

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

### **REGULAR MEETING**

**May 26, 2010**

The Regular Meeting of the Board of the County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kansas, was called to order at 9:00 a.m. on Wednesday, May 26, 2010, in the County Commission Meeting Room in the Courthouse in Wichita, Kansas, by Chairman Karl Peterjohn, with the following present: Chair Pro Tem Gwen Welshimer; Commissioner David M. Unruh; Commissioner Tim R. Norton; Commissioner Kelly Parks; Mr. William P. Buchanan, County Manager; Mr. Rich Euson, County Counselor; Mr. David Spears, Director, Bureau of Public Works; Mr. John Schlegel, Director, Metropolitan Area Planning Department; Mr. John Waller, Diversion Supervisor, District Attorney; Ms. Marilyn Cook, Executive Director, COMCARE; Mr. James Weber, Deputy Director, Public Works; Ms. Iris Baker, Director, Purchasing; Ms. Kristi Zukovich, Director, Communications; and Ms. Katie Asbury, Deputy County Clerk.

#### **GUESTS**

#### **INVOCATION**

Led by Pastor Dave Fulton, St. Paul's Lutheran Church, Wichita

#### **FLAG SALUTE**

#### **ROLL CALL**

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

#### **PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

## Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010

### A. **WICHITA AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (WAMPO) METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN (MTP) 2035 PRESENTATION. ALL DISTRICTS.**

#### **VISUAL PRESENTATION**

**Mr. John Schlegel**, Director, Metropolitan Area Planning Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, “I’m here today to present to you a final draft of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan 2035. You may recall that a number of months ago, in one of your Tuesday morning meetings, I gave you an overview of some of the preliminary work that had been ongoing with this transportation plan, focusing a lot on the necessity of the plan being fiscally constrained, or balanced, between revenues, and projected revenues and projected expenditures. Today I would like to present to you an overview of this final draft. We are in the final public comment period, which started on May 18th and will go through June 18th. We’re anticipating adoption by the WAMPO (Wichita Area Metropolitan Planning Organization) Transportation Policy Body at their meeting in July, if at all possible. I’m not going to spend a lot of time going over individual projects; that would probably require several hours of time to go over all the projects that are on the funding list. Part of this plan is a funding list, and there is a map in this final draft that will show you where all the projects that are recommended for funding over the next 25 years are located. What I’d like to do today, for you and the viewing audience today, is to give an overview and tell you how you could go access the plan, this draft plan, and start reviewing it, and ask questions and provide comments.

“As you probably already know, this is the long-range transportation plan for our region. The WAMPO region includes 21 cities, 20 of which are in Sedgwick County and one in Butler County. It also includes all of Sedgwick County, and then small portions of both Butler and Sumner Counties. We are mandated to create this document in order to maintain the eligibility of those jurisdictions within the WAMPO plan area for federal funding for transportation projects. And the intent of this plan is to show the transportation system as it would exist in the year 2035. As with any good plan, it’s based on a vision, goals and objectives which are based on a lot of data and information that was developed for this plan. And the plan does then outline a list of projects that are recommended for funding and a set of policies and other recommendations for moving forward with developing the transportation system that we project we’re going to need by 2035.”

**Mr. Schlegel** continued, “The vision that’s outlined in this plan is pretty simple; that the region’s multimodal transportation system in the year 2035 will be safe, efficient, accessible and affordable.

## Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010

In order to achieve this vision, there is a set of objectives and strategies that are outlined in the plan to support that vision. And at your places, there is a handout and there will be a page that looks like this, a very colorful page with a chain on it to show the links between the vision and the objectives, both short-term and long-term, for achieving that vision. Those objectives are meant to deal with the change that we're anticipating will occur over the next 25 years within the region. As part of this plan, we were required to project out both employment and population change for that 25 year time period. And the graphic that I have in front of you now shows what we're projecting, in terms of growth and employment, going from current levels of about 290,000 up to over 350,000 in that 25 year time period. And population growth from about 495,000 now to a little over 600,000 by the year 2035. And the plan is meant to respond to those changes, to that growth that we're anticipating within the metropolitan area. More jobs and more people are going to mean more trips being made on our regional transportation system, and so we have to be able to respond to that.

“Part of the exercise that we went through in developing this plan was trying to project where within the region growth could be anticipated. And we really anticipate growth throughout the region, but what we're trying to show in this graphic is where we think the most significant growth areas will be within our metropolitan region. And this probably should not be too surprising to you; we're anticipating a continuation of current growth patterns within the region. You can see, both on the west and east side, significant job and population growth, also down in the southeastern part of the county down towards Derby, and then also some additional population growth up in suburban cities to the north and to the south of the metro area.

“One of the federal mandates is that it be a comprehensive transportation plan, so there are a lot of issues that must be addressed in this plan in order to satisfy the federal requirements and in order to maintain that eligibility for our jurisdictions to get federal funding. I've outlined on this slide some of the more high profile issues that the Plan Advisory Committee and the Transportation Policy Body have addressed in their discussions regarding this plan. In your handouts, there is a more extensive outline, six full pages of detail about what's contained within the plan. There is a great deal of emphasis by the federal agencies on addressing each individual type of transportation mode, so there will be a chapter on each of those, on how the plan would address each of those individual types of transportation modes. A key chapter that I would encourage you to look at would be chapter eight; the financial plan. This tells how the plan will achieve that term fiscal constraint, or balance between projected revenues and projected expenditures. Also in there you'll find the map that I referred to earlier that shows all the projects that are recommended by the plan for funding and also a detailed list of those projects.”

“Now WAMPO alone cannot implement this; WAMPO's role in this is limited in a lot of respects. It relies on the individual jurisdictions to carry out the recommendations of the plan. WAMPO's role in this is to develop this regional plan and then to back that up with an allocation of federal funding which comes to us each year to individual projects. But the key to implementing this plan is really

## Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010

the activities of local jurisdictions. Each individual city or county are the ones that really carry out the implementation of projects and also the implementation of policies within this plan. You can see what WAMPO can do on this slide from the Metropolitan Transportation Plan 2035. We will have a set of recommendations about projects that should be funded in the Transportation Improvement Program, which is the TIP, and that's the equivalent of the county's Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

“And then we can also carry out to a certain extent some of the strategies that are recommended by the Metropolitan Transportation Plan through our Unified Planning Work Program. WAMPO does receive a certain allocation of funding for staff each year, and in that Unified Planning Work Program then we outline the work that will be carried out by the staff, so the WAMPO staff is able to put together policy documents in response to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, but it really will be up to individual jurisdictions to carry those out. An example of that would be a ‘complete streets’ policy. That's currently a very hot topic with a lot of the jurisdictions within the region, and there is a recommendation within the Metropolitan Transportation Plan that we develop a ‘complete streets’ policy, but WAMPO cannot carry that out; that will be up to individual jurisdictions. What WAMPO can do is develop a policy then that can be adopted by individual jurisdictions. And so we're all part, WAMPO and the individual jurisdictions, like the county and the cities, can work together to implement policies and recommendations and also then to carry out projects.

