, Health Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, "As Claudia said, we did have an exercise on November 4th and to kind of back up, how we started, about a year ago the Pandemic Influenza Work Group set aside a committee to look at the idea of doing a mass vaccination and they charged the committee with developing a process to provide vaccination to the entire population of Sedgwick County once a vaccine becomes available.

So with that chart, we went out and found members and here you can see the members. I co-chaired the committee with Greg Rockers, whose a pharmacist at the Wichita Clinic. We have several people from the Sedgwick County Health Department: Aaron Davis, JVonah Maryman and Janice McCoy and then from the Harvey County Health Department we have Terry Bourlard and then last but not least representatives from the Kansas Air National Guard who have been integral in this mass type of a vaccination process, Dan Arnold, Michael Foster and Jeff Welshan.

We identified the Coliseum as probably our primary spot simply because it has shelter from the elements anytime of year that a flu would attack, we need to be able to address it. It provided shelter from the sun or the rain, the wind, extreme cold and things like that. It also has amenities. As you'll see in a minute, it will take several hundred people to operationalize this facility during the event, so we needed restrooms and kitchens to cook food and provide those types of services, as well as the enclosure of the facility at the Coliseum provides some security. That was an issue that we wanted to address from the beginning. It also allows for a large premises and lines for cars to line up, because this would be a drive through clinic. People would not actually get out of their cars. We can get approximately 1.5 miles of cars actually on the Coliseum premises, so that will help alleviate some traffic problems.

And then the other issue that we needed to address was being able to vaccinate large groups of people at the same time. By using the pavilion, the large pavilion, the Sam Fulco Pavilion we're able to get 44 cars at one time, so that was the benefit of going with the Coliseum. We worked with

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

John Nath and his crew out there and they've been excellent in working with us to help develop that process.

When we met, we haven't actually done a plan, which is kind of funny because exercises are usually based around plans. We kind of took a backseat approach or backwards approach in that we have these assumptions and before we wrote the plan, we wanted to test these assumptions, one of the assumptions being that we need to move two cars in and two cars out of the facility every 13 seconds. The other assumption being that because we didn't have . . . or we weren't sure who would be available to exercise or to participate in a real event, we were going to have to do just in time training, so we tested that process as well. And the other issue of bringing all those cars into an enclosed facility, running them and bringing that many cars in I guess, we needed to test how the carbon monoxide levels would work in a facility.

Just to kind of compare what we did during the exercise, versus what we'd need during a real event, we had about 100 volunteers for the exercise. To run it, the real issue . . . or to run a real incident, we would need about 350 running a nine hour shifts. We would be open for 18 hours a day. We ran 22 cars during the exercise. We'd run 44 during a real event and for over the course of an hour and a half, we were able to vaccinate 1,800. Actually we vaccinated oranges, because we weren't using real vaccine, so we vaccinated 1,800 oranges, but during a real event, we would be able to . . . our guess is that we would be able to vaccinate approximately 43,000 people a day using this process. Those are the people going through cars. We also would plan to bus in people that don't have transportation to get them to the Coliseum, as well as using our currently established medical facilities to vaccinate their own patients and their families. So over the course of seven to ten days, we feel as though we would be able to vaccinate the entire population.

Here's an example of the Pavilion, and as you can see the red line, or the solid red line is kind of the traffic flow in, and then the cars pull in, as you can see the tables there that are numbered, and we'll take N-2 for an example. N-2 was made up of an assessment member and then two vaccinations, which really made up that team, so the car that pulled in to the left of N-2 was greeted by an assessor who asked them a series of questions. At the same time, the car to the right on N-2 was receiving their vaccination. They pulled out and then a new car took that spot, and then the assessment team would then change places with the vaccination team, so the teams were just hopping back and forth around the tables to speed this process up.

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

Thirteen seconds sounds like a very short amount of time, but what it is is actually that allows each of these cars on this side to be in line, or in the facility for five minutes, which gives us plenty of time. Now to get to 44 cars, we would replicate that same process on the south side, or the bottom side of the screen there would have the same flow. Starting on the inside, the cars would pull in and then exit down that dotted red line.

For the exercise, we had 21 job roles that we filled. For a real event, and this just kind of gives you a scale, we have 93 job roles that we'd have to fill with those 350 people. So we didn't test it all and that's down the road, but I did bring some pictures with us today of the just in time training. We have here people receiving the training. We put workers in vests, so that way we could identify them, who was traffic, who was our assessment teams. It's just much easier when you've got that many people to help manage, if you have some way of identifying them.

There you can see the cars coming in and we actually have a video that I'm going to play here in just a moment that will quickly walk you through the process, but we had to give instruction, and the gentleman there is holding a light stick. We did a lot of our communications for the cars with light sticks and hand signals and things like that. Imagine moving 13 cars through that door every 13 seconds. It was a pretty coordinated effort and we're very pleased with the volunteers that received about an hour of training before they pulled this off.

