

SEDGWICK COUNTY
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN FIVE-YEAR UPDATE

Submitted to:

The Kansas Department of Health and Environment

By:

**The Sedgwick County Board of County Commissioners and
The Sedgwick County Solid Waste Management Committee**

June 2023



Sedgwick County...
working for you

This page intentionally left blank.

Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
DEMOGRAPHICS.....	1
COUNTY DESCRIPTION	2
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE	2
MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE.....	3
Waste Analysis	3
MSW Collection.....	4
Solid Waste Trends	5
SW Disposal.....	6
SOLID WASTE REDUCTION	7
Amount recycled in Sedgwick County.....	7
Drop-off recycling	8
Curbside recycling.....	8
Composting in Sedgwick County.....	8
Management of grass clippings	9
MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS FOR SPECIFIC WASTES.....	9
Drug Drop Off.....	9
Household Hazardous Waste.....	9
Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generators	10
Construction & Demolition (C&D) Materials	11
Storm Debris	11
Christmas Trees.....	12
Special Cleanup Programs.....	12
Bulky Waste	12

Electronic Waste	12
Sharps/Medical Waste	12
White Goods	13
Waste Tires	13
Batteries.....	13
Dead Animals	14
KDHE SOLID WASTE PERMITS IN THE LAST 5 YEARS.....	14
KDHE GRANT APPLICATIONS IN THE LAST 5 YEARS	14
PUBLIC EDUCATION	15
SOLID WASTE FEE.....	15
SOLID WASTE PROJECTS IN THE LAST 5 YEARS	15
HEARINGS.....	16
TIMELINE	16
APPENDICES	
GEOGRAPHICAL AND GEOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SEDGWICK COUNTY.....	APPENDIX A
REGIONAL GROWTH PATTERNS AND LOCAL TRANSPORTATION NETWORKS.....	APPENDIX B
SEDGWICK COUNTY DEBRIS MANAGEMENT PLAN.....	APPENDIX C

INTRODUCTION

K.S.A. 65-3405 requires the development of county solid waste management plans. This report is a required five-year update to the plan and evaluates the current plan, highlights events and changes to solid waste over the past 5 years and provides direction for solid waste planning for the next 10 years.

DEMOGRAPHICS

Sedgwick County consists of 20 incorporated cities and 26 unincorporated townships. Over 75% of the County's population lives in Wichita. U.S. Census Bureau data shows that Sedgwick County's estimated population in 2021 (the most recent data available) was 523,828. Population is expected to grow 0.4% per year through year 2030, expanding to approximately 531,888 citizens. Table 1 shows 2020 actual census data and 2021 census data (estimated) for Sedgwick County and the cities within Sedgwick County.

Table 1 - Population for Cities in Sedgwick County			
City	2020	2021	% change
Andale	941	938	-0.3%
Bel Aire	8,262	7,661	3.0%
Bentley	560	517	-1.2%
Cheney	2,181	2,165	0.3%
Clearwater	2,653	2,519	-0.7%
Colwich	1,455	1,398	1.5%
Derby	25,625	23,633	0.5%
Eastborough	756	761	-0.9%
Garden Plain	948	894	-0.3%
Goddard	5,084	4,710	-0.2%
Haysville	11,262	11,245	0.3%
Kechi	2,217	1,995	-0.1%
Maize	5,735	4,438	1.7%
Mt. Hope	806	807	-0.7%
Mulvane	6,286	6,316	0.0%
Park City	8,333	7,632	0.2%
Sedgwick	1,603	1,695	-0.7%
Valley Center	7,340	7,343	1.7%
Viola	115	130	0.8%
Wichita	397,532	389,902	0.2%
Sedgwick County Total	523,824	523,828	0.0%

COUNTY DESCRIPTION

The physical characteristics of Sedgwick County have not changed since the original plan. Appendix A contains the topography and geology of Sedgwick County. Regional growth patterns and local transportation networks information are included in Appendix B, "Community Investments Plan...a framework for the future, 2015-2035". This comprehensive plan was approved by the Sedgwick County Board of Commissioners on January 20, 2016.

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE


Sedgwick County's Solid Waste Management Committee consists of 16 members, including 10 members that are required by state statute, one appointment by each of the five County Commissioners, and one member to be the non-voting chair of the committee. Table 2 identifies the members of the Sedgwick County Solid Waste Management Committee and their associations. The committee meets as business items dictate.

Table 2 - Sedgwick County Solid Waste Management Committee	
Representing	Member Name
Cities of 1st Class	Alex Dean
Cities of 1st Class	Hannah Chegwiddden
Cities of 2nd Class	Tom Jones
Cities of 3rd Class	Terry Somers
Unincorporated Areas	Clem Dickerson
General Public	Kay Drennen
Citizen's Organizations	Susanne Boese
Private Industry	
Private Solid Waste Industry	
Private Recycling/Scrap	Keith Shaw
Sedgwick County Recycling	Cindy Le
Commission District #1	Nancy Larson
Commission District #2	Tony Martinez
Commission District #3	
Commission District #4	
Commission District #5	Angela Massions
Chairperson (non-voting)	Nicki Soice

MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE

Waste Analysis

The Sedgwick County Solid Waste Management Committee deemed a new waste analysis was not advisable at their 5/1/23 meeting. A waste analysis performed in 2008-2009 found the following waste composition:



MSW Collection

The solid waste management system in Sedgwick County is private sector driven. Eleven businesses were licensed to haul non-hazardous waste in 2022, and a new business was added in the first quarter of 2023. Best Value Services discontinued trash service in October, 2022. Table 3 lists these businesses.

Table 3 – Businesses licensed to haul non-hazardous waste		
<i>Name</i>	<i>Address</i>	
Allen and Sons Waste Services	3645 W. Esthner	Wichita, KS 67213
Ballinger Trash Service	405 N Baehr	Wichita, KS 67212
*Best Value Services	200 W. Douglas, Ste 600	Wichita, KS 67202
<i>1-800-JUNKPRO</i>	608 S Ramsey Dr	Valley Center, KS 67147
<i>Junk Boys</i>	P.O. Box 47912	Wichita, KS 67201
M.T McCray Sanitation	P.O. Box 8460	Wichita, KS 67208
Moran Trash Service	2847 N Arkansas	Wichita, KS 67204
Nisly Brothers, Inc.	5212 S Herren Rd	Hutchinson, KS 67501
On-Site, Inc. dba Waste Link/Air Capital	5720 N Broadway	Wichita, KS 67219
Waste Connections Inc. of Kansas	2745 N Ohio	Wichita, KS 67219
Waste Management of Wichita	4330 W 31 st St S	Wichita, KS 67205
Wheat State Disposal	3525 W 30 th St S	Wichita, KS 67217

*Went out of business

Businesses in *green* do not provide curbside residential trash collection

Solid Waste Trends

County leaders support local communities' efforts to reduce the cost and increase services for solid waste collection. Sedgwick County recognizes that cities should make their own decisions in regards to waste disposal. Sedgwick County does recognize the advantage of waste hauler contracts that will reduce road wear and tear, reduce air emissions, reduce disposal costs and increase services such as curbside recycling, volume-based trash rates and bulky waste collections.

Table 4 shows the solid waste collection details for all cities in Sedgwick County. Approximately 5.6% of the Sedgwick County population live in a city without a solid waste collection contract of some sort.

Table 4 – City Solid Waste Collection/Curbside Recycling Arrangements, June 2022		
City	Solid Waste Collection Details	Curbside Recycling
Andale	Contract with Waste Connections	MSVP - CSR
Bel Aire	Preferred vendor is Waste Connections, volume based rates	MSVP - CSR
Bentley	Contract with Waste Connections	MSVP–CSR
Cheney	Contract with Waste Connections	MSVP -CSR
Clearwater	Contract with Waste Connections	MSVP -CSR
Colwich	Free market	Free market
Derby	Contract with Waste Connections, volume based rates	MSVP -CSR
Eastborough	Contract with Waste Connections, volume based rates	CSR
Garden Plain	Contract with Waste Connections	MSVP - CSR
Goddard	Free market	Free market
Haysville	Free market	Free market
Kechi	Preferred vendor is Waste Connections	MSVP - CSR
Maize	Free market	Free market
Mount Hope	Contract with Waste Connections	MSVP -CSR
Mulvane	Free market	Free market
Park City	Preferred vendor is Waste Connections	MSVP -CSR
Sedgwick	Contract with Waste Connections, volume based rates	MSVP -CSR
Valley Center	Contract with Waste Connections, volume based rates	MSVP - CSR
Viola	Contract with Waste Connections	MSVP -CSR
Wichita	Contract with all haulers, volume based rates	Hauler must offer single stream CSR

MSVP – Mandatory Subscription, Voluntary Participation

CSR – Curb Side Recycling

SW Disposal

On May 1, 2023, the Solid Waste Management Committee reaffirmed their commitment to using transfer stations as the disposal option for solid waste. They also reaffirmed their commitment to siting a local, County-owned landfill and exploring the integration of new waste technologies. The Solid Waste Management Committee strongly encourages the opening of a transfer station on the south side of Sedgwick County.

Waste Connections Transfer Station, located at 4300 W. 37th Street North, handles on average 1,198 tons per day of MSW plus an additional 1,149 tons of single-stream recycling per month based on their operating days. This transfer station is open to the public and was designed to a capacity of handling 3,000 tons per day. On August 1, 2019, Waste Disposal Transfer Station, located at 55th Street South and Hoover Road, stopped operations. In 2021, Waste Connections Inc. of Kansas purchased the Waste Disposal Transfer Station. As of this date, the facility remains closed. The excess capacity available at both transfer stations gives Sedgwick County ample room for population growth and new industry over the next 10 years. The transfer stations are randomly inspected on a weekly basis by Sedgwick County staff to check operational practices.

Waste Connections Transfer Station reported that 386,925 tons of solid waste was received at their facility during 2022, which is a 4.2% decrease from the previous year.

The MSW was transferred to Plumb Thicket Landfill in Harper County for final disposal. The Plumb Thicket Landfill has a site life of 44 years at current volumes. Figure 1 shows Sedgwick County MSW disposal trends for the past five years. A 10-year trend shows a decline:

- 2012 - 405,059 tons
- 2017 - 396,902 tons
- 2022 - 386,925 tons





Figure 2 shows the amount of MSW generated per person per day in Sedgwick County for the past 5 years. The EPA national amount is 4.9 pounds per person per day.



SOLID WASTE REDUCTION


Sedgwick County encourages citizens to recycle and reduce waste. The Solid Waste Management Committee recommends that Sedgwick County works with recycling facilities to determine the types of contaminants received, and educate the public on proper recycling.

Amount recycled in Sedgwick County

Tonnage reports for the materials shipped for recycling in 2022 were submitted by four material recovery facilities in the county. Waste Connections Recycling Facility shipped 13,788 tons; International Paper shipped 40,367 tons; Pratt Industries shipped 12,668 tons; and PRo Kansas Recycling shipped 452 tons.

The total reported by the facilities is 67,265 tons, which is a 34.7% increase from the previous year. Sedgwick County's combined commercial and residential recycling trends for the past 5 years are shown in Figure 3. A 10-year trend shows an increase:

2012 – 50,051 tons
 2017 – 65,374 tons
 2022 – 67,265 tons



Drop-off recycling

International Paper has drop-off boxes for fiber products in their parking lot. These drop-off boxes are for use by the general public. PRo Kansas Recycling accepts some types of plastic containers, plastic bags, mixed paper, metals, books, and glass.

Curbside recycling

In Sedgwick County, single-stream curbside recycling collection is offered by all haulers. The collection is either provided by the individual haulers or contracted through a 2nd party hauler. Obtaining data on the number of residential customers using curbside recycling service is difficult due to the number of haulers in our area.

Composting in Sedgwick County

Brooks Construction and Demolition Landfill is open to the public and operates a compost site at their location at 4100 North West Street in Wichita, Kansas. They reported receiving 535 tons for composting. Evergreen Recycle at 302 West 53rd Street North is open to the public. They operate a compost site and a pallet refurbishing business. Evergreen reported receiving 141 tons of grass and leaves, 6,510 tons of wood and 5,915 tons of trees for a total of 12,566 tons for composting and/or pallet construction. The cities of Clearwater, Colwich, Derby, Haysville, Mount Hope, Sedgwick, and Valley Center maintain small brush piles and/or compost sites for their residents' use.

Curbside composting is available locally through Nudge Compost. A five gallon bucket is provided for food scraps and is picked up weekly. The contents are taken away and converted into compost.

Management of grass clippings

Residents are encouraged to mulch mow or compost their grass clippings. Grass clippings are accepted at numerous compost sites located throughout the county. These sites are listed under the compost section of this report.

MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS FOR SPECIFIC WASTES

Drug Drop Off

Sedgwick County residents can now easily dispose of unwanted or expired prescriptions, over-the-counter and controlled medications at designated drug drop off boxes without any questions asked or ID check. Environmental Resources has partnered with local law enforcement agencies to collect controlled substances through the MedSafe Medication Disposal System at the following locations:

Bel Aire Police Department, 7651 E. Central Park Ave., Bel Aire, Kansas
Cheney Police Department, 131 E. Main, Cheney, Kansas
Clearwater Police Department, 109 S. Lee, Clearwater, Kansas
Mulvane Police Department, 410 E. Main, Mulvane, Kansas
Valley Center Police Department, 616 E. 5th St., Valley Center, Kansas

The Cheney, Clearwater, Mulvane and Valley Center boxes have a 38 gallon capacity. The Bel Aire box has an 18 gallon capacity. The amount of medications collected for disposal in 2022 was 67.4 pounds at Mulvane, 128.55 pounds at Valley Center, and 28.1 pounds at Bel Aire.

Nine sites in Sedgwick County collected old or unused pharmaceuticals from citizens by participating in the DEA National Prescription Drug Take-Back Day. The sites were at the Wichita Patrol East and West Police stations, Sedgwick County Zoo, Wesley Medical Center, Sedgwick County Household Hazardous Waste facility, the Oaklawn Activity Center, Maize City Hall, Haysville Police Department and Cheney Police Department.

Three Wichita Walgreens stores at 555 N. Maize Rd., 3150 S. Seneca, 3333 E. Central and one Derby Walgreens store located at 458 N. Baltimore, two Walmart pharmacies at 10600 W. 21st St. and 3030 N. Rock Rd., the CVS store at 10405 W. 13th, Professional Pharmacy at 744 N. Waco, Cheney Pharmacy in Cheney, and McConnell AFB at 7950 Leavenworth St. installed drug disposal kiosks for the same purpose.


Household Hazardous Waste

The Sedgwick County Household Hazardous Waste Facility is located at 801 Stillwell in Wichita, Kansas. In 2022, 13,802 participants brought 1,275,787 pounds of materials (excluding solid waste) to the HHW Facility. HHW volume and customer trends are shown in Figures 4 and 5. The trends appear to be impacted by COVID-19.

Of the total brought to the HHW facility, 327,109 pounds were reclaimed by 9,997 Swap and Shop customers. Sedgwick County provided five remote collection events in 2022. These locations were Textron East Campus, Spirit AeroSystems, Park City Library, Sedgwick County Zoo and the Haysville Municipal Building.

Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generators (CESQG)

In 2022, 209 conditionally exempt small quantity generators brought in 39,950 pounds of waste to the Sedgwick County Household Hazardous Waste Facility. HHW volume and customer trends are shown in Figures 4 and 5.




Construction & Demolition (C&D) Materials

Commercially generated construction & demolition materials are banned from the transfer stations in Sedgwick County. There are two Construction & Demolition Landfills in Sedgwick County that accept this waste. Both facilities are open to the public.

During 2022, Brooks C & D Landfill buried 102,612 tons of waste and CDR - North buried 84,808 tons of waste. The total for all C & D waste buried in 2022 is 187,420 tons. This is a 14% increase from the amount reported the previous year.

The City of Wichita Brooks C&D Landfill has 43-45 years of available space and the asbestos monofill has 68 years of space remaining. The estimated life remaining at CDR - North is 5 to 8 years. The C&D landfills are randomly inspected by Sedgwick County staff on a weekly basis to check operational practices.

Figure 6 shows the amount of construction and demolition material disposed of in Sedgwick County in 2022.



Storm Debris

Sedgwick County updated and approved their Debris Management Plan on November 8, 2017. This can be seen as Appendix C of this Solid Waste Plan Update. Sedgwick County purchased a tub grinder and air curtain burner in 2015. These portable units can be used to help clean up storm debris throughout the county.

Christmas Trees

From December 19, 2022 through January 20, 2023, Sedgwick County provided 22 sites throughout the County for residents to drop off Christmas trees. Residents were also invited to take free mulch home with them. The number of trees disposed of through this program for this period was 3,495. This is an increase of 21% from the previous year. In addition, some small cities in Sedgwick County also operate their own Christmas tree disposal program.

Special Cleanup Programs

Since 2002, Sedgwick County has paid for the disposal of 1,122 tons of illegally dumped waste collected by townships. The County will continue to pay the tipping fees at the transfer station for illegally dumped materials collected by townships.

In 2022, residents of Payne Township had the opportunity to dispose of bulky waste at a township clean-up event. Roll-off containers were placed at the township facility where 1 mattress, 354 tires and 10.35 tons of material was collected.

The Department of Environmental Resources partnered with the Sedgwick County Department of Aging and the Metropolitan Area Building and Construction Department (MABCD) on special cleanups and to help hoarding cases and divert fines by providing free roll-off trash containers to 87 properties in 2022. Vouchers were given to another 83 individuals for self-hauling their items to the local trash transfer stations.

Bulky Waste

Beginning on December 1, 2022 Sedgwick County promoted a bulky waste coupon program. County residents could request a coupon that would pay the disposal fees charged at Waste Connections transfer station for loads up to 1,000 pounds. The coupon is valid for 6 months from the time of receipt. 3,930 coupons were issued. Sedgwick County started the bulky waste coupon program in 2012. From 2012 to 2021, Sedgwick County issued 65,630 bulky waste coupons that were redeemed by 20,855 citizens.

Electronic Waste

A list of Sedgwick County businesses that accept electronics for recycling is accessible on the County's website at <http://Sedgwickcounty.org/environment/recyclingguide.asp>. These locations are updated as needed on the County's online recycling guide. Sedgwick County has conducted 4 electronics collection events since 2009. The events were free to all residents and businesses of Sedgwick County, Kansas. A breakdown of these events is as follows:

- 2009 – 1,144,163 pounds of e-waste from 2,520 vehicles (January 24)
- 2018 – 536,553 pounds of e-waste from 3,874 vehicles (April 5-7 & April 12-14)
- 2020 – 562,356 pounds of e-waste from 5,037 vehicles (Aug. 13-15 & Aug. 20-22)
- 2022 – 234,915 pounds of e-waste from 2,452 vehicles (April 21-23 & April 28-30)

Sharps/Medical Waste

Stericycle services the medical waste generators in the area.

White Goods

White goods are accepted for recycling at local metal recycling businesses, Waste Connections Transfer Station, and The City of Wichita Brooks C & D Landfill.

Appliances with CFCs are accepted at local metal recycling businesses, Waste Connections Transfer Station and The City of Wichita Brooks C & D Landfill. These businesses assume responsibility for the removal of the refrigerant before recycling. A list of metal recycling businesses can be found on the County's website recycling guide.

Waste Tires

Waste tires have been an issue for decades. Before regulations that controlled tire storage, local businesses stockpiled large numbers of waste tires. These large piles posed fire hazards and health and environmental risks. Waste tires are improperly stored on some farms and residential land and have been and continue to be an illegal dumping problem.

Sedgwick County held a waste tire collection event on April 20, 21 and 22, 2023. This was the eighth Waste Tire Collection event held by Sedgwick County. The event was held for residents, farmers, businesses, and government agencies. Tire dealers and other businesses that collected fees for tire disposal were not eligible to participate. April 20 was promoted as the day for businesses and government agencies.

Sedgwick County Public Works managed the large tire piles and the flow of traffic through the yard. The vendor, Champlin Tire Recycling, Inc., was present during the event and hauled the tires away for recycling. The program was funded by the County's Solid Waste Fee and collected 137,187 passenger tire equivalents from 2,028 vehicles.

Sedgwick County has held 8 waste tire collection events since the year 2000. These events collected a total of 1,336,563 tire units. The event was held for residents, farmers, businesses, and government agencies. A breakdown of these events is as follows:

- 2023 - 137,187 passenger tire equivalents from 2,028 vehicles
- 2021 - 183,471 passenger tire equivalents from 2,552 vehicles
- 2019 - 180,372 passenger tire equivalents from 2,663 vehicles
- 2017 - 101,193 passenger tire equivalents from 1,307 vehicles
- 2015 - 137,780 passenger tire equivalents from 2,054 vehicles
- 2011 - 155,878 passenger tire equivalents from 1,866 vehicles
- 2004 - 222,638 passenger tire equivalents from 3,569 vehicles
- 2000 - 218,044 passenger tire equivalents from 5,630 vehicles

Batteries

Lead acid, Lithium, and other batteries are accepted for recycling at numerous automotive supply stores and battery stores in Sedgwick County. They are also accepted at the Household Hazardous Waste Facility. These locations are updated as needed on the County's online recycling guide.

Dead Animals

Disposal of animal carcasses resulting from foreign animal disease and storms will follow KDHE guidelines. The animals would be buried on the owner's land at least ten feet above the water table and ten feet below the surface of the ground and away from any known wells. This disposal method has been coordinated through the Sedgwick County Animal Control Department.

KDHE SOLID WASTE PERMITS IN THE LAST 5 YEARS

KDHE requires that any solid waste permit must first be approved by the local government as to its consistency with the local Solid Waste Management Plan. There were no solid waste permit applications from June 2022 to June 2023.

KDHE requires that any solid waste permit must first be approved by the local government as to its consistency with the local Solid Waste Management Plan. Stericycle, Inc. presented a permit application for a medical waste transfer station in Wichita, Kansas. The proposed medical waste transfer station is a relocation of the existing medical waste transfer station operated by Stericycle, Inc. at 3811 S. West Street (permit #932). The facility is relocating to 4210 W. Pawnee Street. On June 3, 2019, the Solid Waste Management Committee unanimously approved that the permit application conforms to the Solid Waste Management Plan for Sedgwick County and that the committee supports the application. On June 19, 2019 the Board of County Commissioners reviewed the permit application and confirmed that it conforms to the Sedgwick County Solid Waste Management Plan.

There are 2 solid waste permit applications in process in Sedgwick County from June 2020 to June 2021. Evergreen Recycle, located at 302 W. 53rd St. N. in Park City, Kansas, is in the process of a permit modification to accept construction and demolition material for recycling. This was approved by the Sedgwick County Board of County Commissioners on March 24, 2021, as being consistent with our local Solid Waste Management Plan. Waste Connections Transfer Station, located at 4300 W. 37th St. N. in Wichita, Kansas, is applying for a modification to their Transfer Station Permit to become a KDHE permitted Tire Collection Center. Waste Connections is currently a KDHE permitted Tire Transporter. This was approved by the Sedgwick County Board of County Commissioners on April 21, 2021, as being consistent with our local Solid Management Plan.

KDHE GRANT APPLICATIONS IN THE LAST 5 YEARS

KDHE requires that all grant applications come before the Solid Waste Management Committee. There were no grant applications from June 2022 to June 2023.

Nudge Compost, located at 424 S. Dellrose in Wichita, applied for two grants in the FY 2022 Small Solid Waste Grant Program provided by KDHE. One grant is for funding increased advertisement/education; and the second grant is for a utility trailer to increase efficiency and volume of compost transportation. The grant applications were presented to the Sedgwick County Solid Waste Committee on May 10, 2021. The Solid Waste Committee approved both of the grant applications as being consistent with our local Solid Waste Management Plan.

There were three grant applications from June 2021 to June 2022. Sedgwick County applied for and received a Waste Tire Grant to resurface the Boundless Playground at Sedgwick County Park for rubber made from recycled tires. Nudge Compost applied for two Solid Waste Grants to purchase

equipment and supplies for its food waste compost business. Evergreen Recycling applied for two Solid Waste Grants to increase education and equipment to start receiving C&D materials for recycling.

PUBLIC EDUCATION

The Solid Waste Management Committee recommends the county increase public education on proper recycling in order to reduce the amount of contamination. The committee also recommends that the County educate the public on disposal & recycling options offered by their waste hauler.

Sedgwick County continues to make numerous efforts to inform and educate citizens and businesses about issues related to solid waste in Sedgwick County. Staff interacted with the public at trade shows and numerous presentations to civic groups and schools. Information is also conveyed through the Sedgwick County social media pages. Staff made ongoing updates to an online recycling guide. The guide can be found at: <http://Sedgwickcounty.org/environment/recyclingguide.asp>. Numerous promotional items and educational pieces were developed and distributed to the public.

SOLID WASTE FEE

Sedgwick County utilizes a Solid Waste Fee to help fund certain components of the Solid Waste Plan. On May 24, 2023, the Board of County Commissioners voted to keep the Solid Waste Fee and keep the annual residential base rate per dwelling at \$8.38. The fees for non-residential and commercial properties have five tiered rates based on classification standards. Tier 1 is still \$5.33 per parcel. Tier 2 is still \$7.11 per parcel. Tier 3 is still \$8.89 per parcel. Tier 4 is still \$10.67 per parcel. And Tier 5, which is the large malls, is still \$7.11 times the number of tenant spaces located on a single parcel.