“This is the time frame we're on, as I mentioned earlier, we started this final public comment period on May 18th. It will run until June 18th, with the, we hope, action to adopt by the Transportation Policy Body at their meeting on July 13th. So we are in this public review and comment period. If you are interested in accessing the plan, you can do it a number of different ways. One is through the WAMPO website [[www.wampoks.org](http://www.wampoks.org)], which I have up on the screen now. We also have the plan on a CD, if that would be more convenient for you to do that. Those are available to you and to the public. And then, finally, I would offer up if you would be interested in having an individual briefing session and review of the plan, WAMPO staff, including myself, will be available to come and sit down with you and go over the plan. It's a rather extensive document. You can see how extensive it is from what I'm holding here now. This is the final draft. And we're willing to help you go through that in individual briefing sessions, if that's convenient for you. And with that, I'll be glad to take any questions.”

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, “Thank you, Mr. Schlegel. Questions or comments? Commissioner Unruh.”

**Commissioner Unruh** said, “Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, John, first of all, let me thank you for your discretion in not going through that document page by page. Appreciate that this morning.

## Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010

Can you remind me, who are the people who helped develop the plan? I mean, who are those representatives?"

**Mr. Schlegel** said, "The major effort was done by a Plan Advisory Committee that was set up by the WAMPO policy body, and we have a broad representation of different groups within the community. KDOT (Kansas Department of Transportation) certainly is represented, Sedgwick County has representatives on that group, City of Wichita is the biggest city, and then a number of the smaller cities have representatives, SCAC (Sedgwick County Association of Cities) has a representative, Airport Advisory Board, Wichita Transit, the passenger rail organization has a representative, Visioneering Wichita. I'm probably not naming everybody, so I hope I'm not slighting anybody by not naming them, but I'm trying to give you an indication that it's a broad representation of the community and people that have an interest in transportation issues."

**Commissioner Unruh** said, "Okay, good. Well it was not just a staff effort; it was elected and other representatives."

**Mr. Schlegel** said, "No, yeah."

**Commissioner Unruh** said, "Is the plan a rolling plan that can be, I mean it's not a 25 year plan, that's it, like it or lump it?"

**Mr. Schlegel** said, "No, great question, thank you for asking that. We are required to update this every five years. We are required to look out 25 years, and then every five years go back and redo it. So it is, as you described, a rolling plan, which constantly gets reviewed and updated."

**Commissioner Unruh** said, "Okay. Thank you. And then one final question or comment, you mentioned there were representatives from the rail there, and does that imply this new concept of a passenger rail service from Kansas City to Fort Worth, is that part of our plan, is that in there?"

**Mr. Schlegel** said, "No, it's too early, I think, to have a definitive recommendation in this plan regarding that. As you probably know, the studies are just coming out and being reviewed regarding the feasibility of passenger rail through our community. It does address and acknowledge that that work is underway, so that if during the next five-year period, let's say KDOT decides that they want to move forward with that and provides funding for that, then it could be eligible for federal funding. So we needed to at least acknowledge that that work was underway in this plan."

## Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010

**Commissioner Unruh** said, "Alright. Well, I appreciate that position and that we're acknowledging it's there. It's been getting a little bit of higher profile publicity lately, and I'm kind of lukewarm on it myself, but with the realization that long-term it perhaps has to be part of our transportation infrastructure and integrate with all the other forms, so I don't know what to think about it yet, but wondered what this document said. So you've answered my question. I appreciate it. That's all I have."

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, "Thank you. Commissioner Parks."

**Commissioner Parks** said, "One of the projects in my district is Northwest Expressway, and I probably have a question a week from a constituent on that, the progress of that project. Is this document online where they can go online..."

**Mr. Schlegel** said, "Yes."

**Commissioner Parks** said, "...and look at some of that?"

**Mr. Schlegel** said, "The WAMPO website is up there on the screen now and they'll find that document there."

**Commissioner Parks** said, "And I'm certain that if we don't have it through our county website that we can connect to that, that our staff will soon..."

**Mr. Schlegel** said, "Well you can get it there through the county website by accessing Planning Department, and then there will be a transportation division, and once you click on there, you will be on the WAMPO website."

**Commissioner Parks** said, "I think during these public hearing modes that's most important that we get every kind of factual information out there to the people that we can. Thank you."

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, "Thank you. Commissioner Welshimer."

**Commissioner Welshimer** said, "Could you explain just a little bit, the Governor's signing a transportation bill today and how the relationship is with this and what he's doing?"

**Mr. Schlegel** said, "Well, I think to the surprise of many people, KDOT was able to get a new transportation bill through the legislature in this session, and that's the bill that the Governor is now signing in a number of locations throughout the state. That bill provides another source of funding for the implementation of this plan. The specific projects that will be funded under that state

## Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010

transportation plan have not been identified yet. My understanding is that those projects will be identified next year, in 2011, with the start of the new session. But we're busy right now working with the WAMPO Transportation Policy Body to try to identify projects for this region that we feel should be eligible for funding through that state transportation bill, and those policies that the Transportation Policy Body are working on feed off of this plan. So that's the link, is that this whole planning exercise that we've gone through over the past 18 months really has given the Transportation Policy Body a sense about what the priorities should be for our region, and we'll be able to provide really good input to KDOT on projects that we think should be funded by that state transportation bill."

**Commissioner Welshimer** said, "Okay. Great. Thank you."

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, "Mr. Schlegel, I've got a couple of questions. On the handout, one of the short-term objectives was listed, 'Increase multimodal options and access,' could you give us all a quick definition of what a multimodal option is, and how we're going to increase it and access to it, I guess?"

**Mr. Schlegel** said, "That can happen in a number of different ways. One example might be to, that has been talked about, is how do you provide better, for example, better bus service to the airport terminal, so that somebody has that additional option of taking the bus to catch a flight at the airport. Or let's say, another way it came up during the discussions in this plan were if we do get passenger rail service into Wichita, how do people then debarking from the train get around within Wichita? You know, will taxis be available, will the bus be available, and so forth. Another example would be what the Wichita Transit is doing with bike racks on the buses now where you can ride your bike to the bus stop and then when the bus comes along, you put your bike on the front on the rack, and at the end of your bus ride, then you get off, retrieve your bike and ride on to your destination. Those are examples."