There you can see the vaccination assessment teams. They have a very small amount of supplies in the middle of the facility. We had a central supply location that basically delivered just in time supplies to the . . . i.e. the vaccine in the pre-filled syringes. And then there's kind of a panoramic view of cars lined up and then cars exiting out the building and again, if one car had to exit approximately every 13 seconds to keep us on time.

I think some of the biggest successes we had in this exercise was pulling together the community and here you can see a list of agencies or organizations that participated: the Sedgwick County CERT and MRCs, we had Wichita USD 259 and then Valley Center both sent school nurse, the Newman and WSU student nurses came out and helped with the process, we also had members from COMCARE, Via Christi Medical Center, the Red Cross, the Wichita Clinic and then the Sedgwick County and City of Wichita Fire Departments and HAZMAT Teams were there and they played a couple of different roles. Some of them were actually trained to give shots.

The others were there to monitor the carbon monoxide levels and it was really a pretty slick system that they had set up. They had wireless monitors that were set at each of the tables or at a couple of different tables and then they had one central computerized station that reported all the readings back, so from one spot in the facility, they were able to monitor the entire facility. And what we

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

found out on that is that we no where hit or came close to any kind of toxic levels, so even if we doubled the cars, we still don't anticipate hitting the half-way point of it being unsafe for workers to be in the building. And then we also had the Sedgwick County Health Department and DIO, who was there to film the video which will see in just a moment.

And I think the other group that we need recognize are our victims. We had approximately 75 cars, or 100 additional people that came out and played our victims. Those came from the Kansas Air National Guard. It was actually their duty weekend, so they made that part of their weekend, to come out and help us with this exercise and then we actually had some connections in our office to the Wichita Area PT Cruisers Club and the Air Capital Corvette Club, so they came out with their cars and when through the process, so that was really fun to partner with them and have them come out with their vehicles.

Simply our next steps, we really met the expectations, but we also have some work to do. We're going to work out the fine details. We found out, which is what we're hoping, that we don't have to scrape the plan and start from scratch, so this will work, so we'll now get it on paper and then text all 93 job roles in the fall . . . probably the fall of 2007.

So at this time I will play this video and it's about a minute and we have not had the chance to get sound to it, so I'm going to walk you through as it's playing and then I'll open it up to any questions that you guys might have.

Plays video.

Basically here, they're pulling into the pavilion, through the little courtyard between the Coliseum. You can see there, on the left of the screen, our traffic workers directing them down to a point at which they will pull in. And they were given directions ahead of time by sheets of paper that were handed out in the parking lot to kind of heed them to what would be happening in the facility, but you can see the cars have turned in there at the front of this, and this car that we're driving in is pulling into its position.

And it will be met by, like I said, the assessment worker, who will actually be asking a series of questions to make sure that it's safe for the people in the car to receive the vaccine. We do have to have a consent form for legal purposes, so you see the driver there filling out, signing that information. And then next I believe you'll see the vaccinator vaccinating the orange and we did follow the process of actually cleaning, like we would an arm, they stuck it and they actually did bandage the orange. And we reused the oranges, so by the end of the exercise, some of these oranges were pretty covered in Band-Aids. But there you can see our exit person is giving

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

commands and that was one of the biggest things that we were concerned about is making sure that we didn't have any wrecks, so traffic was going to have to be a very coordinated effort and I'm pleased to report that we did not have any accidents, and that was due to the fact that our traffic people had everything under control.

So that's the conclusion of the video and unless you guys have any questions at this time, it was my honor to present this information to you and we look forward to being back."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Commissioner Burtnett."

Commissioner Burtnett said, "You said you did meet your assumption, so you were getting them in and out . . . or you were getting every 13 seconds?"

Mr. Konkel said, "We were, yes."

Commissioner Burtnett said, "That's amazing."

Mr. Konkel said, "And it was and when I told that to the group at the beginning of the training, I said we've got to get one car in here every 13 seconds and they all kind of laughed, but we were able to do it."

Commissioner Burtnett said, "Wow, well congratulations, that's quite a feat. I think you will be prepared."

Mr. Konkel said, "We hope so."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Now it's just one person per car can get vaccinated? What happens if there's four people?"

Mr. Konkel said, "No, no. What we would do is we've developed a form that would take the entire carload. We are encouraging people, when this happens, to bring as many people. If you have a full-sized van and a compact car, we're asking that you bring your full-sized van and your neighbors."

Chairman Sciortino said, "All right, got it. Now, do they exit the van then and get their shots or do you just go around?"

Mr. Konkel said, "They would go around and if there are, like for example a full-size van where

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

the vaccinators couldn't get to the person, they would hop in the van with everything they need."

Chairman Sciortino said, "So it's a true one-stop, drive-through vaccination clinic."

Mr. Konkel said, "It is."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Okay, great. Commissioners, any other questions or comments? This is kind of exciting."