SOLID WASTE PROJECTS IN THE LAST 5 YEARS

In the last five years, Sedgwick County Environmental Resources has provided the following:

- Partnered with the Sedgwick County Department of Aging and the Metropolitan Area Building and Construction Department (MABCD) on special cleanups to help hoarding cases and divert fines by providing free roll-off trash containers to 608 properties from 2018 through 2022. Vouchers were given to another 535 individuals for self-hauling their items to the local trash transfer stations during this time period.
- Offered Townships dumpsters for a neighborhood-style cleanup event. Residents of Payne Township had the opportunity to dispose of bulky waste at four township clean-up events from 2018 through 2022. Roll-off containers were placed at the township facility where 54.76 tons of material, 61 mattresses, and 1,218 tires were collected.
- Offered five bulky waste coupon programs. County residents could request a coupon that would pay the disposal fees charged at local transfer stations for loads up to 1,000 pounds. 30,973 coupons were issued from 2018 through 2022.
- In April 2022, a tornado damaged structures in the southeast part of Sedgwick County. The County immediately responded to rescue victims and assess damage. This was followed

with supplying equipment, staff and dumpsters to assist in cleanup efforts. Residents were asked to bring household hazardous waste to the roadside for collection by HHW staff. The staff collected the HHW in the afternoons. This resulted in collecting 4,100 pounds of HHW from these residents. The County provided 10 dumpster locations that were collected, dumped and returned for 21 days. This resulted in collecting and disposing of 467,440 pounds of tornado debris from 62 dumpsters.

- Offered 4 electronic waste collection events that collected 2,477,987 pounds of e-waste from 13,883 vehicles.
- Offered 8 waste tire collection events that collected 1,336,563 passenger tire equivalents from 21,669 vehicles.

HEARINGS

The Sedgwick County Solid Waste Management Committee approved a draft of the 5-Year Solid Waste Plan Update on May 1, 2023.

A presentation on Sedgwick County’s five-year Solid Waste Update was made to the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission on June 22, 2023. MAPC approved the plan as being consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

A public hearing on the five-year update to the Solid Waste Plan was held on May 24, 2023 during a regularly scheduled Board of County Commission meeting. The Board of County Commissioners adopted the plan.

TIMELINE

KDHE requires that the five-year review include appropriate information for a ten-year planning period.

Sedgwick County will continue to evaluate current programs and make adjustments as needed to minimize waste, educate the public, offer solid waste projects, and increase the efficiency of the solid waste system.

2024, June Annual Solid Waste Update

2025, June Annual Solid Waste Update

2026, June Annual Solid Waste Update

2027, June Annual Solid Waste Update

2028, June Five-year Solid Waste Review

2029, June Annual Solid Waste Update

2030, June Annual Solid Waste Update

2031, June Annual Solid Waste Update

2032, June Annual Solid Waste Update

2033, June Five-Year Solid Waste Review

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix A

Geographical and Geological Characteristics of Sedgwick County

This page intentionally left blank.

E. PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SEDGWICK COUNTY

1. TOPOGRAPHY

Sedgwick County is located in south central Kansas and is comprised of 1,008 square miles, or 645,120 acres. The County lies mainly within the Arkansas River Lowlands section of the Central Lowland physiographic province (see Figure 4). The Arkansas River Lowlands section includes the area drained by the Arkansas River and its tributaries. The topography in the Arkansas River Lowlands is characterized by a predominantly flat river valley and gently rising slopes to the uplands areas adjacent to it.




Figure 4

Physiographic Provinces of Kansas

Source: Water Resources of Sedgwick County, Kansas

The northeastern portion of the County is on the western edge of the Flint Hills Upland, a subdivision of the Osage Plains section of the Central Lowlands physiographic province. The topography of this area is irregular with local relief of 20 to 60 feet, and is drained by tributaries of the Walnut River.

The western edge of the County is located within the Wellington Lowlands, a subdivision of the Arkansas River Lowlands. This area is drained by the Ninnescah River and has irregular topography with local relief ranging from 20 to 100 feet.

The highest point in Sedgwick County is approximately 1,545 feet above sea level, and is located about 5 miles southwest of Andale in Section 31, Township 26 South, Range 3 West of the Sixth Principal Meridian. The lowest point in the County has an altitude of less than 1,220 feet above sea level. This occurs where the Arkansas flows out of the County to the south at Section 36, Township 29 South, Range 1 East, of the Sixth Principal Meridian.

2. GEOLOGY

a) SUBSURFACE GEOLOGY

Sedimentary rocks are occasionally exposed at the surface in Sedgwick County. Most of the bedrock is Permian shale which is easily eroded, and overlain by unconsolidated eolian, colluvial, and fluvial deposits over most of the County. The Wellington Formation of the Permian System is the oldest rock unit that outcrops in the County. This formation occurs at or near the surface east of the Arkansas River Valley. These rocks comprise the bedrock surface for the eastern two-thirds of the County. The Wellington Formation consists of gray shale, limestone, gypsum, anhydrite, and thin beds of maroon shale. As erosion degrades the Wellington Formation, water infiltration results in solution removal of soluble materials. The solution activity has created "boxwork" limestone indicative of reprecipitated carbonate and small-scale settlement structures. A thick salt bed, the Hutchinson Salt member of the Wellington Formation, is present in the subsurface. This member is easily eroded and occurs near the surface in the Arkansas River Valley.

The Wellington Formation dips at approximately 10 feet per mile toward the west. This formation outcrops in the eastern part of the county and occurs at a depth of approximately 180 feet along the western edge of the County. The thickness of the Wellington Formation ranges from a minimum of 80 feet thick along the eastern edge of the County to a 550 foot maximum along the western edge.

The western one-third of Sedgwick County has a bedrock surface consisting of the Ninnescah Shale of the Permian System. The Ninnescah Shale consists of brownish-red silty shale and siltstone, with thin beds of dolomite, grayish-green shale, and fine-grained sandstone. The Ninnescah Shale outcrops at its geologic

contact with the Wellington Formation. The Ninescah Shale ranges in thickness from a feather-edge in the east to approximately 180 feet in the western edge of the County.

Most of Sedgwick County is covered with unconsolidated deposits overlying the bedrock. As much as 160 feet of undifferentiated Pliocene and lower Pleistocene deposits occur in the basal part of the Arkansas River Valley north of Wichita. South of Wichita, lower Pleistocene deposits reach a thickness of 70 feet in the basal part of the Arkansas River Valley and 20 feet on the uplands north of the Ninescah River. The Pliocene deposits consist mainly of calcareous, gray-to-tan silt and clay, fine-to-coarse sand, and fine-to-coarse gravel.

Along the western side of the Arkansas River Valley, Illinoian terrace deposits occur over Permian and lower Pleistocene deposits at a thickness of as much as 75 feet. These deposits are primarily fine-to-coarse gravel and fine-to-coarse sand with clay and silt lenses. On both sides of the Ninescah River valley, colluvium occurs at thickness' of as much as 30 feet over the Permian bedrock. The colluvium is of Illinoian to Holocene age and occurs as a heterogeneous mixture of clay, silt, sand, gravel and bedrock fragments. In most upland areas, loess deposits occur at thickness' up to 75 feet. The loess consists of tan calcareous silt with zones of caliche nodules and sand. These deposits are of Illinoian to Holocene age and occur over bedrock and lower Pleistocene deposits.

In the Arkansas River valley and the Ninescah River Valley as much as 50 to 60 feet of alluvium and terrace deposits of Wisconsin to Holocene age occur over the Permian bedrock and undifferentiated Pliocene and lower Pleistocene deposits. The deposits consist mainly of fine-to-coarse sand and gravel. The total thickness' of unconsolidated deposits range from near zero in the upland areas to as much as 250 feet in the Arkansas River Valley. Deposits associated with the Equus beds aquifer occur in the northwestern part of Sedgwick County, consisting of unconsolidated deposits of clay, silt, sand, and gravel, ranging in age from Pliocene to Pleistocene.

Figure 5 shows a geologic map and Figure 6 shows corresponding geologic cross sections of Sedgwick County.




Figure 5

Geologic Map of Sedgwick County

Source: Water Resources of Sedgwick County, Kansas




Figure 6
Geologic Cross Sections of Sedgwick County
 Source: Water Resources of Sedgwick County, Kansas

b) GEOLOGIC STRUCTURES AND STABILITY

Sedgwick County is located within the Sedgwick Basin Structural feature (see Figure 7). This Basin is a major pre-Desmoinesian, post-Mississippian structural feature. It is bound on the east by the Nemaha Anticline and on the west by the Pratt Anticline. The Salina Basin lies to the north. The Sedgwick Basin is a shelf-like-southerly plunging area with strata characterized by facies changes and an increased thickness regionally to the south. The surface rocks are Permian and Tertiary in age. The Basin has an extensive cover of unconsolidated deposits which includes the Equus Beds.




Figure 7

Sedgwick County Within Sedgwick Basin Structural Feature

Source: The Geologic History of Kansas

The Sedgwick Basin contains several minor structures. Two of those structures are located within Sedgwick County (see Figure 8). The Greenwich Anticline is located in the northeastern part of the County and the Bluff City-Valley Center-Elbing Anticline trends northeast to southwest across the center of Sedgwick County into Summer County to the south. These are minor, south-plunging anticlines that interrupt the regional westward dip of the Nemaha Anticline into the Sedgwick Basin.




Figure 8

Minor Structures Within Sedgwick County

Source: The Geologic History of Kansas

The Nemaha Anticline is a major pre-Desmoinesian, post-Mississippian structure that crosses Kansas from Nemaha County on the north to Sumner County on the south. A major zone of faulting occurs along the entire length of the Nemaha Anticline (See Figure 9). Frequency of earthquakes along the Nemaha Anticline indicate that it is mildly tectonically active. At least ten earthquakes had epicenters located west of the Nemaha anticlinal axis (in Riley, Pottawatomie, Geary, Sedgwick, and Sumner Counties. Figure 9 also shows the relationship of earthquake epicenters to structural features. Sedgwick County lies within a region which is classified by the U.S. Geological Survey as a Seismic Impact Zone within the 10% probability area (see Figure 10). Seismic impact zones are areas with at least a 10% probability that the maximum horizontal acceleration (expressed as % of gravity (g) in rock) will exceed 0.10g in 250 years. These areas have a greater probability of exhibiting the earth's movement through shaking ground. The immediate Wichita area has reported two earthquakes in 1919 and one in 1948. The 1948 earthquake was located 5 miles east of Wichita and contained six tremors which resulted in the trembling of house walls. Since the majority of the rock movement is deep-seated, there is usually no observable fault displacement of the surface rocks.




Figure 9

Nemaha Anticline and Earthquake Epicenters

Source: The Geologic History of Kansas




Figure 10

Seismic Impact Zone Locations

Source: USGS , Probabilistic Estimates of Maximum Acceleration and Velocity in Rock in the Contiguous United States

Another type of structural feature found in Sedgwick County is due to solution-subsidence or solution-collapse. Sinkholes and slump structures have occurred in Sedgwick County along the eastern limit of the Hutchinson Salt of the Wellington Formation. Solution removal of gypsum and halite has resulted in numerous small-scale settlement structures such as gentle folds and undulations in the overlying rock strata. The amplitude of these settlement structures ranges from a few feet to greater than ten feet in vertical settlement. Examples of these irregularities and folds can be seen in outcrops along Interstate 35 east of Wichita, at the junction of I-35 and Andover Road, and at the junction of Hillside Avenue north and the east fork of Chisholm Creek.

c) SOILS

The type of soils in Sedgwick County and their characteristics are influenced by the type of sedimentary rock from which they were derived (see Section II E 2). Sandy soil is typically found along the river valleys and a clayey soil is typically associated with weathering from the local shales. Figure 11 shows the eight general soil associations of the County. These map units have a distinct pattern of soils, relief and drainage. Due to the map scale, the map provides a broad perspective of the soils in the area, but does not precisely show the kind of soil for a specific site.

The eight general soil associations of Sedgwick County are:

- Lesho-Lincoln-Canadian: Occupies ~ 8% of County; nearly level; poorly (Lesho) to excessively (Lincoln) drained; soils are shallow to deep over sand; have a sandy substratum; formed in alluvial sediments; on flood plains
- Naron-Farnum-Carwile: Occupies ~ 9% of County; nearly level; poorly drained; deep soils that have a loamy subsoil formed in old alluvial sediments; in terrace positions above flood plains and below upland soils
- Elandco-Canadian: Occupies ~ 8% of County; nearly level; well drained; deep soils have a loamy subsoil; formed in alluvial sediments; occasionally flooded
- Goessel-Tabler-Farnum: Occupies ~ 9% of County; nearly level to gently sloping; moderately to well drained; deep soils have a clayey or loamy subsoil; formed in old alluvial sediments; on terraces and uplands
- Irwin-Goessel-Rosehill: Occupies ~ 17% of County; nearly level to sloping; moderately to well drained; deep soils that have a clayey subsoil; formed in old alluvial sediments and shale residuum; uplands and slopes
- Shellabarger-Milan-Renfrow: Occupies ~ 9% of County; gently sloping and sloping; well drained; deep soils that have a loamy or clayey subsoil; formed in old alluvial sediments and shaly clay residuum; on uplands

- Renfrow-Blanket-Owens: Occupies ~ 5% of County; nearly level to strongly sloping; well drained; deep and shallow soils that have a clayey subsoil; formed in clay shale residuum and old clayey alluvial sediments; on uplands
- Blanket-Farnum-Vanoss: Occupies ~ 35% of County; nearly level to sloping; well drained; deep soils that have a loamy or clayey subsoil; formed in old clayey, silty, and loamy sediments; on uplands

3. HYDROLOGY

a) SURFACE WATER

Sedgwick County is mainly drained by the Arkansas River and its tributaries. The Arkansas River, a navigable stream, flows from the northwest corner of the County in a southeast direction toward Wichita where it turns south and exits the County near the southeast corner. Within Sedgwick County the main tributary to the Arkansas River is the Little Arkansas River, which enters Sedgwick County near the center of the north border and joins the Arkansas River in Wichita. To help alleviate recurrent flooding of the Wichita area, an extensive flood diversion system was constructed around the west side of Wichita.