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, "Okay. A little further down the page under long-term it says, 'Increase the affordability of the transportation system for all users, recognizing identified populations in the Environmental Justice Policy,' can you explain to me what an Environmental Justice Policy is and how that fits into the overall plan?"

**Mr. Schlegel** said, "That comes under the heading of making sure that when you do provide transportation services that they are available to disadvantaged populations. It's a requirement that under federal law that we address that whole issue of environmental justice, that somebody that lives in a low income, distressed neighborhood has affordable access to the transportation system,

## Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010

and that's really a question of being able to provide mass transit service to those types of dependant populations. So in the plan we have to be able to address how the systems that are in place and are being proposed provide for that type of affordable access to those populations."

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, "Without going through page by page of the entire report, give us, if you don't have an exact number, a ballpark number, in terms of the number of projects that are listed in this long-term 25 year plan."

**Mr. Schlegel** said, "Hundreds."

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, "Hundreds?"

**Mr. Schlegel** said, "Hundreds. I don't have the exact figure but it's on the order of 300 to 400..."

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, "Okay..."

**Mr. Schlegel** said, "...different projects."

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, "...300 to 400. How would those numbers change if we moved from being in an attainment area like we currently are for air quality to a nonattainment area?"

**Mr. Schlegel** said, "Well the biggest impact of this region being designated for nonattainment for ozone will be in how the money is distributed among the projects that are recommended for funding, and that the first priority would be to projects that actually contribute to reducing pollutants and help to bring us into attainment status. So in the competition for project funding, those projects that are able to demonstrate that they would reduce congestion, for example, or would best reduce congestion, would score better than projects that didn't do as well in that regard. And then certainly things like mass transit would probably move up the priority list. I don't know that it would really reduce the number of projects, it would probably just change the priorities for which projects get funding first."



**Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010**

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, “Thank you. Any further questions? What’s the will of the Commission?”

**MOTION**

Commissioner Unruh moved to receive and file.

Commissioner Welshimer seconded the motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Unruh	Aye
Commissioner Norton	Aye
Commissioner Parks	Aye
Commissioner Welshimer	Aye
Chairman Peterjohn	Aye

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, “Thank you. Next item.”

**NEW BUSINESS**

**B. MODIFICATION TO DISTRICT ATTORNEY STAFFING TABLE.**

**Mr. John Waller**, Diversion Supervisor, District Attorney, greeted the Commissioners and said, “We are requesting a modification to the District Attorney staffing table that would impact a case coordinator position, number 20001989. We are recommending this position be increased from a part-time three-quarter-time position to full-time. This position works within our juvenile diversion and intervention programs which serve both juvenile offenders and truants. The position was created in 2001, and since that time it has been a three-quarter-time, 32 hour per week position with full benefits. We are requesting that this position be increased to full-time to enable it to serve more

**Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010**

clients annually. Our intervention programs went through a restructuring process, it started last year, and part of that plan was to increase this position to full-time. It is a grant funded position, there is no match required, therefore there is no budget impact. We recommend that you approve the request to make the position full-time. I would be happy to take any questions that you might have.”

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, “Thank you, Mr. Waller.”

**MOTION**

Commissioner Welshimer moved to approve request for grant funded position 20001989 from .75 FTE to 1.0 FTE.

Commissioner Unruh seconded the motion.

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, “Okay. Motion and a second, questions or comments? Commissioner Parks.”

**Commissioner Parks** said, “I’d like to ask the Manager how this fits in with what we might be looking at from his recommendations in the near future about moving more people to full-time employment.”

**Mr. William P. Buchanan**, County Manager, greeted the Commissioners and said, “Commissioners, as has been stated, this position is a grant funded position and doesn’t affect any real estate tax funded positions from Sedgwick County. This move is perfectly appropriate and I would recommend it.”

**Commissioner Parks** said, “And all the benefits are paid by the grant also?”

**Mr. Buchanan** said, “Yes, sir.”

**Commissioner Parks** said, “Thank you for the record.”

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, “Thank you. Seeing no further comments or questions, please call the vote.”

**VOTE**

Commissioner Unruh	Aye
Commissioner Norton	Aye

**Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010**

Commissioner Parks	Aye
Commissioner Welshimer	Aye
Chairman Peterjohn	Aye

**Mr. Waller** said, “Thank you.”

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, “Thank you. Next item.”

**C. CONTRACT WITH DCCCA INC. TO PROVIDE SHORT-TERM RESPITE AND PROFESSIONAL RESOURCE FAMILY CARE SERVICES.**

**Ms. Marilyn Cook**, Executive Director, COMCARE, greeted the Commissioners and said, “This is a contract with DCCCA Inc. to provide short-term respite and professional resource family care services. We have approached five different vendors to try to get these contracts in place, and there have not been a lot of people willing to do it, so we were very thrilled when DCCCA was willing to step up to the plate. The term resource family is a new term for a foster care family, so we don’t call them foster care families anymore, we call them resource families. Respite care services are those that provide direct care and supervision of children who have serious emotional disorders for the purpose of giving relief to the families and caregivers of these children. The service is in place to help both the family and the child, and the service can be provided up to 72 hours in the home of the child or elsewhere in the community. The professional resource family care supports are services intended to provide short-term intensive resources for youth and their families who are in some kind of crisis.”

“These services, the purpose is to stabilize the situation that the kids and the families are experiencing, and to try whatever possible to prevent a psychiatric hospitalization. And they utilize what they call co-parenting approach, where they will have a resource family, or a surrogate family where the child stays, and a child can stay up to 21 days in these environments with a goal of working toward a successful return to the family when that crisis is over. And during that time it’s mandated that resource families who are supporting these children have regular contact with the family to prepare them for the child’s return, so that can be a smooth transition. Without these community-based services, more of these children would be hospitalized, so we’re recommending that you approve the agreement, and authorize the Chairman to sign and authorize the necessary budget authority.”

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, “Thank you. Questions or comments for Ms. Cook? I would like to throw out a question concerning the, this is 100 percent state funded?”

## Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010

**Ms. Cook** said, "It is."

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, "And was part of the reason that you went through this was concern about the possibility with the state's fiscal problems that there might be challenges down the line, and perhaps you can go through exactly the duration of this grant?"

**Ms. Cook** said, "These are primarily Medicaid waiver services or services that come from our grant funding. All community mental health centers are mandated to provide a scope of services, and these two services are two of the services that we are mandated to provide, we've just had a difficult time getting someone to contract them. We will bill for these services and pay DCCCA for the services they provide. We are fortunate in that the 10 percent rate reduction for Medicaid did get restored effective July 1st, so that was very thrilling news for all of us. But it's not in place because of a budget crisis; it's in place because it's one of the array of services that we are to offer."

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, "Okay. Because looking through here, from my notation, I believe this contract's only through the end of this year; December 31st, I believe is the last day, am I correct in that?"