Mr. Konkel said, "It was. It was fun."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Great. And it does show that, to kind of keep climbing on words that Commissioner Norton has, we've got a great plan and we'll all pray that we never have to use it, but we have a plan. Neat. Commissioners, what's the will of the Board on this item?"

MOTION

Commissioner Burtnett moved to receive and file.

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, "Claudia, you've got a terrific plan and you're to be congratulated. Thank you. Next item please."

J. DIVISION OF HUMAN SERVICES.

DIVISION OF HUMAN SERVICES- DEPARTMENT ON AGING

1. AGREEMENTS (15) TO PROVIDE IN-HOME SERVICES TO RESIDENTS AGE 60 AND OLDER WHO NEED ASSISTANCE TO REMAIN IN THEIR

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

HOMES.

1. **ADVANTAGE HOME CARE, INC.**
2. **AFFORD-A-CARE, INC.**
3. **ALL SAINT'S HOME CARE, INC.**
4. **ASSOCIATED HOME CARE**
5. **CARE 2000 HOME HEALTH CARE**
6. **COMMUNITY CARE CONNECTIONS**
7. **HOME HEALTHCARE CONNECTION**
8. **HOME INSTEAD SENIOR CARE**
9. **LOVING HEARTS HOME CARE**
10. **MT. HOPE HOME HEALTH**
11. **PROACTIVE HOME CARE, INC.**
12. **PROGRESSIVE HOME HEALTH & HOSPICE**
13. **RIGHT AT HOME**
14. **SAINT RAPHAEL HOME CARE, INC.**
15. **SENIOR SERVICES, INC.**

Mr. Ray Vail, Director of Finance, Department on Aging, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I'm here today to present you with the contracts to provide in-home services for the elderly under Title III of the Older Americans' Act. The funding for these services has been previously approved, when you approved the Area plan in July of 2007 [sic]. Both Finance and Legal have approved these contracts and I ask you approve the agreements and authorize the Chair to sign."

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

MOTION

Commissioner Unruh moved to approve the Agreements 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

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

Commissioner Winters	Aye
Commissioner Burtnett	Aye
Chairman Sciortino	Aye

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

DIVISION OF HUMAN SERVICES- COMCARE

- 2. ADJUSTMENTS TO THE COMCARE STAFFING TABLE TO INCLUDE 16 CASE MANAGER POSITIONS, BAND 216; 8 CASE MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST POSITIONS, BAND 217; AND 8 QUALIFIED MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS, BAND 322; AND ADJUSTMENT TO THE DIO STAFFING TABLE TO INCLUDE ONE CUSTOMER SUPPORT ANALYST POSITION, BAND 322, TO BE FUNDED THROUGH COMCARE.**

Ms. Marilyn Cook, Director, Comprehensive Community Care, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I am here this morning requesting the previously mentioned additions to the COMCARE's staffing table. These positions are needed because of the number of individuals with severe and persistent mental illnesses and children with serious emotional disturbances who are approaching us. These positions would be added in our children's and our adult programs and we have had some significant increases in referrals. I don't want to read this whole thing, to be quick, so I'm trying to modify this as I go.

Essentially the staff would be responsive to the increase in referrals from the school system, from the child welfare system and would be responsive to the adults in our Community Support Services program who have serious and persistent mental illnesses who are needing employment services, which has been an evidence-based practice and one we've been very proud of. In addition, we are going to utilize some of these positions as team leads for these physicians are patient populations, conditions are getting more complex, our clinical interactions with them more complex and we feel this will address that.

One final piece of this would be an additional customer support analyst through DIO to help with the increased technology needs that we would have, based on these additions to our staffing table. In cases of the case managers we would fill these positions only when the caseload warranted that. I'd be happy to answer any questions you have."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Okay, Marilyn. We have at least one. Commissioner Winters."

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

Commissioner Winters said, “Thank you. Just a couple of quick questions. Marilyn, the financing of this, this is a fairly significant increase and you may have touched on that but I’m not sure I fully was listening then.”

Ms. Cook said, “I didn’t touch on it because I didn’t go through this whole outline. I tried to abbreviate it.”

Commissioner Winters said, “Let’s go through part of that.”

Ms. Cook said, “In terms of the financing for these positions, we have met and worked with county finance and all agree that the primary focus of these additional positions are individuals who are able to produce Medicaid and other revenue and the revenue that they will produce will pay for their positions and these other positions and the support that’s required for that. These are non-county general funds. These are revenues that are being produced through the services we provide.”

Commissioner Winters said, “And you, and in combination with finance, will continue to monitor that over a period of time to make sure there is a balance there.”

Ms. Cook said, “Absolutely, we track billable hour activity for all of our providers.”

Commissioner Winters said, “All right. Yesterday, we did have an opportunity to visit about this and you indicated that this was one of the areas that COMCARE really believes is a core service area, really believes that it is something that COMCARE is in touch with. Can you expound on that just a little bit for me?”