The eastern part of Sedgwick County is drained by east-flowing tributaries of the Walnut River. The Ninnescah River and its tributaries drain the southwestern portion of the County. Drainage to the south also occurs through smaller creeks such as the Big Slough, Cowskin Creek, and Spring Creek. Within Sedgwick County, the Arkansas, Little Arkansas, and Ninnescah Rivers are all gaining streams. Minor flooding can occur along all of the creeks and rivers in Sedgwick County. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Federal Emergency Management Agency have developed maps indicating areas adjacent to water bodies that are subject to the 100-year floods.

There are numerous lakes and ponds within Sedgwick County. Cheney Reservoir is located approximately 17 miles west of Wichita and 7 miles north of the town of Cheney along the Sedgwick County border with Kingman and Reno Counties. Cheney Reservoir is located on the North Fork of the Ninnescah River and lies primarily in southeastern Reno County. The dam was completed in 1964 and controls runoff from 901 square miles. Cheney Reservoir has a total storage capacity of 566,300 acre-feet of water. When it is filled to the top of the conservation pool, the reservoir has a surface area of 9,540 acres. The City of Wichita owns all of the surface-water rights for public supplies (52,600 acre-feet per year) from Cheney Reservoir. This supplies Wichita and adjacent communities with approximately half of their water needs.

Lake Afton is located on the Middle Branch of Clearwater Creek approximately 8 miles west of Wichita. This is a 258-acre recreational lake.

There are over 2,000 ponds or lakes in Sedgwick County. The larger ponds (10 acres or greater) are shown in Figure 12.

b) WETLANDS

An area is classified as a wetland if it displays three criteria: Hydric soils; hydrophytic vegetation; and wetlands hydrology. Sedgwick County has two soils that have been designated as hydric soils (soils that typically hold water). Plevna soils are almost always wetlands and are also indicated in Figure 12. Carwile Soils can also be wetlands. Additionally, the Natural Resource Conservation Service has determined 10,357 acres of wetlands exist on 497 agricultural tracts in the County. These wetlands generally exist on Plevna or Carwile soils.

Investigation into additional wetland locations is ongoing. Sedgwick County has soils that contain small areas of inclusions which may be wetlands. Soils which may have inclusions are: Blanket Silt Loam (Ba), Elandco Silt Loam (Ea), Elandco Silt Loam, frequently flooded (Ec), Farnum Loam (Fa), Farnum Loam, 1-3% Slope (Fb), Lesho Loam (La), Lincoln (Lb), Pratt Loamy Fine Sand (Pc), Tabler-Drummond Complex (Tb), Vanoss Silt Loam (Va), Waldeck Sandy Loam (Wa), and Waurika Silt Loam (Wb).

Some of the larger historic wetlands are easily identified and are listed in Table 10. Their locations are shown in Figure 12.

Each area outlined on this map consists of more than one kind of soil. The map is thus meant for general planning rather than a basis for decision on the use of specific tracts.




Figure 11
 U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
 SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE
 KANSAS AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION
GENERAL SOIL MAP
 SEDGWICK COUNTY, KANSAS




SOIL LEGEND

- 1** Leno—Lincoln—Cassdell: Soils that are shallow to deep over sand; are nearly level and somewhat poorly drained; well drained, and somewhat excessively drained; have a sandy subsoil; and formed in alluvial sediments.
- 2** Natick—Furness—Cawville: Deep, nearly level, well drained and somewhat poorly drained soils that have a loamy or clayey subsoil; formed in alluvial sediments.
- 3** Eubank: Deep, nearly level, well drained soils that have a loamy subsoil; formed in alluvial sediments.
- 4** Gossard—Tabor—Furness: Deep, nearly level and gently sloping, moderately well drained and well drained soils that have a clayey or loamy subsoil; formed in old alluvial sediments.
- 5** Leno—Cassell—Koschik: Deep and moderate to deep, nearly level to sloping, moderately well drained and well drained soils that have a clayey subsoil; formed in old alluvial sediments and shale residuum.
- 6** Shickling—Allen—Bertron: Deep, gently sloping and sloping, well drained soils that have a loamy or clayey subsoil; formed in old alluvial sediments and stony clay residuum.
- 7** Renbow—Blanton—Owens: Deep and shallow, nearly level to strongly sloping, moderately well drained and well drained soils that have a clayey subsoil; formed in clay shale residuum and old clayey alluvial sediments.
- 8** Blanton—Furness—Vandus: Deep, nearly level to sloping, well drained soils that have a loamy or clayey subsoil; formed in old clayey, silty, and loamy sediments.

Compiled 1978

SECTIONALIZED	
TOWNSHIP	RANGE
6 S	1 W
7 S	1 W
8 S	1 W
9 S	1 W
10 S	1 W
11 S	1 W
12 S	1 W
13 S	1 W
14 S	1 W
15 S	1 W
16 S	1 W
17 S	1 W
18 S	1 W
19 S	1 W
20 S	1 W
21 S	1 W
22 S	1 W
23 S	1 W
24 S	1 W
25 S	1 W
26 S	1 W
27 S	1 W
28 S	1 W
29 S	1 W
30 S	1 W



LEGEND

- BODIES OF WATER OVER 10 ACRES.....
- KNOWN WETLANDS.....
- PLEVNA SOIL.....

Source: Sedgwick County Conservation District




Figure 12

**SEDGWICK COUNTY
KANSAS**

PREPARED BY THE
KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
IN COOPERATION WITH THE
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION



This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix B

Regional growth patterns and local transportation networks

This page intentionally left blank.



Community **Investments** *Plan*

...a framework for the future, **2015-2035**

A New Comprehensive Plan for Wichita-Sedgwick County

Adopted by the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission
on November 19, 2015

Approved by the Wichita City Council on December 8, 2015

Approved by the Sedgwick County Board of Commissioners on January 20, 2016



*Sedgwick County...
working for you*



This page intentionally blank.



CommunityInvestmentsPlan

...a framework for the future, 2015-2035

A New Comprehensive Plan for Wichita-Sedgwick County

Table of Contents

Plan Introduction and Overview 1

Plan Vision, Community Values and Guiding Principles 9

Future Land Use Policies 15

 2035 Urban Growth Areas Map 19

 2035 Wichita Future Growth Concept Map 20

 Locational Guidelines 22

 Wichita Urban Infill Strategy 25

Plan Elements 27

 Funding and Financing 29

 Transportation 30

 Water, Sewer & Stormwater 31

 Arts, Culture and Recreation 33

 Public Safety 34

 Priority Enhancement Areas for Wichita Public Infrastructure Projects Map 35

Plan Implementation 37

 Part 1. Infrastructure Investment Decision-making Framework 39

 Part 2. Plan Monitoring, Review and Amendment 42





Plan Steering Committee Members

Name	Representing
Mitch Coffman	Sedgwick County Board of Commissioners
Richard Ranzau	Sedgwick County Board of Commissioners
James Roseboro	Wichita City Council
Gary Schmitt	Wichita City Council
David Foster	Metropolitan Area Planning Commission
Matt Goolsby	Metropolitan Area Planning Commission
Joe Johnson	Metropolitan Area Planning Commission
John McKay	Metropolitan Area Planning Commission
Mitch Mitchell	Metropolitan Area Planning Commission
Bill Ramsey	Metropolitan Area Planning Commission
Debra Miller Stevens	Metropolitan Area Planning Commission
Ken Lee	Sedgwick County Association of Cities
Randy Oliver	Sedgwick County Association of Cities
Stacy Christie	Community-at-Large
Susan Estes (Co-Chair)	Community-at-Large
Bryan Frye	Community-at-Large
Julie Hedrick	Community-at-Large
Cindy Miles (Co-Chair)	Community-at-Large

Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Department Staff Support

John Schlegel, Planning Director
 Dave Barber, Advanced Plans Manager
 Scott Knebel, Downtown Revitalization Manager
 Stephen Banks, Senior Planner
 Jess McNeely, Senior Planner
 Scott Wadle, Senior Planner
 Ashley Jones, Planning Aide
 Jim Schiffelbein, Planning Aide




Plan Introduction and Overview





. This page intentionally blank.





Plan Introduction


Why This Plan

- The State of Kansas requires cities and counties to have a comprehensive plan in order to exercise authorized development reviews, and to guide spending decisions on public infrastructure and facilities.
- The current joint comprehensive plan for Wichita and Sedgwick County dates back to 1993. A new plan is needed in an era of diminishing revenues and fiscal constraint.
- A new joint comprehensive plan is needed to guide the future growth, development and public infrastructure investment decisions of Wichita and Sedgwick County (our community) over the next 20 years. Accordingly, this new plan is called the Community Investments Plan ... a framework for the future.
- This Plan will better guide the long-term capital improvement programs for Wichita and Sedgwick County in the overall Plan context of:
 - > Promoting economic growth and job creation
 - > Advancing community quality of life and safety
 - > Creating a community that will attract and retain future generations

Setting Our Public Infrastructure Investment Priorities

- Over many decades, investment in public infrastructure has shaped our community's economy and quality of life. This investment has also influenced private investment decisions in Wichita and Sedgwick County.
- Current and future generations in Wichita and Sedgwick County will live with the infrastructure investment decisions we make today, just as we live with those decisions of past generations.
- The primary public infrastructure investment challenges our community faces over the next 20 years are determining:
 - > How best for the City of Wichita to grow
 - > How much and where best to spend or not spend in terms of future City and County public infrastructure and facility investment
 - > How to close the long-term gap between our future investment needs and wants and our projected revenues (ability to pay)
- The following graphic illustrates three key inter-related elements that ultimately shape our public infrastructure and facility investment decisions.

Community Investment Plan Development – Key Interrelated Elements





Developing the Plan

This Plan has been developed by an 18-member Plan Steering Committee jointly appointed by the City and County, with technical support provided by staff from the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Department, the City of Wichita and Sedgwick County. The Plan is reflective of the following considerations:

Existing Infrastructure Conditions Assessment (see Appendix for details)

- A comprehensive assessment of all Wichita and Sedgwick County infrastructure and facilities in 2011-12 revealed that 38% of Wichita's infrastructure is in a 'deficient/fair' condition (about 11% of the County's infrastructure is in a 'deficient/fair' condition).
- Costs of bringing existing deficient Wichita infrastructure (primarily local streets, aging water and sewer lines) up to standards is estimated at an additional \$45-55 million annually.
- Ongoing existing infrastructure replacement costs are estimated to require an additional \$102 million annually for Wichita.
- This situation is due in part to decades of under-investment in maintaining Wichita's local road, water and sewer infrastructure.


Community Trends and Challenges Ahead

(see Appendix for details)

- Our infrastructure investment decisions and future growth will be influenced by the following fiscal/economic shifts:
 - > Diminishing state and federal funding for local infrastructure;
 - > Slowing locally generated revenues for Wichita and Sedgwick County;
 - > Rising costs of maintaining existing infrastructure and facilities; and,
 - > Slowing new job creation and employment growth rates.

Population and Employment Growth Projections: 2012 to 2035 (see Appendix for details)

This Plan has been developed with a *baseline growth rate (0.83%)* and an *accelerated growth rate (1.25%)* for annual population growth and associated employment growth projections in Wichita and Sedgwick County. The accelerated growth rate is reflected in the *2035 Urban Growth Areas Map* and the *2035 Wichita Future Growth Concept Map*.





Preferred Wichita 2035 Growth Scenario Development (see Appendix for details)

- Three 2035 growth scenarios were developed for Wichita to illustrate a range of possible growth patterns and associated infrastructure investment impacts. These scenarios were called *Current Trends*; *Constrained Suburban Growth*; and *Suburban and Infill Growth Mix*.
- Growth and development patterns depicted in the *Suburban and Infill Growth Mix* scenario reflected a more constrained suburban growth pattern combined with increased urban infill growth in Wichita's mature urban neighborhoods (the Established Central Area). This scenario required the least amount of expansion to Wichita's existing system of infrastructure, and placed greater investment priority on maintaining our existing infrastructure and transit system. This scenario became the basis for the development of the *2035 Wichita Future Growth Concept Map*.
- There is currently a \$9-10 billion gap over the next 20 years between Wichita's planned future infrastructure and facility expenditures and its projected revenues. Different growth scenarios alone won't close this gap ... a combination of new revenues, shifting project priorities and reducing project expenditures will be necessary.