**Ms. Cook** said, "Yes, you are. We are doing that with all of our state contracts. We moved all of, we are negotiating the contract with the state right now that goes into effect July 1st, but since we have so many business partners, every year, up until this one, these contracts have been negotiated at the last minute and we're not sure what money we're getting, when we're getting it. So we moved all of our contracts with our community providers to be on the calendar year when we know what resources we have to work with."

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, "Thank you."

**Ms. Cook** said, "You're welcome."

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, "Commissioner Unruh."

**Commissioner Unruh** said, "Thank you. Marilyn, you mentioned that this was a mandated service that we offer. So we have been doing this previously for [inaudible] for several years?"

**Ms. Cook** said, "Well we've had some form of respite. The Wichita Children's Home has done some respite care for us. We've had contracts with other providers, but, for instance, UMY (United Methodist Youthville) had the contract, or the resource family contract, for a little while and then decided not to continue with it, so it's an array of services that every community mental health center needs to have in place. All of us have different environments and communities we work in,

**Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010**

so there is an understanding on the state's part that we provide this whenever possible and make every effort to make it possible."

**Commissioner Unruh** said, "Okay. Thank you."

**Ms. Cook** said, "You're welcome."

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, "Thank you. What's the will of the Commission?"

**MOTION**

Commissioner Unruh moved to approve the Agreement, authorize the Chairman to sign, and authorize the necessary budget authority.

Commissioner Parks seconded the motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Unruh	Aye
Commissioner Norton	Aye
Commissioner Parks	Aye
Commissioner Welshimer	Aye
Chairman Peterjohn	Aye

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

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

**D. PRESENTATION OF AN ENGINEERING EXCELLENCE AWARD FROM THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF ENGINEERING COMPANIES OF COLORADO (ACEC/COLORADO) AND AN HONOR AWARD FROM THE AMERICAN**

## Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010

### COUNCIL OF ENGINEERING COMPANIES (ACEC) FOR THE LEVEE CERTIFICATION USING GEOSPATIAL TECHNOLOGIES PROJECT.

**Mr. James Weber**, Deputy Director, Public Works, greeted the Commissioners and said, “I’ll try to be brief, but it might not work. Somebody can throw something at me if it goes too long. In 2006, the City of Wichita and Sedgwick County were notified that we would have to certify that the local levee system would meet federal standards. By February 2nd of 2007, Wichita, Haysville, Park City, Valley Center and Sedgwick County had entered into an agreement with FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency) that would allow the existing floodplain maps to remain in effect while we worked out the certification. We were the first community in the nation to enter into this type of agreement with FEMA and we weren’t really sure what steps would be required to complete the work. It quickly became obvious that we were going to need a massive survey project in order to meet the federal requirements. The city storm water staff concluded early on that aerial mapping would be the quickest and most cost-effective way to complete the survey of over 100 miles of the levee. They were also interested in getting good quality mapping of the city and the surrounding area. They contacted us to see if it might be possible to get the entire county mapped.”

**Mr. Weber** continued, “As the project developed, it became apparent that the mapping would be useful for both the government and private users. The economies of scale in a project of this type are significant given the cost to mobilize airplanes and expensive high-tech equipment to complete the work. The United States Geological Survey (USGS) expressed an interest and offered partial funding for the project. In January of 2008, we entered into an agreement with the City of Wichita to contract with a mapping company to collect data for all of Sedgwick County. Data was collected for the entire county in order to provide two foot elevation contours. In more critical areas in the City of Wichita, the data collection was more intense and was able to produce one foot elevation contours. The flight included new digital aerial photos of the entire county and they were then tied to the elevation data.

“After the selection process, the City of Wichita contracted with Merrick & Company out of Aurora, Colorado to perform the mapping. And during that same time frame, a separate selection process resulted in the hiring of AMEC Earth & Environmental to perform the engineering study to certify the levee system. Due to the stringent survey standards needed to meet the levee certification requirements and a desire to leverage the project to get the most out of the local investment, Merrick, AMEC, Wichita and Sedgwick County began to work together to better define the project

## **Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010**

goals and the work processes. The project was quite successful. The data is in use by AMEC to complete the levee certification study. City and county GIS, Geographical Information Systems, departments continue to employ new tools for use by both the private and the public sectors. Our own staff at Public Works uses this data on an almost daily basis to aid decision making, begin design work or solve problems.

“We knew it was a good project but perhaps we didn’t really know how good it was. Unbeknownst to us, Merrick & Company entered our mapping project for an Engineering Excellence Award from the American Council of Engineering Companies (ACEC) of Colorado. In November of 2009, Engineering Excellence Awards were given in eight categories in Colorado. Our project, now called Levee Certification Using Geospatial Technologies, won the Engineering Excellence Award in the Surveying and Mapping Technology division. This is the highest award that you can get at the state level. The project team for that includes Merrick & Company, AMEC Earth & Environmental, Sedgwick County and the City of Wichita, and I’ll show you that one. That would be this plaque here. Now we’ve had this one since January, but we’ve been holding back to see how things go.”

“I also left for all of you a copy of this two-sided sheet, the front of that is the actual poster that Merrick put together and submitted for the award competition, and then the back side is an executive summary. It was a very detailed application they had to submit, but this is just the quick picture. So as the winner of the Engineering Excellence Award at the state level, our project was then entered into the competition at the national level. A total of 163 state level winners were considered by a panel of 29 judges from academia, government agencies and large corporations. The judges selected 24 projects for national recognition. Out of that group, one would be named for the Grand Conceptor Award, seven for Grand Awards, and the remainder would receive an Honor Award. Those awards were presented at the annual meeting of the ACEC on April the 27th. I’m sorry to report to you that we did not win the Grand Conceptor Award. If you’re interested the big winner was the Gills Onion Advanced Energy Recovery System, which is a project that is making bio gas out of juice from waste onions and using it to run the onion plant. It’s a good project. Little hard to compete with.

“I’m also sorry to report to you that we did not win one of the seven Grand Awards. That group included the new Dallas Cowboys Stadium, a massive coastal highway project to serve the Winter Olympics at Whistler, British Columbia and five other equally deserving large projects. So why am I here today if we didn’t finish in the top eight? I’m here because we did finish in the top 24 with an Honor Award. I don’t have any documentation, but I would like to say, we’re number nine. I can,

## Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010

however, document the fact that our project was the only Surveying and Mapping Technology project to make it into the top 24, therefore, we did in fact have the top rated project in our division at the national level. I will show you the national award; John Rogers hasn't even seen this one yet. So this is the national award. It is basically the third tier down, but it's quite an achievement, I think.