Ms. Cook said, “Case management services are services that require a lot of coordination among providers and as a result of that the state and the community health center system have agreed that case managers are very central to the role of insuring that the consumers who are interacting with any number of systems and any number of providers have care that’s coordinated, get to appointments on time, so we don’t have no-shows that affect our billable activity and get the treatment that they need.

We are truly the only mental health center in the entire state that also has community partners doing this, but it is a very core service to the services that we provide to this population and we have an obligation to do that for citizens in this community.”

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

Commissioner Winters said, "All right. And you mentioned the collaborative effort in the community. Is it your contention and these case managers that we're going to hire and all of current COMCARE staff to . . . you know one of the things that . . . I was with a group yesterday and I visited about the number of organizations that are involved in the human services, there are a lot and it becomes confusing to people like me to really keep everyone straight of whose doing what. But you can certainly see, with that many organizations involved, that if folks aren't coordinated, you can rapidly get a duplication of effort someplace. So speak to me just a moment about your philosophy and COMCARE's philosophy on coordination within the community."

Ms. Cook said, "Well, our philosophy and our practice has been to work with community partners wherever possible. We're getting a lot of referrals from the schools, from the criminal justice system, from primary care providers and we have good working relationships with those providers to provide the services that are required in a community this large and in our system of care. We meet with them regularly. We involve them in our planning activities and when we have situations, as we do now, where there have been waiting lists, we work with them to see which of the consumers who are approaching us are able to go to our community partners who may have openings which chose not to."

Commissioner Winters said, "Okay. Well, I would just certainly encourage all our department's staff and particularly COMCARE to stay attuned to that connectedness to the community and collaboration, so thank you very much for your comments."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Commissioners, I see no other lights on, so what's the will of the Board on this item?"

MOTION

Commissioner Burtnett moved to approve the adjustments to the COMCARE Staffing Table.

Commissioner Winters seconded the motion.

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

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

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.”

- K. ADJUSTMENTS TO THE SHERIFF’S OFFICE STAFFING TABLE TO INCLUDE TWO PROPERTY TECH POSITIONS, RANGE 17; ONE DETECTIVE POSITION, RANGE 23; AND ONE CAPTAIN POSITION, RANGE 28; AND TO DELETE ONE MAJOR POSITION, RANGE 30; AND ONE LIEUTENANT POSITION, RANGE 26.**

POWERPOINT PRESENTATION

Sheriff Gary Steed greeted the Commissioners and said, “If you have the patience for me, I have one more short PowerPoint. I know you’ve seen a few today, but we’re making some pretty important reorganizational changes at the Sheriff’s Office and I wanted an opportunity to present those to you and also I guess to our viewing public out there as well. It’s really the first opportunity that anyone other than yourselves have really had an opportunity to see what we’ve done so I appreciate the opportunity.

At the end of day and the end of the presentation I’ll be asking you simply to approve two new additional positions. They will be civilian positions that we would like to add to our staffing chart and approve the positions of a detective and a captain’s position that we don’t have at this point. All of this will be done within our current budget, as has been said, so I’m not asking you for additional funding, I’m just asking you to approve the positions that we would like to reorganize.

So let me tell you a little bit about how we came to make this request. This is our current structure and recently, through the retirement of a sheriff and a major, we’ve had the opportunity to really shuffle the deck on our organization to work through some things that we could do to reorganize a department so that we could have employees to meet the needs that we need to see in the future. So

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

we had an opportunity to really make changes and organize our department so that we could meet those needs.

In order to do that, we tried to do some strategic planning. We did some critical analysis of our staffing needs. We asked Brian Withrow from out at the university to come in and work with us to determine questions like are there things that we're doing that we shouldn't be doing? Are there things that we should be doing that we're not? And are there some things that we're doing that we could do differently? And so he worked with us. We worked through some focus groups with our lieutenants and our sergeants to provide input to get input from the folks that actually do the work about how we can do things differently. And we also made it possible for our employees on the Internet to get on and provide us some answers to a survey that we put on there, so that they could provide input from all levels of the department as to how we might meet these needs.

Some of the strategic planning things that we've included in our review of our environment included some of the workload, increasing workload that we have. One of the examples that we're struggling with is that we have quite a caseload that we've developed over tracking sex offenders and the sex offender registration. We have more than 600 and perhaps more than 700 that live in Sedgwick County. We get about 30 to 60 complaints per month to go out and check on these sex offenders and when we go out and check on them, if we don't locate them, we have to go find them. If we don't find them or if we find them somewhere else than they're registered we have to work up a case file. We have to present it to the district attorney and try to prosecute the individual, so that has become a full-time staffing position in our investigations unit that we don't have a detective for that we've had to take detectives from other duties that are awfully important also to do. We haven't really had a significant increase to our investigations division for some time now.