Listening to the Community (see Appendix for details)

- Most City and County residents may not be aware of the current condition of our public assets, nor may they be aware of current City and County spending plans for the maintenance and expansion of these assets. During the development of this Plan, ongoing efforts have been made to better inform and educate the community on these important issues.
- Public outreach initiatives have included a *community-wide survey*, *eight informal public open house meetings*, *nine community discussion meetings* and *over 40 presentations* to community/neighborhood groups, business organizations and service clubs. The web-based Activate Wichita engagement tool has also been utilized.

Plan Overview

Within the broader context of the 2035 Plan Vision Statement, Plan Guiding Policy Principles and the Future Land Use Policies, this Plan provides an Infrastructure Investment Decision-making Framework to guide future public investment decisions that best reflect our community's highest priority needs and wants, and "willingness to spend" on public infrastructure. This Plan is comprised of the following components:

1. 2035 Plan Vision Statement and Core Community Values

A general statement describing what we envision our community will be 20 years from now in terms of employment and quality of life opportunities:



“Building on our rich aviation and entrepreneurial heritage, Wichita-Sedgwick County is a global center of advanced manufacturing and high-tech industry and a premier service, education, health and retail center for South Central Kansas. People feel safe and enjoy affordable housing choices in diverse, vibrant neighborhoods offering unique quality living environments and active, healthy lifestyles with access to arts, culture and recreation.”





Seven core community values also collectively define our community approach and beliefs for the purposes of this Plan:

- *Common-sense Approach*
- *Fiscal Responsibility*
- *Growth-oriented*
- *Inclusiveness and Connectivity*
- *Cultural Richness*
- *Vibrant Neighborhoods*
- *Quality Design*

2. Plan Guiding Policy Principles

Five overarching themes and aspirations for our community's future. They help set relative priorities at the broadest and highest levels for future public infrastructure and facility investment decisions:

1. **Support an Innovative, Vibrant and Diverse Economy**
2. **Invest in the Quality of Our Community Life**
3. **Take Better Care of What We Already Have**
4. **Make Strategic, Value-added Investment Decisions**
5. **Provide for Balanced Growth but with Added Focus on Our Established Neighborhoods**

3. Future Land Use Policies

2035 Urban Growth Areas Map - Depicts the anticipated growth pattern and extension of city limits for the cities of Sedgwick County.

2035 Wichita Future Growth Concept Map - Depicts the preferred 2035 growth concept for Wichita based on projected population/employment growth rates.

Locational Guidelines - Encourages compatible and appropriate future land use change in Wichita and unincorporated Sedgwick County.

Wichita Urban Infill Strategy - Encourages appropriate infill development in Wichita's Established Central Area.

Neighborhood and area plans adopted as elements of the Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan will provide additional land use policy guidance as applicable.

4. Plan Elements

A set of Plan Goals and Strategies to guide public infrastructure and facility investment decisions pertaining to each of the following Plan elements:

Funding and Financing - Guidance on how we should best fund and finance our public infrastructure and facilities.

Transportation - Guidance on how we should best invest in our transportation infrastructure and facilities.

Water, Sewer and Stormwater - Guidance on how we should best invest in our water, sewer and stormwater infrastructure and facilities.

Arts, Culture and Recreation - Guidance on how we should best invest in our arts, culture and recreation facilities.

Public Safety - Guidance on how we should best invest in our public safety facilities.

Priority Enhancement Areas for Wichita Public Infrastructure Projects Map - Guidance on priority areas for aesthetic enhancements to planned City of Wichita public improvements.

5. Plan Implementation

Part 1. Infrastructure Investment Decision-making Framework

This framework is intended to help close the long-term cost/revenue gap between our currently planned future infrastructure expenditures and our projected revenues. Three different levels of evaluation are recommended for both new and replacement infrastructure projects. This encourages best practices for public infrastructure investment decision-makers. It also enables strategic investment decision-making by aligning funding priorities with community priorities as reflected in the 2035 Plan Vision Statement, Core Community Values and Plan Guiding Policy Principles.





Part 2. Plan Monitoring, Review and Amendment

An ongoing, systematic approach to monitor community change, and review and amend the Plan so that it remains relevant and appropriate for our community.

Plan Appendix

Under separate documentation, the Plan Appendix contains important and relevant background information listed below that has been helpful in shaping the development of this Plan:

- *Wichita 2035 Growth Scenarios*
- *Community Trends & Challenges Ahead*
- *Existing Conditions & Community Infrastructure Assessment*
- *Community Engagement*





This page intentionally blank.





Plan Vision, Community Values and Guiding Principles





This page intentionally blank.





2035 Plan Vision Statement

The 2035 Plan Vision Statement below describes what kind of future we want to help make for our community over the next twenty years based on our public infrastructure and facility investment decisions.

“Building on our rich aviation and entrepreneurial heritage, Wichita-Sedgwick County is a global center of advanced manufacturing and high-tech industry and a premier service, education, health and retail center for South Central Kansas. People feel safe and enjoy affordable housing choices in diverse, vibrant neighborhoods offering unique quality living environments and active, healthy lifestyles with access to arts, culture and recreation.”

Core Community Values

Listed below are important **Core Community Values** that define our community approach and beliefs for the purposes of this Plan. These core values collectively provide the context in which the Plan Guiding Policy Principles will be accomplished:

- **Common-sense Approach** – pragmatic; market-driven; competitive; low tax burden; appropriate/simplified regulations only as necessary; strong belief in personal rights and property rights.
- **Fiscal Responsibility** – don’t spend more than you have; spend and invest wisely; take care of what you have; build on what you have; maximize ‘return-on-investment’.

- **Growth-oriented** – innovate; re-invent; diversify; entrepreneurial; positive ‘can-do’ attitude; the future holds hope and promise.
- **Inclusiveness and Connectivity** – easy to get around; social and technological accessibility.
- **Cultural Richness** – visual and performing arts; educational achievement; diversity of cuisine; strong community events and celebrations; philanthropy; community service; value racial diversity; community pride and heritage.
- **Vibrant Neighborhoods** – care about neighbors, value condition of property, take pride in quality of place and where we live.
- **Quality Design** – value public art, attractive and sustainable design, and community aesthetics.

Plan Guiding Policy Principles

The following **Plan Guiding Policy Principles**:

- Represent the overarching themes, aspirations and actions for our community’s future,
- Reflect the 2035 plan vision statement and our core community values,
- Guide future land use policies and the plan element goals and strategies,
- Help set relative priorities at the broadest and highest levels for future investment decisions and funding/expenditure reductions.

1. Support an Innovative, Vibrant and Diverse Economy

Without good jobs and opportunities for all to prosper, our vision and aspirations as a community cannot be achieved.

Core Community Value Elements

Common-sense Approach: Promote an environment of low taxes and reasonable regulation





Fiscal Responsibility: Target economic development investments in areas with the greatest public return

Growth-oriented: Focus on innovation and diversification for start-ups, entrepreneurship and growing existing businesses

Inclusiveness and Connectivity: Improve transportation connections to businesses for employees and customers of all incomes and abilities

Cultural Richness: Encourage a culture of corporate philanthropy and encourage culturally-diverse business areas

Vibrant Neighborhoods: Support neighborhood-scale business development

Quality Design: Utilize aesthetic and cohesive treatments in major business areas to encourage compatibility with adjacent businesses and residential areas

2. Invest in the Quality of Our Community Life

Quality of life is important to both current and future residents of our community and is essential to support job growth and a strong economy.

Core Community Value Elements

Common-sense Approach: Ensure that basic services are delivered efficiently and effectively

Fiscal Responsibility: Make strategic investments in public resources and facilities that will benefit current and future residents

Growth-oriented: Foster quality of life amenities that attract and retain talented workers

Inclusiveness and Connectivity: Provide equitable access to arts, culture and recreation

Cultural Richness: Support broad-based diversity in quality of life opportunities, events and facilities

Vibrant Neighborhoods: Provide safe, active and healthy living environments in all neighborhoods

Quality Design: Make strategic investments in iconic facilities that create a community of distinction

3. Take Better Care of What We Already Have

Maintaining and preserving existing infrastructure and community facilities is a high priority for citizens, supports economic growth and quality of life/place, and makes sound fiscal sense.

Core Community Value Elements

Common-sense Approach: Invest in maintenance first

Fiscal Responsibility: Establish long-term maintenance programs based on asset life-cycle


Growth-oriented: Leverage maintenance investments to promote infill development


Inclusiveness and Connectivity: Take a systems and networks-based approach

Cultural Richness: Re-invest in public facilities and infrastructure throughout our community

Vibrant Neighborhoods: Invest in existing neighborhood stability, redevelopment and growth

Quality Design: Consider life-cycle costs





4. Make Strategic, Value-added Investment Decisions

Our limited public resources must be focused on infrastructure and community facility investments that best support the vision for our future. Priority will be given to projects that support economic growth and job diversification, are multi-purposed and have multiple impacts for the greatest benefit to our community.

Core Community Value Elements

Common-sense Approach: Use the comprehensive plan to guide capital improvement programming

Fiscal Responsibility: Ensure that our investments are scale-appropriate and maximize economic and social returns that are measurable

Growth-oriented: Tie major infrastructure investments to economic development

Inclusiveness and Connectivity: Focus major transportation investments on critical community-wide connections

Cultural Richness: Make strategic long-term investments in cultural facilities

Vibrant Neighborhoods: Use multi-faceted and strategic approaches

Quality Design: Use context-sensitive design for infrastructure projects



5. Provide for Balanced Growth but with Added Focus on Our Established Neighborhoods

Growth can be expected to occur in all parts of our community and should be supported. Established neighborhoods will receive more attention than has been given in previous comprehensive plans in order to promote growth and maintain vibrancy/quality of place.

Core Community Value Elements

Common-sense Approach: Target areas of greatest opportunity

Fiscal Responsibility: Establish a funding mechanism for the additional maintenance costs of existing and new infrastructure

Growth-oriented: Support growth in all areas of our community

Inclusiveness and Connectivity: Promote physical, social and economic accessibility and connectivity for all

Cultural Richness: Enhance existing cultural facilities


Vibrant Neighborhoods: Focus growth in established neighborhoods and encourage infill development programs

Quality Design: Support infill project designs that enhance value in existing neighborhoods



This page intentionally blank.





Future Land Use Policies





This page intentionally blank.





Future Land Use Policies

Introduction

The purpose of the Future Land Use Policies is to encourage orderly growth that meets future market demand while considering impacts to taxpayers, developers, the environment, and the community as a whole while protecting individual property rights. These policies reflect the 2035 Plan Vision Statement, Core Community Values, and Plan Guiding Policy Principles and guide future land use through the ongoing comprehensive planning process.

The Future Land Use Policies are comprised of the following *four components* which are described in this section of the Plan:

1. 2035 Urban Growth Areas Map

Depicts anticipated long-term growth patterns for the cities of Sedgwick County. These areas are not prescriptive or binding in nature but serve as a reasonable indication as to where the future efficient and fiscally responsible extension of public infrastructure, services, and corporate limits could occur by 2035.

2. 2035 Wichita Future Growth Concept Map

Depicts the preferred 2035 future growth concept for Wichita. This concept is based upon projected population and employment growth rates, reflects the Plan Guiding Policy Principles, and strategically guides future public investment that supports the growth of Wichita.

3. Locational Guidelines

Provide a framework for decision-making regarding land use changes so as to: encourage patterns of development that efficiently and effectively use land, public infrastructure, and services; strive for compatibility among various land uses; and, promote quality of place through design.

4. Wichita Urban Infill Strategy

Focuses on Wichita's Established Central Area (comprised of the downtown core and the mature neighborhoods surround-

ing it in a roughly three mile radius) and 'areas of opportunity' within it that have the most vacant/underutilized parcels where infill development can reverse patterns of abandonment and decline. The strategy provides a framework for addressing: regulatory barriers; infrastructure in need of modernization; neighborhood concerns about different housing types or incompatible uses; difficulties with land assembly and financing; and, preserving areas of stability.

These *four components* constitute the Future Land Use Policies. To ensure needed flexibility in the application of the Future Land Use Policies, it is important to continue to modify land use implementation tools such as the zoning and subdivision regulations to maintain consistency with the Plan as it is amended in the future.

Adopted Neighborhood and Area Plans

Neighborhood and area plans adopted as elements of the Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan will provide additional land use policy guidance as applicable, to supplement the overall guidance provided by the Future Land Use Policies.





1. 2035 Urban Growth Areas Map

(Refer to fold-out map on page 19)

2. 2035 Wichita Future Growth Concept Map

(Refer to fold-out map on page 20) The *2035 Wichita Future Growth Concept Map* visually portrays the goals and policies of the Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan. It generally illustrates anticipated development patterns and provides a generalized guide to future land use, development and rezoning decisions within the City of Wichita and its 2035 urban growth area. The categories shown are intended to provide a generalized guide to land use based upon functional use classifications, rather than by type of facility or type of ownership. The small-scale nature of the map does not allow for detailed assessment on an individual parcel basis. Suitability of future development at the site-specific, facility level needs to be determined based upon existing land uses and zoning, along with the Locational Guidelines and Wichita Urban Infill Strategy, as applicable. Development proposals that do not exactly match these guides but reflect market place demand should be given reasonable consideration, if they do not present extraordinary new public infrastructure or service burdens on the community.