“The project's been a cooperative effort and only became the award winning project that you see today because a number of government agencies and private sector companies worked together to make it happen. I'd like to take all the credit, but the fact is that I have essentially been a promoter living off the backs of a bunch of hardworking people. If you give me a few more minutes, I'd like to mention some of the key players. First, I'd like to recognize Kenny Legleiter and Brian Raber from Merrick & Company. They're not with us today, but they've worked on this project from the beginning. Kenny's a K-State [Kansas State University] graduate who's stuck working in Colorado. These gentlemen and their staff went the extra mile to not only meet the project specifications, but to help us develop a better project than was initially planned.”

**Mr. Weber** continued, “Scott Lindebak heads up the Storm Water [Management] department at the City of Wichita. Part of that role is to manage our jointly funded flood control operations. Scott's right in the middle of the whole levee certification project and Scott is the visionary who not only brought in the big ideas, but followed up with the detailed technical work that it took on the local side to get this project completed. Scott was the hub of the wheel for the whole project. Scott is in Oklahoma City today working on something else technical. He's not here with us. Stephen Noe, who I think many of you have met, is the project manager for AMEC Earth & Environmental for the levee accreditation project. After we contracted AMEC to work on the levee project, he and his team became very involved in the mapping project. Clearly one of the most important uses for this set of data is in the levee project. The AMEC team brought in yet another set of expertise and was able to help us clearly define the project needs at an early stage of Merrick's work. This has resulted in a very useful project that will meet our needs now and in the future.

“One of the important aspects of the project is that the data received from the flights is very accurate. Merrick & Company contracted with a local firm, the Savoy Company, to collect ground shots at a number of sites with varying ground and vegetation conditions to validate the flight data. I can tell you that the data from the flights hits consistently across the county within a matter of inches, and I can tell you that because Savoy has done the field work to prove it. The Sedgwick County and the City of Wichita GIS departments were instrumental in the project. Not only did they



## **Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010**

help write the specifications and plan the project, they've done the heavy lifting of checking data and deploying various products that have allowed, or will allow, general usage of the data. And I want to recognize John Rogers, he is with us today, apparently he doesn't have anything else to do, and his staff for their work for Sedgwick County and Todd Mayer and his staff for their work with the City of Wichita. You know, you get together with those GIS people, and it's a little geeky, but they know what they're doing.

"I dragged a number of Public Works staffers into the project. In particular I'd like to thank Kent Taylor, who's our Network Administrator, and Tricia Robello, who's our Deputy County Surveyor, for their effort that they put in in making this a successful project. And I also want to recognize Dave Spears for his early and constant support of the project. And one of the nice things about Dave is sometimes he just gets out of my way, and I appreciate that. Finally, I would like to recognize the Board of County Commissioners for seeing the vision. Unfortunately, Commissioner Peterjohn wasn't on the board yet and missed the staff meeting where I stood here and used a couple of pieces of acrylic artwork, and a piece of the USGS map to try to explain how LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) mapping was going to work."

"If you haven't seen the mapping in action, I suggest that you visit John Rogers and the GIS staff, they can do amazing things with it and they keep working to add functionality. And the little handout that you have, on the front of that poster there are three or four different versions of GIS images, things that they can do with it. That's not everything they can do, that's just that's the easy stuff. The project costs approximately \$900,000. The US Geological Survey contributed about \$150,000 of the project, and the city and the county split the rest. Our investment was approximately \$385,000, and in my opinion, it was a very good investment. It will be used to complete the levee project to provide updated flood maps around the levee system and a separate project that's being used in a restudy of the Cowskin Creek basin in northwest Wichita, which will produce another piece of the new flood maps in the county. FEMA is currently writing a project scope to update the flood maps for the entire county, the data provided by the mapping project, which you've already paid for, will be used as a local match to fund the new project. Local engineers, architects, contractors are using it every day to develop projects and solve problems, and new ideas come up all the time. The recommended action is to receive and file the awards. I'd be happy to try to answer any questions. If they get very detailed, I'm probably going to defer to John Rogers."

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, "Thank you."

### **MOTION**

## Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010

Commissioner Parks moved to receive and file.

Commissioner Welshimer seconded the motion.

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, "We've got a motion and a second. Commissioner Welshimer."

**Commissioner Welshimer** said, "Without our GIS system, we probably could not have done this, right?"

**Mr. Weber** said, "Absolutely not."

**Commissioner Welshimer** said, "And I'm interested in you saying that GIS pulled together a lot of the data that went into this. On top of our area, it was our aerials that were used, right?"

**Mr. Weber** said, "Actually we had new aerials that were provided with this data. They're digital for the first time, and so they are exactly tied between the digital aerial and the three dimensional coordinates that we have for all these ground points."

**Commissioner Welshimer** said, "Well I'm so pleased to know that we have received recognition for this, because what we do have in our GIS system is something very unique and very useful for many, many purposes, equal to this and maybe even more beneficial for our economic development here. And so I'm a great supporter of our mapping and our computerization that goes along with it. And I guess I get impatient from time to time wanting to see more of this, more of this type of success, come from there. And so, anyway, I'm just very pleased with the fact that this did receive an award and I hope that we have more to come. Thank you."

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

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, "Commissioner Parks."

**Commissioner Parks** said, "I would like to congratulate the staff on this award. Now, this is the LCLUGTP award, is that the acronym we're using for that then?"

**Mr. Weber** said, "I haven't put one together for it."

**Commissioner Parks** said, "Okay. So the onion factory beat the Dallas Cowboys Stadium, that's interesting."

## Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010

**Mr. Weber** said, “Yes, it did. And the building in Dubai, believe it or not, didn’t make the top eight. So they’ve got all kinds of money in Dubai, so you’d think every project they did would be a winner.”

**Commissioner Parks** said, “You’d think. I’m going to say about the same thing I did on a couple of the last things about the public being able to use this also. Now the digital aerial photographs, are they incorporated somewhere on the county website, or will they be soon, or will [inaudible]?”

**Mr. Weber** said, “I’ll take a shot at this. The digital aerial photographs are currently out on the county website, in fact, you can look at the 2008 digitals, you can go back and look at 2006 and maybe 2003, maybe even 2000, but you can look at several versions of aerial photographs. What’s not available out of this package is some of the more technical stuff is not available yet on their website. For example, the elevation data. But they’ve made it available, basically, I don’t know, there are probably 20 or 25 sets of the full set of data points out there. Consulting engineers and people that would use them have brought in a hard drive, a portable drive about the size of a hardback book, drop it off and give these guys or the city about 12 to 15 hours to try to load all that data down, and then they walk out with a complete set. That’s what we’re working off of down in Public Works, so we have access to all the data.”