Employee backgrounds are an important part of how we hire people that go out and do the jobs that we do, the public servant jobs that go into people's homes, have the powers to arrest people, have the powers to supervise them in our detention facility, so it's important that we do good and thorough employee backgrounds and of course that area of our department has grown substantially and will continue to grow with the addition of a detention facility.

Space limitations, our property and evidence and quartermaster all sort of tied together, these are two different functions that we're going to eventually combine into one single function and combine the staff to do that. Property and evidence is all the evidence that we collect out there on the streets in cases and property that we collect as lost and found property. We store all of that property over on Stillwell in our property and evidence section. At the same time, we have a quartermaster over at training center at 37th. That individual or those people over our training center are in charge of issuing all the boots, shoes, guns, belts, uniforms, raincoats, everything we

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

issue to deputies, all the equipment that we use. What we would like to do through our reorganization is to combine our quartermaster and combine our property and evidence sections over on Stillwell and eventually I'll explain to you how we would like to get some civilians in there to maintain that function.

Currently, we have a sergeant assigned over at the property and evidence section. We've found that to be inadequate for the property that we're using, and so we've already robbed some of our other sections of the department in order to meet those needs and we have taken a person from our tag enforcement unit already and assigned them over to meet those needs. That's a commissioned law enforcement officer that we would like to put back to doing law enforcement duties as opposed to handling property, so that's one of the individuals that's going to get assigned.

The homeland security concerns, we've already found it necessary to assign a lieutenant to help us with some of the special projects that we do around the department and some of those special projects are particularly related to homeland security. As you know, we've taken on a lot of extra functions from that, NIMS, NIMS training, NIMS requirements, there are tabletop exercises it seems like almost weekly. We just heard from the Health Department about the program that they put out there that we end up participating in in some function, so we have found a growing need for that as well and some previous unfilled requests that we have tried to fill over the years include background investigator, civilian quartermaster, court security personnel, civil process deputies and court security deputies are all things that we have tried to address in this reorganization.

Organizational changes, this is kind of where we're getting to, we're going to eliminate our executive officer position. We're going to eliminate a major in our support division, we're going to eliminate that position. We're going to establish a second undersheriff position. I think that we have talked to Johnson County, Douglas County and several law enforcement agencies that are of similar size to us. I think that you'll find that all of those have two undersheriffs. Any department, police agency that is our size or larger, Wichita Police Department for example has three deputy chiefs, and that's essentially what we're talking about with undersheriffs. The organization is becoming rather large and we need the administrators that it takes to operate that.

You'll see in a little bit that we're going to call one of these positions an undersheriff and one a chief deputy. There's some reasons for that. The undersheriff position, when we read through the Kansas statutes that relate to that, would imply that an undersheriff has to have law enforcement powers, so we're going to leave ourselves some flexibility as to who could fill those positions and we're going to call that position the chief deputy, so that we don't get into those laws, letting him imply what the qualifications for that individuals might be. That way we can hire the person that we think might be best to fill that position now and in the future.

As I told you, we're going to eliminate an entire bureau. We're going to reduce it to a division, do

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

away with a major's slot. That's going to require that we add a captain to our staffing table and that division that used to be a bureau is going to take care of all those items that kind of go across the department and affect all parts of the department, the support division and those things are things like records, property and evidence training and those things of that nature.

Tag unit, we're going to retain the function of the tag unit. We're not going to retain it in the same way that we do now. We're going to reassign all the personnel that are in there. We have a sergeant, two deputies and a clerical person. The sergeant we're going to leave in there and he will operate as a liaison type person and he will coordinate the investigations, the tags that we have to pick up by coordinating with patrol and by more thoroughly using our reserve organization to go out and do that function as well. The position, that clerical position in there is eventually going to get assigned elsewhere and the two deputies that are up there are eventually going to get assigned, generally as background investigators.

This is the proposed structure, so that you might see what it looks like. This is the support division, as it will end up. Support division, this is the new division and that has all of the common functions that go between the department. I might back up just a little bit, I think there's another important point that I ought to visit with you about how we're going to organize the divisions across the board. We had often talked about if we would establish two undersheriffs that we would have one in charge of the detention facility and the other in charge of the law enforcement side of the department. We're going to do that a little bit differently. We're going to be a little bit cutting edge there. We're going to assign one of these undersheriffs to be a human resources type of undersheriff. He's going to take care of the people issues. He's going to be the personnel undersheriff and the other undersheriff, the chief deputy will be the individual that's in charge of programs, facilities, money, budgets, fleet, those type of things like that so that we're better able to track that as well.

We'll maintain the judicial division, the patrol division. I'm showing this for one reason, just to show you that all the functions that we've had in the past we're still maintaining in some manner. You'll see that we have the tag unit included in that organization there, we'll just be doing it differently.