Established Central Area: Comprised of the downtown core and the mature neighborhoods surrounding it in a roughly three mile radius, the Established Central Area is the focus area for the Wichita Urban Infill Strategy.

New Residential: Encompasses areas of land that likely will be developed or redeveloped by 2035 with uses predominately found in the Residential category. Pockets of Major Institutional and Commercial uses likely will be developed within this area as well, based upon market-driven location factors. In certain areas, especially those in proximity to existing industrial uses, highways, rail lines, and airports, pockets of Industrial Uses likely will be developed.

New Employment: Encompasses areas that likely will be developed or redeveloped by 2035 with uses that constitute centers or concentrations of employment primarily in manufacturing, warehousing, distribution, construction, research, technology, business services, or corporate of-

fices. Major shopping centers and office parks likely will be developed within this area as well, based upon market driven location factors. In certain areas, especially those in proximity to existing residential uses, higher density housing and convenience retail centers likely will be developed. In areas where the uses are already established, pockets of industrial uses associated with extraction, processing or refinement of natural resources or recycling of waste materials likely will be developed.



New Residential/Employment Mix: Encompasses areas of land that likely will be developed or redeveloped by 2035 with uses predominately of a mixed nature. Due to the proximity of higher intensity businesses uses, residential housing types within this area likely will be higher density. Due to the proximity of residential uses, employment uses likely will have limited negative impacts associated with noise, hazardous emissions, visual blight, and odor.




2035 Urban Growth Areas Map

(This map is not reflective of any Zoning Areas of Influence in Sedgewick County)

CommunityInvestments2035



- Legend**
- Little Established Central Area
 - Small City Limits
 - Wichita City Limits
 - Wichita Growth Areas
 - Small City Urban Growth Areas
 - Small City Urban Growth Areas
 - Rural Growth Areas
 - K-96 Special Uses Corridor
 - Industrial & Improvement Districts and Sedgewick County Park



The 2035 Urban Growth Areas Map visually portrays the anticipated growth patterns for the cities of Sedgewick County. Municipal growth patterns that do not exactly match this guide but reflect marketplace demands should be given reasonable consideration, if they do not present extraordinary new public service burdens on the community. It is also important to note that the 2035 urban growth areas depicted are not prescriptive or binding in nature. They serve only as a reasonable indication as to where the future efficient extension of public municipal services and corporate limits could occur by the year 2035.

Small City Urban Growth Areas: Generally located adjacent to existing municipal boundaries, these areas indicate the likely direction and magnitude of growth these communities can expect to experience out to the year 2035. Determination of growth direction and amount is based upon municipal political considerations, anticipated municipal population growth, efficient patterns of municipal growth, current infrastructure limitations, cost effective delivery of future municipal services and environmental factors.


Wichita Urban Growth Area: Areas adjacent to Wichita that are primarily undeveloped but have the potential to be developed by the year 2035, based upon Wichita population growth projections and current market trends. This is the area in which City expansion and extension of municipal services and infrastructure should be focused. Determination of growth direction and amount is based upon municipal political considerations, anticipated population growth, efficient patterns of growth, current infrastructure limitations, cost effective delivery of future municipal services and environmental factors.

Established Central Area: Comprised of the downtown core and the mature neighborhoods surrounding it in a roughly three mile radius, the Established Central Area is the focus area for the Wichita Urban Infill Strategy.

K-96 Special Uses Corridor: Encompasses areas identified in the K-96 Corridor Economic Development Plan that require special land use controls in order to ensure appropriate patterns of commercial redevelopment within the K-96 corridor. The K-96 Corridor Economic Development Plan should be consulted for more specific future land use direction.

Industrial and Improvement Districts and Sedgewick County Park: Encompasses areas within the Wichita Urban Growth Area where various legal agreements have been established to restrict Wichita city limits expansion and provide for shared delivery of municipal services by the City of Wichita, Sedgewick County, and townships.

Rural: This category encompasses land outside the 2035 urban growth areas for Wichita and the small cities. Agricultural uses, rural-based businesses, and larger lot residential suburban subdivisions likely will be developed in this area. Such development should occur in accordance with the Urban Fringe Development Standards for Wichita and Sedgewick County.



2035 Wichita Future Growth Concept Map

Legend

- Established Central Area
- Northwest Bypass Right-of-Way
- Residential and Employment Mix
- New Employment
- New Residential
- Small City Limits
- Small City Limits
- Wichita City Limits
- Statistical Development Areas
- Small City Urban Growth Areas
- Small City Urban Growth Areas
- Rural Areas
- Residential
- Commercial
- Industrial
- Major Ar, Transportation & Military
- Parks and Open Space
- Agricultural or Vacant
- Major Institutional
- Neighborhood/Area Plans





Residential: Encompasses areas that reflect the full diversity of residential development densities and types typically found in a large urban municipality. The range of housing densities and types includes, but is not limited to, single-family detached homes, semi-detached homes, zero lot line units, patio homes, duplexes, townhouses, apartments and multi-family units, condominiums, mobile home parks, and special residential accommodations for the elderly (assisted living, congregate care and nursing homes). Elementary and middle schools, churches, playgrounds, small parks and other similar residential-serving uses are located in these areas.

Commercial: Encompasses areas that reflect the full diversity of commercial development intensities and types typically found in a large urban municipality. Convenience retail, restaurants, small offices, and personal service uses are located in close proximity to, and potentially mixed with, Residential Uses. Major destination areas (centers and corridors) containing concentrations of commercial and office uses that have regional market areas and generate high volumes of traffic are located in close proximity to major arterials or highways and typically are buffered from lower density residential areas by higher density housing types.

Industrial: Encompasses areas that reflect the full diversity of industrial development intensities and types typically found in a large urban municipality. Centers or concentrations of manufacturing, warehousing, distribution, construction, research, and technology are located in close proximity to highways and airports and may have rail service. Industrial uses associated with the extraction, processing or refinement of natural resources or recycling of waste materials typically are located along rail lines. Businesses with negative impacts associated with noise, hazardous emissions, visual blight, and odor typically are buffered from Residential Uses by Commercial Uses.

Major Air Transportation & Military: Encompasses areas that are developed with airports, airfields, and military installations. The areas surrounding these areas, particularly immediately in proximity to areas used for take-off and

approach to runways, should be protected from encroachment by uses that are negatively impacted by high levels of noise.

Parks and Open Space: Includes major parks, golf courses, public open space, private development reserves and recreational facilities/corridors (including floodplain, natural drainage channels, easements, abandoned railway corridors, etc.). More detailed maps and policies are contained in the *Wichita Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan*.



Agricultural or Vacant: Encompasses areas that are undeveloped or used for agricultural production. Agricultural land is an important natural resource. Pockets of low-density residential uses without the full range of municipal services likely will be developed in areas of the urban fringe that primarily are used for agriculture. Such development should occur in accordance with the *Urban Fringe Development Standards for Wichita and Sedgwick County* and should be developed in a manner that facilitates future connection to municipal services when they become available.

Major Institutional: Includes institutional facilities of a significant size and scale of operation and could include a range of such uses as government facilities, libraries, high schools, colleges, universities, cemeteries, and hospitals.





Neighborhood/Area Plan: Adopted neighborhood and area plans have been designated on the map. These plans should be consulted for specific future land use direction.

3. Locational Guidelines

The Locational Guidelines provide a decision-making framework regarding land use changes. This decision-making framework is comprised of three key elements - **Development Pattern, Land Use Compatibility, and Design**. These elements encourage patterns of development that efficiently and effectively use land, public infrastructure, and services; strive for compatibility among various land uses; and, promote quality of place through design. Within each of these elements, guidance is provided according to the following geographic areas:

“...strive for compatibility among various land uses; and, promote quality of place through design...”

1. **General** (applicable throughout the entire Plan area)
2. **Established Central Area** (specific to the downtown core and the mature neighborhoods surrounding it in a roughly three mile radius)
3. **Outside Established Central Area** (specific to the remaining incorporated areas of Wichita outside the *Established Central Area*, and also including Wichita’s 2035 Urban Growth Area)
4. **Rural Area** (specific to the unincorporated areas of Sedgwick County located outside the 2035 Urban Growth Areas)

Geographic Area	Development Pattern	Land Use Compatibility	Design
General	p. 22	p. 23	p. 24
Established Central Area	p. 22	p. 24	p. 25
Outside Established Central Area	p. 23	p. 24	p. 25
Rural Area	p. 23	p. 24	p. 25

These Locational Guidelines should be used with a sense of flexibility supplemented by guidance contained in neigh-

borhood and area plans adopted as elements of this Plan; small city comprehensive plans; and other state-of-the-art planning principles and practices as circumstances warrant.

Development Pattern

1. General

- a. Development should occur where necessary supporting infrastructure and services exist or are planned for extension concurrently with the development.
- b. Discourage development from occurring in aquifer recharge, flood prone, high ground water, wetland, and unsuitable soil areas.
- c. Major commercial and employment centers should be located at intersections of arterial streets and along highways and commercial corridors.
- d. Industrial uses should be located in areas with good access to highways, rail lines, and airports.
- e. Higher-density residential uses and neighborhood-serving retail and office uses should buffer lower-density residential uses from major commercial and employments centers and industrial uses.
- f. Primary outdoor sales uses should be located along highway corridors or in areas where the uses have already been established.
- g. Support expansion of existing uses to adjacent areas.
- h. Development near primary and secondary gateways identified on the *Priority Enhancement Areas for Wichita Public Infrastructure Projects Map* should be oriented primarily towards destination retail (such as: regional shopping centers, entertainment complexes, national retailers with limited locations) and hospitality.

2. Established Central Area

- a. Encourage infill development that maximizes public investment in existing and planned infrastructure and services.
- b. Promote mixed-use redevelopment of existing commercial centers and along arterial streets.
- c. Promote downtown as the region’s preeminent walk-






able, mixed-use development area with a focus on office, retail, hospitality, government services, high-density residential, and entertainment, cultural, and civic facilities and activities.

3. Outside Established Central Area

- a. Strip commercial development along arterials should be discouraged except along established commercial corridors and highways.
- b. Major commercial development should be guided to the intersection of two arterial streets.
- c. Small, neighborhood-serving retail and offices uses and high-density residential uses not located at arterial intersections should be limited to the intersection of an arterial and a collector street.
- d. Low-density residential uses should be buffered from commercial and industrial areas by open space, water bodies, changes in topography, or major barriers such as arterial streets or highways.
- e. New development areas separated from existing developed areas by major barriers (such as: highways, railroads, waterways, and airports) or by significant open space or undeveloped areas should be discouraged unless the scale of the development is sufficient to support the cost of extending infrastructure and services in a manner that sup-



ports additional development on surrounding sites.

- f. New development in areas where city growth areas abut should be coordinated among the affected cities, particularly as it relates to street connectivity and land use compatibility.

4. Rural Area

- a. Outside the 2035 Urban Growth Areas, commercial/industrial development should be limited to the following: agricultural-oriented uses; rural home occupations; natural resource dependent; convenience services; highway-oriented services at interchange areas; or uses that need significant buffering from residential areas (to mitigate nuisance or hazard impacts).

- b. Urban-density development is discouraged from locating in rural areas, and rural-density development should be located in accordance to the *Urban Fringe Development Standards for Wichita and Sedgwick County*.

Land Use Compatibility

1. General

- a. Higher-intensity development should be discouraged from locating in areas of existing lower-intensity development, particularly established low-density residential areas.

- b. Industrial and major commercial land uses that generate pollution, odor, noise, light, safety hazards, and high levels of traffic should be located away from residential areas and developed with screening, buffering, and site design features sufficient to mitigate adverse impacts.

- c. Residential development should not encroach upon existing or planned heavy industry, airfields, and military installations.

- d. Manufactured home parks (as distinguished from manufactured home subdivisions) should be located on large





tracts and buffered from lower-density residential areas by physical barriers (e.g., freeways, drainage ways, railway, etc.).

2. Established Central Area

- a. Neighborhood-serving retail and office uses and high-density residential uses can be appropriate along arterial streets on small infill sites near residential uses or through conversions of residential structures if appropriate site design features that limit traffic, noise, lighting, and adverse impacts on surrounding residential are provided and the scale of the development is appropriate for its context.
- b. Accessory dwelling units, duplexes, and small-scale multi-family developments can be appropriate in existing residential areas if appropriate site design limits adverse impacts on surrounding residential uses, the design of the buildings is compatible with existing residences, and the scale of the development is compatible with the intensity of the surrounding area.

3. Outside Established Central Area

- a. Except in mixed-use developments, residential and non-residential development areas generally should be separate and distinct with appropriate screening and buffering to ensure compatibility among land uses while maintaining connectivity among uses.