“And just so you’ll know, there are several billion data points in that set. In the county, where we’ve done two foot contours, they basically had a laser beam hit the ground on average every five feet. So there are a million data points in every square mile. In the urbanized area, where they were going for two foot spread on the data points, I haven’t done the math, but that’s got to be two or three times, probably two and a half times as many points in there. And part of it is, we have this massive data set that includes the top of this building, tree tops and everything, and as people find other needs, they can go back to that complete data set and refilter it to get what they need out of it. For example, we had a meeting with a radio consultant this week, and mentioned to them if they are needing to know what the skyline looks like, the data is in the data set. Now I don’t know if it’s useful for them or not, but that’s just an example. We’ve collected a massive amount of data and it’s just up to people to figure out what to do with it and how to get it deployed.”

**Commissioner Parks** said, “Well certainly even farmers in their cropland farming, recently a guy that had 80 acres was interested in some elevations, so that might be good for him to be able to know where his low spots are to try to...”

**Mr. Weber** said, “Sure.”

**Commissioner Parks** said, “...eliminate those or something.”

## Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010

**Mr. Weber** said, "That's one of the things we use it for. And I think, again, if someone needs something like that, they just need to get ahold of John Rogers and his staff at GIS, and they've been easy to work with for people to get a plot of, you know, an [inaudible] or a quarter section, or whatever they need."

**Commissioner Parks** said, "Okay. And how, on those digital aerials, how far can you zoom in on those? I mean, can we tell if it's a Ford or Chevy in your driveway?"

**Mr. Weber** said, "Probably not that good..."

**Commissioner Parks** said, "Okay."

**Mr. Weber** said, "...you can tell there's a white car sitting in your driveway, or a red car, you can tell it's a car. If you come in too far it starts to pixelate. Right? Yes. I've got all kinds of help back here. But we have that problem even with the regular photos as well, because they're just digitized into the system. But it is amazing the detail that you can pick up on a property, or if you have the elevation data combined with an aerial photo, you can really tell what's going on."

**Commissioner Parks** said, "Okay. Thank you."

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, "Thank you. Mr. Weber, the technology is very impressive, but the bottom line, basically, as far as I am concerned, is obviously getting the recertification in place and avoiding having businesses and homeowners having to pay extra for flood insurance unnecessarily, and having this tool available, how much will this speed up our process and give us an advantage, in terms of lowering the cost? Because we're looking at, if my recollection is right, we're spending a little over a million dollars a year, and our counterparts at the City of Wichita are spending a little over a million a year, and last year we both spent \$4 million each, so you combine it over two years, we're looking at a price tag of over \$10 million total with what's been appropriated in the last two budget years. So if you can put it in that bigger picture context, I'd appreciate having that information as well. So let me throw that out and then I'm going to make a suggestion concerning one place where the awards can be displayed, since they do have a fairly expensive price tag that I've just given."

**Mr. Weber** said, "I don't know that we actually have an estimate of what it would have cost to do an on the ground survey of that system, but considering the fact that it would have required complete cross sections of all 100, I think it was really closer to 110 miles of the levee, have to do a complete cross sections of the levee, that's a lot of shots, that's people on the ground, I think it's probably, to do it in the time frame that we needed to do it in would have been multiple survey crews trying to get it done. A crew these days is basically two people and a vehicle. Those things,

## Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010

you know, we used to think our own crew ran probably \$75 an hour in the field; it's probably a lot higher than that now. I can't give you an estimate for what that would have cost. I can tell you it would have been more expensive than the \$900,000 that we've spent here.

"The other thing about it is, because we have so much detail for the money that we spent, it's been very helpful in the project because they were able to get the process data in, do an overall map of the entire system, and with some computer trickery that I can't do, quickly identify the areas that were, they literally would've took the old construction plans, overlaid them on top of this stuff, and you could tell places where maybe settlement had occurred and the systems they're using will basically color in the hotspots. And one of the things that Stephen Noe talked to us about earlier was let's do the worst first. Let's find the worst spots that we absolutely know have to have something done to them and get started with the design and construction on those projects. This was able to make that happen very quickly. The other thing that's nice about this is, that we now have a record, a sort of snapshot in time, of what things looked like in 2008. We know that on some 10 year cycle, we are probably going to have to recertify the levee system. Every 10 years this is going to come up. I can't tell you if they'll clock it to the day we actually make the certification, if they'll clock it to '07, but it's going to happen."

"And we're going to have to do this again. The nice thing about this is, since we have this in place in a digital format, we could come back, fly it again, process all that, lay that digital image on the 2008 image, hit the color and tell you, hey, it all matches perfectly, or here's a spot that's two inches too low, and we'd be very directed about everything that we ever do out there in the future. You do have to go out in the field and it won't do everything. The limitation is this, I know there's a shot out there every five feet but I don't know if it hit the low spot right at the front of that pipe. So if we have a structure, we still on the levee project had to have surveyors go out in the field and shoot the hard points at the end of the structures, the critical points. That's something we'll still have to do, but in terms of ongoing maintenance, it will be easy for the flood control staff to see what things look like in 2008. We can do a little field survey if there was a blowout on the levee or something. You can splice that data right back into this set and it becomes a seamless set. It just, from this point forward, I don't know if I'm going to say it's going to reduce your maintenance costs, but I think it could, just because the engineering will go faster and will be more accurate."

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, "I think that's a very positive benefit to make note of. And I just would mention that we have in the County Commission office, and it's available and open to the public, a display case for various awards that the county has received at one point or another. If there are other places down at Public Works or anywhere else at the county, they can certainly rotate too. But I just mention that as a place to display them and where they could be visible from the public for those very nice awards that you showed earlier."

**Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010**

**Mr. Weber** said, “Well thank you. I think it’s been an important project. It’s not a real expensive project. The part that kind of surprises me is if you look at the projects that were in the competition, I’m not going to say it was the least expensive project in there but it wasn’t an expensive project. Big winners tend to be big expensive projects. This one is a winner because it was effective, it met its goals and it was innovative. And fact of the matter is that Merrick had trouble working in this part of the country because it is so flat. These guys fly flights all over the world but they struggled a little bit, and that’s part of what made this project special because we had to get together and work with everybody to try to figure out how to make this all work here.”

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, “Thank you. Seeing no further questions or comments, have a motion to receive and file, please call the vote.”

**VOTE**

Commissioner Unruh	Aye
Commissioner Norton	Aye
Commissioner Parks	Aye
Commissioner Welshimer	Aye
Chairman Peterjohn	Aye

**Mr. Weber** said, “Thank you.”

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, “Thank you. Next item.”