Detention bureau, you'll notice down at the bottom we have a transportation unit. One of the things that we decided through our reorganization is that we could take those transportation deputies that are currently assigned on the 8th floor of the courthouse to do all the transportation, which is primarily the transportation of the inmates out of the detention facility, we're going to move those deputies over to the detention facility so that they can closely work with the detention facility and we'll be better able to do their function.

This is a chart, it's rather complicated, I don't think you probably need to study it too much. This is a chart that Dave Thompson worked with our Finance Department to show how we're going to do

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

this within our current budget, to be able to staff all these positions. And this has been approved . . . I guess reviewed, I don't know about approved, by the Finance Department and yesterday I visited with our civil service board about it as well and I think they're pretty excited about it also. My request today to you is to request that we increase the department staffing by two persons. That will bring us from 526 personnel and a half to 528 and a half and I request that you approve the positions of Detective, Captain and two Property Technicians, which are the new positions. I might mention that we've also reviewed, that there are a number of items we need to support these people, vehicles for example, we think we can do with the current fleet that we have now. There are a number of items that have to do with some office remodeling, some purchasing of office equipment, desks and things like that, we recognize that this is not a budgeted item and we're going to basically take care of that out of the use of our seizure funds. So, no additional cost there as well. If you have any additional questions, I'd be happy to answer those."

Chairman Sciortino said, "I don't see that there's any questions. So Commissioners, what's the . . . oh, excuse me. Commissioner Norton."

Commissioner Norton said, "Just want to be sure I've read all this right. All these change are going to make you more effective, it's going to be cutting edge and there's going to be a savings of almost \$8,000 in doing all that?"

Sheriff Steed said, "That's . . . yes, that's a pretty good summary. It's going to allow us to do some of the things that we've struggled with getting done, and doing it more effectively. So we've had some difficulty in getting backgrounds done. We're going to have background investigators now. We're going to have detectives freed up to do sex offender investigations, so it's going to allow us to do our work much more efficiently."

Commissioner Norton said, "Well I have to applaud you for, you know, working through the system, responding to change, adding positions, subtracting positions, but at the end of the day not asking for more money. Actually it's going to be less money. That's pretty good."

Sheriff Steed said, "It's exactly what we set out to do and I think we've been pretty successful to do that. I want to warn you, it won't mean I won't be back asking for more in the future, because we still have a number of . . ."

Commissioner Norton said, "We understand that, Sheriff. That's all I have."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Commissioners, any other questions or comments? Seeing none, what's the will of the board on this item please?"

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

MOTION

Commissioner Burtnett moved to approve the adjustments to the Sheriff's Office Staffing Table.

Commissioner Winters 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, Sheriff. Next item please."

L. KANSAS COLISEUM MONTHLY REPORT.

POWERPOINT PRESENTATION

Mr. John Nath, Director, Kansas Coliseum, greeted the Commissioners and said, "This is the report today on the activities at the Coliseum for the month of October, busy month, kicks off our season. It's nice to get back in the swing of things after what was a pretty quiet summer. We had over 67,000 people attend the events in October, nine separate events, 26 individual performances, net revenues were in excess of \$274,000.

Kicking off with one of annual events, the Fall Circuit Futurity, which is one our standard horse shows, 3,500 folks through the door for that. And then we knew we were really getting into the swing of things, so what we did we pitched a little publicity idea to the newspaper and the television stations about our busiest week of the year and we actually got some very good response, from the Wichita Eagle as well as two of the network affiliates.

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

First off, we converted the Britt Brown Arena into a television studio and tapped two shows with World Wrestling Entertainment and that really got things kicked off pretty good. Wrestling went out, Disney on Ice came in so we had mice on ice for seven performances and over 15,000 people enjoyed that show. At the same time, we had the Chisholm Trail Antique Gun Show going on in the pavilion. But what turned out to be a local publicity effort actually turned into some nice home coverage for us, because Pollstar magazine picked up the picture that was ran in the Wichita Eagle and this is the caption about what we were going through to kick Disney on Ice out of the building, bring the dirt in to get ready for the World Wide Paint Horse Congress, which I understand is the second largest Paint Horse show in the country.

This is just a few scenes of the Britt Brown Arena floor, accommodating the usage of the World Wide Paint Horse. Chisholm Trail Antique Gun Show going on at the same time, but over in Pavilion I. And in the arena building, we had a return of Tornado Alley, who hosted another paintball tournament. Mid-America Flea Market returns. As you know, we do ten of those a year and we had almost 3,000 people in attendance for that. Then we had the Wheatland Poppin' Johnnies, the antique tractors, 17,500 people through the doors to enjoy that event.

Coming up . . . Let me go back just a little bit if I can. I don't want to forget, Wichita Thunder kicked off their season and they're doing a great job, 40% up over what they started last year, and last year they were another 40% above the previous year. They're averaging, we've had five games, this is only two for October, but we have had five games so far. They're doing over 5,200 people a game. That's legitimate attendance and that's really great. If you recall, it was only a couple of years ago that they were doing less than 2,000, so Chris Presson and his crew and his staff have done a wonderful, wonderful job with that.