- b. Mixed-use developments should provide appropriate screening and buffering to ensure compatibility with surrounding lower-intensity land uses while maintaining connectivity among uses.

4. Rural Area

- a. Discourage encroachment of land uses such as residential and recreation that would be negatively impacted by noise, dust, odor, light, and other impacts of agricultural operations into primarily agricultural areas outside the 2035 Urban Growth Areas.
- b. Industrial and commercial uses located in rural areas should be separate and distinct from lower-intensity


lands uses and should provide appropriate screening and buffering to ensure compatibility among land uses.

Design

1. General

- a. Commercial centers, office parks, and mixed-use developments should be designed with shared internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation, combined signage, coordinated landscaping and building design, and combined ingress/egress locations.
- b. Ingress/egress locations to non-residential uses generally should not access residential streets unless such access will not negatively impact nearby residential areas, except that industrial traffic should not feed directly into local streets in residential areas.
- c. Driveways and intersections along major thoroughfares should be limited to maintain safe and efficient mobility. Medians should be used when appropriate to limit turning conflicts, particularly near arterial intersections. Pedestrian crossings of arterial streets should be provided between arterial intersections.
- d. Except in mixed-use development areas, non-residential uses should provide appropriate screening and buffering from residential uses.
- e. Non-residential uses should have site design features that limit traffic, noise, lighting, and adverse impacts on surrounding residential land uses.
- f. Major commercial and employment centers and institutional and government services should be designed to accommodate convenient transit service, particularly for those with mobility challenges.
- g. Building entrances should be oriented to the street or internal circulation drives that connect to the street and designated pedestrian connections should be provided from building entrances to the street.
- h. Development abutting the targeted arterials, Kellogg freeway, gateways, and landmarks identified on the





Priority Enhancement Areas for Wichita Infrastructure Projects Map should consider the inclusion of site design features that increase the sense of quality of life through emphasis of visual character and aesthetic improvements.

2. Established Central Area

- a. Support development of a variety of lot sizes and housing types.
- b. Buildings are encouraged to be located close to the street with parking areas located beside or behind buildings.
- c. Commercial and mixed-used developments are encouraged to have building entrances, transparent facades, and outdoor patios adjacent to the sidewalk.

3. Outside Established Central Area

- a. Low-density residential lots should not front directly onto arterial streets.
- b. Layout of blocks within neighborhoods should promote direct pedestrian connectivity within the neighborhood and to adjacent neighborhoods and surrounding commercial centers and institutional uses.

4. Rural Area

- a. Layout of blocks that provide a single point of access to a neighborhood should be discouraged.

4. Wichita Urban Infill Strategy

Infill refers to developing vacant or underutilized land in existing developed areas. By absorbing growth in existing developed areas, residential and employment-based infill development can reduce growth pressure on rural areas; provide for efficient use of land; utilize existing infrastructure and services; and improve the quality of life in areas experiencing abandonment and decline. However, infill development can be inhibited by regulatory barriers, infrastructure in need of modernization, neighborhood concerns about different housing types or incompatible uses, and difficulties with land assembly and financing.

The Wichita Urban Infill Strategy is focused on the Established Central Area – comprised of the downtown core and the mature neighborhoods surrounding it in a roughly three mile radius (see *2035 Wichita Future Growth Concept Map*). Increased levels of residential infill/redevelopment

throughout the Established Central Area will represent 12% of total new dwelling units forecasted for Wichita by 2035 (a threefold increase from current trends).

The strategy focuses on ‘areas of opportunity’ that have the most vacant and underutilized parcels where infill development can reverse patterns of abandonment and decline. The strategy also is intended to preserve ‘areas of stability’ where few vacant and underutilized parcels exist and a pattern of continued reinvestment is evident. Neighborhood and area plans adopted as elements of the Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan will provide additional land use policy guidance as applicable.

Areas of Opportunity

Defining Characteristics: Areas of opportunity are areas in the community where focused efforts on infill development can have the most success. The defining characteristics of areas of opportunity are generally higher than average and increasing:

- Vacant parcels
- Vacancy rates
- Renter-occupied dwelling units
- Structures in fair or worse condition
- Nuisance complaints
- Building demolitions
- Infrastructure below standard





Guiding Principle: Larger-scale, multi-property infill projects should be guided to areas of opportunity to maximize public investment in existing and planned infrastructure and services.

Areas of Stability

Defining Characteristics: Areas of stability are areas in the community where infill development opportunities are limited by the lack of available land. Areas of stability have few vacant parcels and higher than average occupancy rates. A majority of the structures are in average or better condition and owner-occupied. There are few nuisance complaints and building demolitions, and much of the infrastructure is at or above standard.

Guiding Principle: Infill development should be limited to projects on individual or small sites with a scale of development appropriate for its context. Infill projects should complement existing neighborhood development and incorporate site design features that limit traffic, noise, lighting, and adverse impacts on surrounding properties.

Neighborhood Concerns

Issue: Infill development changes a neighborhood. While redevelopment projects can be of the appropriate scale and have the necessary design features to mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding properties, current processes make it difficult for neighborhoods to visualize the proposed changes and have meaningful input into project design.

Strategy: Establish a participatory neighborhood planning program to prepare neighborhood design guidelines for areas of opportunity prior to construction of large-scale, multi-property infill projects. Also develop basic infill development guidelines that would be applicable throughout the Established Central Area.

Regulatory Issues

Issue: Our traditional development regulations are geared toward suburban-scale, auto-oriented development requirements (such as: parking, setbacks, density, landscaping, screening, etc.). To promote greater levels of more

walkable, urban-scale infill projects, regulatory changes are required.

Strategy: Amend development regulations to better encourage by-right infill development projects.

Infrastructure Modernization

Issue: Many of the areas where the opportunity for infill development exist are also the areas with the most sub-standard infrastructure. While infrastructure may be in place, it often cannot support additional development, and the layout and design of the infrastructure often must be changed to support the configuration of infill.

“...infill development projects often do not qualify for conventional financing because the appraised value of a project is less than the cost of development...”

Strategy: Develop and implement a long-range plan for major infrastructure maintenance projects that focuses infrastructure investment in areas of opportunity in a manner supportive of infill development efforts.

Land Assembly and Financing

Issue: Profitable infill development opportunities are difficult to find. Once an area experiences a few successful projects, the remaining available land often increases in value beyond a level at which additional projects can be profitable. Additionally, infill development projects often do not qualify for conventional financing because the appraised value of project is less than the cost of development.

Strategy: Establish a public-private relationship to support infill development through market research, design assistance, and financing opportunities.



Plan Elements





This page intentionally blank.





Plan Element- Funding and Financing

Plan Context & Perspective - According to Kansas statutes, a specific requirement of a city and county comprehensive plan is to identify major sources and expenditures of public revenue including long range financial plans for the financing of public facilities and capital improvements.

For the purposes of this Plan, the term 'funding' is used to describe the various sources of revenue available for spending/investing. The term 'financing' is used to describe the various means by which funding is leveraged, combined and utilized for spending/investing purposes.

One of the Core Community Values of this Plan is fiscal responsibility.

This value embodies the following principles ... don't spend more than you have; spend and invest wisely; take care of what you have; and maximize the 'return-on-investment'.

Presently, there is an estimated \$9-10 billion gap over the next 20 years between Wichita's planned future infrastructure and facility expenditures and its projected revenues. A key challenge of this Plan is how to close that gap over the long-term. Our choices are essentially increasing revenues (through taxes and fees), decreasing expenditures (utilizing alternate approaches or standards; reducing scope and scale of projects; deferring or eliminating projects), and learning to live within the funding and financing resources available to local government.

From a public infrastructure funding and financing perspective, the preferred option of closing the projected expenditure and revenue gap over the long term is to ***better align expenditures with available funding and financing resources***. While opportunities to increase revenues may present themselves in the future, there are more opportunities to improve how budget allocations are made for capital improvements.

"...there is an estimated \$9-10 billion gap over the next 20 years between Wichita's planned future infrastructure and facility expenditures and its projected revenues..."

“...better align expenditures with available funding and financing resources...”

Our Funding and Financing Goals & Strategies

Goal 1 - Close the long-term cost/revenue gap between our planned future infrastructure and facility expenditures and our projected revenues.

Strategies:

- A. Strategically leverage public and private funding where possible.
- B. Decrease project costs through a combination of reduced or alternate project approaches or standards; reduced project scale and scope; and, project deferral or elimination.
- C. Identify long-term maintenance and replacement costs for all capital improvement program projects. Include ongoing maintenance and operations budgets as part of the overall project cost.
- D. Align infrastructure and facility funding to reflect the maintenance and replacement costs associated with that infrastructure or facility.

Goal 2 - Maintain a responsible and appropriate taxing level to address our community's needs.

Strategies:

- A. Align utility fees, user fees and taxes to reflect the cost of providing facilities and services at standards acceptable to our community.
- B. Align our public infrastructure and facility investments with the willingness of our community to pay for them.
- C. In 1985, Sedgwick County voters approved a county-wide one-cent sales tax to help maintain or construct road projects as well as reduce property tax. The one-cent sales tax revenue distribution formula is determined by statute and is based on local jurisdiction property tax mill levy rates as well as population.

Goal 3- Establish funding priorities which reflect community priorities.

Strategies:

- A. Fund public infrastructure and facilities based upon the following overall ranking of spending and investment priorities:





1. Maintain and replace what we currently have;
2. Make enhancements to what we currently have;
3. Expand our current system of infrastructure and facility assets.

B. Focus funding on infrastructure and facilities that will advance our community quality of life, create a place that will retain future generations, and promote economic growth and job creation.

C. Focus funding on infrastructure and facilities that will maintain vibrancy, promote growth and secure quality of place in the Established Central Area of Wichita.

D. Review existing public infrastructure and facility assets to determine those assets which should no longer be retained by the City or County due to duplication/redundancies with private sector facilities, functional obsolescence, and/or changing community investment priorities.

tion infrastructure constitutes a basic yet essential, community-sustaining investment.

“...additional expenditures are needed to maintain Wichita’s local road system...”

Wichita’s freeway and bridge infrastructure are in good condition overall with adequate system capacity. The County’s road and bridge infrastructure are in very good repair and condition. However, decades of under-investment and deferred maintenance in Wichita’s local road system has required the City to develop an enhanced maintenance strategy for its local road infrastructure. Additional expenditures are needed to maintain Wichita’s local road system.

Decades of under-investment in Wichita’s long-established public transit system have resulted in minimal service levels, low ridership and future financial instability. Additional investment in Wichita’s public transit system would be needed in order to achieve the system’s financial stability and retain public transit service. Opportunities for alternate, innovative solutions must be pursued.

Plan Element -

Transportation

Plan Context & Perspective -

The realization of the 2035 Plan Vision Statement is dependent upon our community having a safe, reliable and well-connected transportation system that strategically supports economic growth and community quality of life. The term “transportation” refers to the movement of goods, people and information. Our transporta-



For Wichita, the level of investment priority over the next 20 years varies across the major transportation infrastructure categories as follows:


- Very high priority* - local streets and bridges
- Medium-high priority* - public transit
- Low-medium priority* - freeway enhancements
- Low priority* - new bypasses


For Sedgwick County, the level of investment priority over the next 20 years varies across the major transportation infrastructure categories as follows:

- Very high priority* - local streets and bridges
- Medium-high priority* - freeway enhancements
- Medium priority* - new bypasses
- Low priority* - public transit

Our Transportation Goals & Strategies

Goal 1 - Preserve and maintain a safe, cost-effective and reliable transportation system that strategically supports the economic growth, vitality and quality of life aspirations of our community.



**Strategies:**

- A. Develop and implement a transportation asset management system that effectively uses available funds.
- B. Make transportation infrastructure investments, particularly integrated transportation technology enhancements, that support and reflect Wichita's 2035 Future Growth Concept and Urban Infill Strategy.
- C. Allocate additional funding for the long-term maintenance and replacement of Wichita's existing local road and bridge infrastructure.
- D. Invest in new or existing transportation infrastructure that directly supports additional job growth, especially of an advanced manufacturing or high-tech nature.

Goal 2 - Improve and increase the movement of goods, people and information with better connectivity and mobility options in our community.

Strategies:

- A. Develop and implement a community-wide, public and/or private broadband infrastructure and high-speed internet access plan to support future job and employment growth.
- B. Develop and implement a long-term transit system plan that reflects the needs of our community.
- C. Improve our community connectivity and safety through the implementation of *Wichita's Bicycle Master Plan* and *Pedestrian Master Plan*, and promoting linkages to surrounding cities in the County.
- D. Coordinate and integrate local transportation infrastructure plans with the Wichita Area Metropolitan Area Organization (WAMPO) long-range regional transportation infrastructure plan.

Plan Element - Water, Sewer and Stormwater

Plan Context & Perspective - The realization of the 2035 Plan Vision Statement is predicated upon our community securing a long-term water supply, and having well-maintained

water treatment/distribution, sewer collection/treatment and stormwater/flood management systems. These constitute essential, community-sustaining services. They represent a basic yet essential public investment that supports future job growth and a strong economy.