**E. RESOLUTION DESIGNATING AND CLASSIFYING CERTAIN STREETS TO THE TOWNSHIP SYSTEM. DISTRICT 3.**

**Mr. David Spears**, Director, Public Works, greeted the Commissioners and said, “It is standard procedure that after a road is constructed within a platted residential subdivision in accordance with county standards, that road is then assigned to the township road system. In this particular case, Garden Lane and Spring Drive will become the responsibility of Afton Township. The Afton Township Board was informed that this resolution would be on the Agenda by letter dated April 26. And I recommend that you adopt the resolution.”

**Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010**

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, “Thank you. And that is in my district and I will make that motion.”

**MOTION**

Chairman Peterjohn moved to adopt the Resolution.

Commissioner Welshimer seconded the motion.

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, “We have a motion and a second, is there anyone in the public who wishes to discuss this issue? Seeing none, are there any questions or comments for Mr. Spears? Seeing none, please call the vote.”

**VOTE**

Commissioner Unruh	Aye
Commissioner Norton	Aye
Commissioner Parks	Aye
Commissioner Welshimer	Aye
Chairman Peterjohn	Aye

**Mr. Spears** said, “Thank you.”

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, “Next item.”

**F. REPORT OF THE BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS’ REGULAR MEETING  
ON MAY 20, 2010.**

**Ms. Iris Baker**, Director, Purchasing, greeted the Commissioners and said, “The meeting of May 20th results in five items for consideration today. First item;

- 1. LAKE AFTON RESTROOM/SHOWER BUILDING – CONCRETE WORK –  
FACILITIES DEPARTMENT  
FUNDING – REPLACE PIT TOILET – LAKE AFTON PARK**

**Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010**

“Recommendation is to accept the low responsive bid from Hahner Foreman & Harness, LLC in the amount of \$11,430. Item 2;

2. **LAKE AFTON RESTROOM/SHOWER BUILDING – PLUMBING – FACILITIES DEPARTMENT  
FUNDING – REPLACE PIT TOILET – LAKE AFTON PARK**

“Recommendation is to accept the low responsive bid from Brand Plumbing, Inc. in the amount of \$20,454. Item 3;

3. **TRACKED EXCAVATOR – FLEET MANAGEMENT  
FUNDING – FLEET MANAGEMENT**

“The recommendation is to accept the proposal from Foley Equipment in the amount of \$268,877 and establish contract pricing for three years on parts and labor. Item 4;

4. **LAPTOP COMPUTERS – APPRAISER  
FUNDING – APPRAISER ADMINISTRATION**

“The recommendation is to accept the quote from Dell in the amount of \$33,936.60. And Item 5;

5. **NCAT FURNITURE & CHAIRS – FACILITIES DEPARTMENT  
FUNDING – NCAT FURNITURE FIXTURES & EQUIPMENT**

“That recommendation is to accept the quote from John A. Marshall in the amount of \$176,387.13. We’d be happy to any questions and I recommend approval of these items.”

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, “Thank you. Questions or comments for Ms. Baker?”

**MOTION**

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

Commissioner Unruh seconded the motion.

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

**VOTE**



**Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010**

Commissioner Unruh	Aye
Commissioner Norton	Aye
Commissioner Parks	Aye
Commissioner Welshimer	Aye
Chairman Peterjohn	Aye

**Ms. Baker** said, “Thank you.”

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, “Next item.”

**G. CONSENT AGENDA**

- 1. ZON2007-67 – Extension of time to complete platting requirement for a zone change from SF-20 Single-family Residential to LC Limited Commercial; generally located on the southwest corner of 21<sup>st</sup> Street North and 159<sup>th</sup> Street East. District 1.**
- 2. Master lease agreement and lease of two fire trucks.**
- 3. General Bill Check Register of may 12, 2010 – may 18, 2010.**
- 4. Payroll Check Register for the week of may 8, 2010.**

**Mr. Buchanan** said, “Commissioners, you have the Consent Agenda before you and I would recommend you approve it.”

**MOTION**

Commissioner Unruh moved to approve the Consent Agenda.

Commissioner Welshimer seconded the motion.

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

**Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010**

**VOTE**

Commissioner Unruh	Aye
Commissioner Norton	Aye
Commissioner Parks	Aye
Commissioner Welshimer	Aye
Chairman Peterjohn	Aye

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, "Next item."

**H. OTHER**

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, "Commissioner Parks."

**Commissioner Parks** said, "I had an opportunity yesterday to see the City of Wichita's Air Quality department in action and utilize that when I was down at the [Pro Kansas] Miller Recycling [Center] recycling the very few things that Stutzman [Environmental Services Recycling Center] doesn't pick up curbside at my house. I happened to see a van over there from the City of Wichita just across the street and they were doing air quality tests. And when I took my 1995 Corsica 2.24 cylinder car through there, they said it was amazingly about like a new car. So I guess I'm doing the right things and my mechanic that works on that vehicle can be commended for that. Did want to say that these times of air quality attainment that we're working towards, I appreciate the City of Wichita doing that project and finding those vehicles that are out there that are getting us closer to the nonattainment of the air quality that EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) is so stringent upon.

"Also, I'd like to say, I'll leave a little bit of it for Commissioner Peterjohn, but because we share this portion of the roadway, and potential bridge and former bridge, and on 119th, north of Maize, there's going to be a meeting tomorrow night. It's a public review and comment meeting. And I think those are very important for the public to be able to comment on those things considering the 119th Street bridge, and if David Spears would like to add anything, I would yield to him also. But these are things that something has been in the works and then been off, and we've been discussing that, or this body has been discussing it for 20 years or more. Go ahead if you would on that..."

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, "Mr. Spears."

**Mr. Spears** said, "I just want to say the meeting's tomorrow night, Thursday, 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. at Maize City Hall."

## Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010

**Commissioner Parks** said, “Maize City Hall, 6:00 to 8:00. And that’s kind of a come and go thing?”

**Mr. Spears** said, “Yes. It’s not a formal presentation. We’re going to have stations set up and people will be there from EMS (Emergency Medical Services), Fire Department, Sheriff and our staff will be there and will be there to answer questions and have various things to show folks. For example, different amounts of time it takes in an emergency to get from point A to point B if you have the bridge and if you don’t have the bridge. Items like that.”

**Commissioner Parks** said, “Yeah. And I have been contacted by farmers in the area, residents in that area. A developer contacted me back about six months ago. So this is important to the area up there and for us to get the input so we can make an informed decision for the public on that. Also, we did have the 2035 plan and the public review comment section is still open on that. If we can get as much public input from the highways and byways that surround our community and our county, that’s good. However, this is an excellent opportunity also for those people that have contacted me over the last three or four years that say we really need to get a bus service in north Wichita. If you live along 53rd or near 53rd in the City of Wichita, now is the time to step forward and be heard on those issues for getting a bus service up to that area. That’s all I have. Thank you.”