Coming up, Thunder play Amarillo this Friday, Rodney Carrington is in concert on Saturday. We have the Turkey Classic go-cart races November 24th through 25th. U.S. Weapons returns for another gun show. We have the Carson and Barnes Circus over Thanksgiving weekend for four performances. Thunder will come back again and play Rock Mountain December 1st. Fenton Motors is doing a car sale over in P-I just like they did last year. Thunder plays Memphis on December 8th and December 9th and the Mid-America Flea Market returns December 17th. Conclusion of my report for October, commissioners, if there's any questions I'd be more than happy to answer them at this time."

Chairman Sciortino said, "John, you seem to be doing a great job. I don't see any questions or comments. So what's the will of the Board on John's report?"

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

MOTION

Commissioner Burtnett moved to receive and file.

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, "Thank you, John. Keep up the good work. Next item please."

M. REPORT OF THE BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS' REGULAR MEETING OF NOVEMBER 9, 2006.

Ms. Iris Baker, Director, Purchasing Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, "The meeting of November 9th results in five items for consideration today.

**1) GPS SYSTEM AND ACCESSORIES- PUBLIC WORKS
FUNDING: PUBLIC WORKS EQUIPMENT RESERVE**

First item is a GPS system and accessories for Public Works. Recommendation is to accept the low bid, including trade-in, from Laser Specialist Incorporated in the amount of \$54,516.97.

**2) AUTOMOTIVE PARTS FOR CHEVROLET VEHICLES- FLEET MANAGEMENT
FUNDING: FLEET MANAGEMENT**

Item two, automotive parts for Chevrolet vehicles for Fleet Management. Recommendation is to accept the low bid from Parks Chevrolet of Augusta to execute a two-year contract with three one-year options to renew.

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

**3) AUTOMOTIVE PARTS FOR FORD VEHICLES- FLEET MANAGEMENT
FUNDING: FLEET MANAGEMENT**

Item three, automotive parts for Ford vehicles for Fleet Management. Recommend the low bid meeting specifications from Rusty Eck Ford and executive a two-year contract with three one-year options to renew.

**4) THREE QUARTER TON FOUR-WHEEL DRIVE SUBURBAN- FLEET
MANAGEMENT
FUNDING: VEHICLE ACQUISITION**

Item four, a ¾ ton four-wheel drive suburban for Fleet Management. Recommendation is to accept the low bid from Don Hattan Chevrolet in the amount of \$33,652 and establish contract pricing for additional purchases for the remainder of the 2007 model year.

**5) CHANGE ORDER FOR MURDOCK TAG OFFICE PARKING LOT- FACILITIES
DEPARTMENT
FUNDING: REBUILD TAG OFFICE PARKING LOT**

And item five, change order for the Murdock Tag Office parking lot for Facilities Department and the recommendation is to acknowledge a change order with Kansas Paving in the amount of \$3,941.90.

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.”

MOTION

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

Commissioner Norton seconded the motion.

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

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

VOTE

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

Chairman Sciortino said, "Iris, thank you. Next item please."

CONSENT AGENDA

N. CONSENT AGENDA.

- 1. Third quarter 2006 range reallocations.**
- 2. Payroll Check Register of November 3, 2006.**
- 3. General Bills Check Register(s) for the weeks of November 1 – 14, 2006.**
- 4. Orders dated October 31 and November 7, 2006 to correct tax roll for change of assessment.**
- 5. Agreement with Unified School District No. 259 for implementation of a Disproportionate Minority Contact project at Brooks and Coleman middle schools.**
- 6. Ratification and confirmation of the actions of the Sedgwick County Board of Canvassers Meeting on Monday, November 13, 2006.**

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

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

<u>Contract Number</u>	<u>Rent Subsidy</u>	<u>District Number</u>	<u>Landlord</u>
V06053	\$475.00	5	William Favreau
V06054	\$385.00	5	Oakview at the Park
V06055	\$500.00	5	William Favreau
V06059	\$665.00	5	Springcreek Apartments
V06062	\$150.00	2	Chapel Ridge Apartments
V04062R	\$232.00	3	Chapel Ridge Apartments

- 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.**

<u>Contract Number</u>	<u>Old Amount</u>	<u>New Amount</u>
V0473	\$260.00	\$207.00
V03089	\$318.00	\$329.00
V04080	\$292.00	\$272.00
V20118	\$229.00	\$252.00
V010150	\$228.00	\$219.00
V05086	\$106.00	\$108.00
V05086	\$208.00	\$201.00
V05071	\$286.00	\$266.00
V20129	\$453.00	\$441.00
V99066	\$329.00	\$321.00
V010162	\$311.00	\$315.00
V04075	\$241.00	\$230.00
V03082	\$321.00	\$315.00
V020128	\$327.00	\$355.00
V2069	\$299.00	\$301.00
V05072	\$318.00	\$280.00
V05085	\$229.00	\$210.00
V04074	\$287.00	\$398.00
V2093	\$550.00	\$550.00
V05073	\$428.00	\$319.00

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

V01056	\$222.00	\$218.00
V05074	\$313.00	\$243.00
V04082	\$94.00	\$27.00
V04068	\$197.00	\$213.00
V04068	\$197.00	\$213.00
V99073	\$272.00	\$290.00
V03090	\$300.00	\$300.00
V05067	\$274.00	\$231.00
V04069	\$291.00	\$282.00
V20122	\$127.00	\$190.00
V05077	\$160.00	\$137.00
V20101	\$274.00	\$279.00
V05068	\$535.00	\$515.00
V020068	\$292.00	\$291.00
V04067	\$261.00	\$300.00
V06046	\$610.00	\$610.00
V20127	\$400.00	\$357.00
V04050	\$325.00	\$34.00
V06007	\$615.00	\$553.00
V06017	\$447.00	\$217.00
V03061	\$385.00	\$22.00
V06006	\$422.00	\$497.00
V03058	\$308.00	\$425.00
V05095	\$278.00	\$243.00
V04062	\$232.00	\$74.00
V06035	\$279.00	\$246.00
V020052	\$423.00	\$411.00
V020021	\$296.00	\$304.00
V06029	\$393.00	\$117.00
V04026	\$174.00	\$166.00
V01041	\$432.00	\$603.00
V06027	\$485.00	\$485.00
V06052	\$260.00	\$279.00
V05057	\$417.00	\$342.00
V06023	\$205.00	\$263.00
V99010	\$530.00	\$452.00

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

V05058

\$450.00

\$170.00

Mr. Buchanan said, "Commissioners, 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, "I don't believe there's anything else to come before us this morning, so is there anything under the category of 'other' that we need to discuss or want to discuss? Commissioner Norton."

N. OTHER

Commissioner Norton said, "Well Commissioners, I was gone for . . ."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Okay, can I take a wild stab?"

Commissioner Norton said, "No."

Chairman Sciortino said, "We're not going to talk about Exploration Place, okay."

Commissioner Norton said, "Well, I'll start out with that. Our T-Rex Named Sue finished up with a flurry and did quite well. There's a new exhibit there called 'Into the Dark' and it celebrates all of

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

those animals and life forms that live in the dark and you can observe there. It's going to be great for kids and families. I would urge people to stop by and see that exhibit, something new and exciting at Exploration Place and I don't have any numbers on how it kicked off, but it has started and I would urge people to know that Exploration Place is alive and well and offering new and exciting things every couple of months and the days of being static are over with and dynamic is the word of the day.

I did want to report that I was gone for Monday and Tuesday. I was in Arizona at a healthcare leadership institute. We were invited, our public health director Claudia Blackburn and I attended. It was from a Kellogg grant that brought in 20 counties, selected by invitation only, to come in and talk about how local communities and county governments can start the dialogue about how we solve the healthcare needs of your community, particularly the uninsured, which includes all those folks in our community that are uninsured and underinsured, whether they be working poor, people just without insurance, homeless, offenders that are coming back to our community. We had great dialogue and I'll let commissioners know that just like the assembly we had several years ago about public health talked at a broad based dialogue in the community, I think real soon Claudia and I will be before you to start talking about a dialogue in the community about some programs that we can initiate and incubate that will start bringing together all the community to talk about how we provide primary healthcare, medical home for every citizen in our community, which I think is the right thing to do for quality of life, but it is also an economic indicator of how healthy your community is, so I've got a lot of information to go back through and absorb and try to distill down to some proposals, but I wanted to give you a little bit of briefing that we probably will start working on convening a group of community leaders, both government and private, to start talking about some of these programs that have incubated in other communities that have done pretty good work at providing primary care, at least a health home for every citizen in their county."

Chairman Sciortino said, "Thank you. I don't see any other lights. Let me just make one brief statement here. We just got through with an election cycle and there were a lot of races that were very close and if you ever doubted your vote counted, this election cycle should have proved that yes I can make a difference by voting.

Less than 50% of the people that were eligible to vote voted, so I just want to encourage everybody, the next time you have the opportunity, make the effort to vote. There were a few races that it proved that your vote really could make a difference so I'm encouraging everybody to make the

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

effort to get out and vote. I congratulate all the winners. I want to publicly congratulate Gwin Welsheimer that will be the new commissioner representing the fifth district and wish her well. But to all of the people who are eligible to vote, please make the effort to vote. Government will be better because of it. That's all I have. Anything else? This meeting is adjourned."

O. ADJOURNMENT

There being no other business to come before the Board, the Meeting was adjourned at 11:47 a.m.

Regular Meeting, November 15, 2006

**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