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, “Thank you. I’m going to jump in with some comments and segue off the Maize bridge, let me rephrase that, 119th Street bridge. It was the old Hultman Bridge, I believe. And this would be north of Maize, and one of the factors that is going into this is the City of Wichita is putting in a water project on 119th Street North, north of the river, and there’s going to be some changes going on there which may or may not be a significant factor on this issue. I’d like to just give a quick report, in terms of where we are with the jail, because today we had 1,512 in the Sedgwick County Jail this morning; 145 of those were in Work Release and 229 were out of county. And while I can’t give you a breakdown, in terms of convicted versus charged, or misdemeanors versus felons, I can say that 454 are being treated as maximum security, 429 are medium security, 574 are minimum security and the rest are listed in the other category. And those numbers are really pretty close to, fairly close to where we were with the numbers I gave last week.

“I also last week discussed the fact that some of the fiscal challenges we’ve had, and since that time we’ve had additional information discussing this, and that revenues are down on a variety of revenue sources for the county, and that’s going to make our environment and our budget

## Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010

challenges going forward much more difficult. And I pass that along because I think that that's going to be true for all the local governments that are dependent in various forms on property tax revenues here within Sedgwick County. And that's my 'other' comments for today; I'm going to turn this over to Commissioner Welshimer."

**Commissioner Welshimer** said, "Well to follow-up on what you're saying, 229 out of county, I think we had a little over 400 last year out of county and we appropriated an extra million dollars to cover that obligation, and so we may be able to make an adjustment to that with all the efforts we've put into reducing the jail population, so that might save us a little bit there. I attended a meeting last night in Derby at the new Derby [Public] Library where Derby, and Mulvane and the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission have been working together over several months and have come up with their plan for whose jurisdiction, what part of the area between those two cities, which city will move into those areas and have jurisdiction. They've worked very hard at this and have had several public meetings. Last night the Derby citizens and Mulvane people came in to see the plans. So far it's worked out very well and hasn't been a lot of controversy over it, so I think they've worked it out and it's going to be a good thing for both communities. That's all I have."

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, "Thank you. Commissioner Unruh."

**Commissioner Unruh** said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just in the discussion about the jail populations, I just wanted to make a comment that public safety, as we deal with different violators in the community, is not inexpensive and it takes a really multifaceted approach to manage that population. Although the numbers you have recited are accurate and they do show some relief from the overpowering numbers we had a few years ago, I think we need to remember that since 2007 we've initiated alternatives to incarceration, including the Day Reporting Center, Sedgwick County Offender Assessment Program and a Drug Court. And just those three programs, which since 2007 have proven very effective, I think they presently have approximately 450 individuals that are being serviced in those programs.

"And it's not cheap; on an annual basis I think we have approximately \$4 million budgeted for just those three. But as we look at the issue of our incarcerated populations and those who are under some sort of sanctions, it is more than just what's in our jail and what's in out-of-county housing.

## Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010

We also would recognize the fact that we've increased our usage of our Pretrial [Services] Program also, which since this time last year, we probably have another 80 individuals who are being supervised in that program. So overall population, when you add those numbers all together, probably those folks who are violators of our community standards and law, those total numbers haven't gone down, we've just done a good job through the leadership of the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council of managing that population in better and effective ways."

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, "Commissioner Unruh, Commissioner Welshimer, I want to segue off both of your comments, because I agree with them and I also think that it's important to talk about the fact that, I mean Community Corrections has well over a thousand people, and I know that last month, or I should say earlier this month, I believe, Pretrial Services set another record with over 300 people that they had in their program. And so we have dramatically increased those numbers and I don't know, I'm not as conversant with the numbers before I joined the County Commission, but I will say this, in October of last year, we had one day where we had, I believe, 1,759 people that the Sheriff had in custody in various places.

"And I think when we voted a supplemental appropriation last year; I think it was actually more closer to two million for the Sheriff rather than a million. So you are both right that we have put additional resources in there in trying to keep this community safe at as reasonable a price as possible as a continuing and ongoing challenge. And I know the Sheriff has a difficult job, in terms of with the large number of people he has, and our Community Corrections folks have a difficult challenge with the large number of people they have. And you add all those numbers together; I still think we're looking at possibly as much as two percent of the population here in Sedgwick County that's in adjudication. Commissioner Welshimer."

**Commissioner Welshimer** said, "Well I'd like to ask the Manager, Mr. Buchanan, when the Sheriff came in for the extra money, a million, two million, I'm not sure what that was, I was thinking it was one million, it was strictly for out of county increase in the inmates that went out of county that would pay other counties for housing them?"

**Mr. Buchanan** said, "Yes, ma'am."

**Commissioner Welshimer** said, "Okay. So we had over 400, maybe close to 500 at the time?"

**Mr. Buchanan** said, "It was closer to 400, I believe."

**Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010**

**Commissioner Welshimer** said, “Okay. And now we have 229 and it has been going down steadily. And so, that money can, I would think, be used in other areas, be it within the Sheriff’s budget, as Commissioner Unruh has brought forward, but in any case, it will help us from having to add another million for this next year’s budget.”

**Mr. Buchanan** said, “Yes, it will.”

**Commissioner Welshimer** said, “Okay. Thank you.”

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, “Seeing no further comments from up here, I’m going to without objection recess this meeting and call the meeting of the Fire District #1. And without objection, Board of County Commissioners will be in recess from this meeting.”

**The Board of County Commissioners recessed into the meeting of the Fire District #1 at 10:20 a.m. and returned at 10:32 a.m.**

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, “And we are returning to the Board of County Commissioners, and seeing no further discussion on anything before us, I’ll entertain a motion to adjourn this meeting.”

**MOTION**

Commissioner Welshimer moved to adjourn.

Chairman Peterjohn seconded the motion.

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

**VOTE**

Commissioner Unruh	Aye
Commissioner Norton	Aye
Commissioner Parks	Aye
Commissioner Welshimer	Aye
Chairman Peterjohn	Aye

**Chairman Peterjohn** said, “We are adjourned.”

**I. ADJOURNMENT**

**Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010**

There being no other business to come before the Board, the Meeting was adjourned at 10:33 a.m.

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
**KARL PETERJOHN**, Chairman  
Third District

\_\_\_\_\_  
**DAVID M. UNRUH**, Commissioner  
First District

\_\_\_\_\_  
**TIM R. NORTON**, Commissioner  
Second District

\_\_\_\_\_  
**KELLY PARKS**, Commissioner  
Fourth District

\_\_\_\_\_  
**GWEN WELSHIMER**, Commissioner  
Fifth District

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Kelly B. Arnold**, County Clerk

APPROVED:

**Regular Meeting, May 26, 2010**

June 9, 2010