Decades of under-investment and deferred maintenance in Wichita's water, sewer and stormwater infrastructure requires the City to be aggressive in protecting what assets it already has (especially replacing aging pipe infrastructure) and making future water and sewer facility enhancements to meet required treatment and discharge standards. Additional investment in our community water, sewer and stormwater infrastructure and facilities is necessary ... securing a long-term water supply is critical to the future of our community.

“...securing a long-term water supply is critical to the future of our community...”

The funding/financing, maintenance, replacement and enhancement of our public water, sewer and stormwater infrastructure and facilities is a *high-very high investment need* for our community over the long term.

**Our Water, Sewer and Stormwater Goals & Strategies**

Goal 1 - Provide a well-maintained long-term water supply, treatment and distribution system that supports the economic growth, vitality and quality of life aspirations of our community.

Strategies:

- A. Develop and implement Wichita's long-term water sup-





ply, treatment and distribution plans to reflect and accommodate Wichita's 2035 Future Growth Concept and Urban Infill Strategy (including long-term population and employment growth projections).

B. Develop and implement a Wichita water supply funding/financing plan that enables our community to make those investments necessary to secure an affordable, long-term water supply.

C. Develop and implement a Wichita water funding/financing plan that identifies appropriate water rate

adjustments necessary to properly maintain Wichita's water infrastructure over the long-term.

D. Place a very high investment priority on properly maintaining and replacing Wichita's aging, existing water distribution system.

E. Develop and implement a Wichita water conservation and drought-response plan that is relevant to our community's need and supported by our community.

F. Create a task force comprised of appropriate representatives from the City of Wichita and other affected cities, the local land development community, and the rural water districts to identify workable long-term solutions to compensatory and logistical issues associated with continued urban growth and development within the rural water districts in Sedgwick County.

Goal 2 - Provide a well-maintained Wichita sanitary sewer treatment and collection system that supports the economic growth, vitality and quality of life aspirations of our community.

Strategies:

A. Develop and implement Wichita's long-term sewer collection and treatment plans to reflect and accommodate Wichita's 2035 Future Growth Concept and Urban Infill Strategy (including long-term population and employment growth projections).

B. Develop and implement a Wichita sewer funding/financing plan that identifies appropriate sewer rate adjustments necessary to properly maintain Wichita's sewer infrastructure over the long-term.

C. Place a very high investment priority on properly maintaining and replacing Wichita's aging, existing sewer collection system.

D. Invest to ensure that Wichita's sewer collection and treatment infrastructure and facilities meet required standards and long-term community needs.

E. Ensure that appropriate local regulations are in place that provide for the compatible, long-term co-existence of city water and sewer infrastructure systems with self-contained, independent sewer collection and water distribution systems.



“...invest in maintaining and replacing our aging water and sewer distribution systems...”

Goal 3 - Provide a well-maintained stormwater management system and approach that adequately serves and protects our community while meeting state and federal mandates.

Strategies:

A. Develop and implement long-term stormwater management plans that reflect and accommodate Wichita's 2035 Future Growth Concept and Urban Infill Strategy (including long-term population and employment growth projections), and address county-wide stormwater and flooding issues.

B. Develop and implement a county-wide stormwater funding/financing plan that will raise sufficient revenues needed to plan and construct stormwater project improvements with regional, county-wide or multi-jurisdiction benefits.





- C. Develop and implement a Wichita stormwater funding/ financing plan that determines appropriate ERU (equivalent residential unit) rate adjustments necessary to properly fund the maintenance and repair of Wichita's stormwater infrastructure over the long-term.
- D. Make the investments necessary to properly maintain and replace our existing stormwater infrastructure and facilities.
- E. Maintain and implement stormwater management standards that meet mandated requirements but do not place undue burdens on development or redevelopment.
- F. Integrate park and open space improvements where appropriate and cost-effective as part of stormwater management system infrastructure improvements.

Plan Element - Arts, Culture and Recreation

Plan Context & Perspective - Having a “quality living environment and active, healthy lifestyles with access to arts, culture and recreation” is specifically referenced in the 2035 Plan Vision Statement. One of the five Plan Guiding Policy Principles is to Invest in the Quality of Our Community Life. It is evident that community quality of life investments are important to residents of our community and are an essential means of supporting future job growth and a strong economy.

Arts, culture and recreation quality of life investments refer to capital, maintenance and operational spending in the general categories of parks and open space; recreation facilities; libraries; and, arts, culture and entertainment. From a public infrastructure perspective, appropriately funding, maintaining and expanding our arts, culture and recreation quality of life investments is an overall *medium-high priority investment need* for our community over the long term.

Our Arts, Culture and Recreation Goals & Strategies

Goal 1 - Improve quality of life and healthy lifestyles for all through an accessible system of arts, culture, library, recreation and open space facilities.

Strategies:

- A. Review and update the *Wichita Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan* to ensure that future planned parks/ open space and recreation facility investments (capital, maintenance, operations) strategically integrate with County regional parks and open space investments, and remain consistent with our community priorities and willingness to pay.
- B. Develop and implement a joint City/County integrated cultural arts/ quality of life facilities investment plan to achieve better planning, coordination, integration and maximization of City and County quality of life community investments.
- C. Utilize relationships with private and not-for-profit organizations and secure dedicated funding sources for the construction, maintenance and operation of our quality of life investments (includes park/open space, recreation, library and cultural arts facilities).
- D. Employ best management practices/systems to properly maintain our existing quality of life facilities.



“...quality of life investments are important to residents of our community..”

- E. Review and update the Wichita Public Library System Master Plan to ensure our city-wide system of library facilities and associated technologies remain relevant to the evolving library needs of our community.
- F. Develop and implement a “built environment” strategic plan that better promotes healthy community lifestyles, neighborhood and community connectivity, resource conservation, protecting the City’s urban forest in public spaces, and multiple-use integration of our parks, open space and stormwater management systems.
- G. Identify opportunity areas and regulatory adjustments necessary to support agritourism in the unincorporated areas of Sedgwick County.



Plan Element - Public Safety

Plan Context & Perspective - Having a “safe community” is specifically referenced in the 2035 Plan Vision Statement. From a public infrastructure perspective, appropriately maintaining and expanding our fire, police and EMS facilities is a *high priority investment need* for our community over the long term.

Our Public Safety Goals & Strategies

Goal 1 - Provide efficient and effective police, fire and EMS public safety service facilities that meet current and future community needs.

Strategies:

- A. Identify opportunities for collaborative partnerships, joint-funding and joint-use agreements, and sharing of facilities between public safety government agencies.
- B. Evaluate the merits of City/County public safety services consolidation as an option to provide for more



coordinated and cost-effective public safety facility operations and service delivery.

- C. Ensure that service and facility planning for police, fire and EMS service delivery addresses current and future community needs, adapts to future patterns of growth, and supports neighborhood-based safety initiatives within the City of Wichita.
- D. Establish performance measures that evaluate functional relevancy, need and effective utilization of our public safety service facilities.

“...maintaining and expanding our fire, police, and EMS facilities is a high priority investment need...”



Priority Enhancement Areas for Wichita Public Infrastructure Projects



Intent and Purpose:

This map replaces the 1993 Visual Form map and is intended to foster efforts to improve community perception and increase the sense of quality of life in Wichita through emphasis of the visual character of public facilities and open spaces.

Its purpose is to help the City with prioritizing City of Wichita public works projects along specified corridors, at gateways, and at other selected locations for aesthetic improvements including landscaping, public art, and other visual enhancements to public facilities and rights-of-way.





Plan Implementation





This page intentionally blank.





Plan Implementation

Part 1. Infrastructure Investment Decision-making Framework

Plan Context & Perspective - The infrastructure investment decision-making framework is a tool to systematically guide future public spending in a manner that supports community priorities, reflects willingness to pay, and is coordinated with market-driven growth. This framework is also intended to help close the gap over the next 20 years between our forecasted revenues and the costs of our proposed capital project needs and wants associated with the 2035 Wichita Future Growth Concept. The forecasted revenues and proposed capital project costs have been aggregated and summarized below for planning-level purposes:

Project Costs

▪ Maintaining and replacing existing infrastructure	\$4.9 billion
▪ Making enhancements to what we currently have	\$6.4 billion
▪ Expanding our current system of infrastructure & facilities	\$2.1 billion
Total	\$13.4 billion

Forecasted Revenues

Total	\$3.9 billion
<i>Projected Gap</i>	<i>\$9.5 billion</i>

The infrastructure investment decision-making framework is comprised of various components, criteria and considerations. This framework is intended to encourage long-term continuity and best practices for decision-makers as they implement the Guiding Principles, Goals and Strategies set forth in this Plan, for the intent of ...

- Promoting economic growth and job creation
- Advancing community quality of life and safety
- Creating a community that will attract and retain future generations

For the purposes of this Plan, the term 'spending/investing' is used to describe *where* and for *what purposes* funding and financing will be utilized. The term 'decision-making' is the process of deciding *how* to spend/invest.

The Framework ...

The components and accompanying criteria listed below represent different levels of evaluation for both new and replacement infrastructure and facility projects. There will be interplay between these three levels of evaluation during the project decision-making process.

Level 1 Evaluation - Detailed Project Analysis

(determining individual project merits)

- To what extent is this project right for our community in terms of:
 - a) Scope and scale (cost effectiveness)
 - b) Timing
- Is this project recommended in a plan approved or endorsed by the City Council or the County Board of Commissioners?
- To what extent does this project build upon prior investments or generate multiple benefits to our community?






- Is there a legal mandate or requirement to do this project?
- To what extent does this project reduce or offset costs to the community?
- Project economic and quality of life assessments – will this project:
 - a) Increase wealth for our local economy
 - b) Generate job growth for our community
 - c) Secure or protect important natural resources (soil, water and air quality)
 - d) Retain current residents and attract future residents - help create a community that is desirable and attractive to future generations
- Is this a project that impacts infrastructure or facility assets that should no longer be retained by the City or County due to duplication/redundancies with private sector facilities, functional obsolescence, and/or changing community investment priorities?
- Project funding and financing assessments:
 - a) How will this project be funded and financed
 - b) Is this project identified for funding in the Capital Improvement Program for Wichita or Sedgwick County
 - c) What is the project's impact on the City of Wichita or Sedgwick County budget
 - d) Have sufficient operating and maintenance funds been secured for this project once construction is completed
 - e) Has a benefit/cost or 'return-on-investment' analysis been done for this project
 - f) What are the 'trade-offs' if this project is approved (e.g. what other projects do not get built, or are deferred or reduced in scope)

Level 2 Evaluation - Project Selection & Funding

(determining project priorities)

- To what extent is this project consistent with the five Plan Guiding Policy Principles:
 1. *Support an Innovative, Vibrant and Diverse Economy*
 2. *Invest in the Quality of Our Community Life*
 3. *Take Better Care of What We Already Have*
 4. *Make Strategic, Value-added Investment Decisions*
 5. *Provide for Balanced Growth but with Added Focus on Existing Neighborhoods*
- What is the priority of this project in relation to the 'Infrastructure & Facility Investment Category Priorities':
 - Priority 1 - Maintain and replace what we currently have*
 - Priority 2 - Make enhancements to what we currently have*
 - Priority 3 - Expand our current system of infrastructure and facility assets*





- To what extent is this project consistent with the Plan Element Goals for:
 - * Public Safety
 - * Transportation
 - * Water, Sewer, Stormwater
 - * Arts, Culture, Recreation
 - * Funding and Financing
- Does this project allocate funding to those categories of infrastructure that have the highest need for additional investment?

Level 3 Evaluation - Capital Improvement Programming

(appropriate project timing, phasing & sequencing)

- To what extent do the capital projects programmed for Wichita or Sedgwick County reflect the project initiation and completion sequencing principles of: 'plan', 'design', 'fund/finance', 'construct'?
- To what extent are the capital projects programmed for funding over the next three to five years properly and logically timed, coordinated and integrated (geographically and fiscally)?
- To what extent are the capital projects programmed for funding critically and strategically timed and synchronized with external mandates and/or external funding and financing considerations?
- To what extent are the capital projects coordinated with market-driven development?





Part 2. Plan Monitoring, Review and Amendment

Plan Context & Perspective - In a new era of social and economic uncertainty, it is imperative that a systematic and ongoing approach be developed to monitor change and to review and evaluate this Plan. This will allow the Plan to be adjusted and updated annually as necessary so as to remain relevant and appropriate for our community. The ultimate measure of the Plan's success is whether it helps our community to become what we wish it to be over the next 20 years.

a) Plan Monitoring Approach

2035 Plan Vision Statement - Reflects Desired Plan Outcomes:

- > Global center of advanced manufacturing and high-tech industries
- > Premier regional service, education and retail center
- > Affordable housing opportunities
- > Vibrant neighborhoods
- > Active, healthy lifestyles
- > Safe community

Plan Guiding Policy Principles - Represent Key Areas to Measure Plan Performance:

1. Support an Innovative, Vibrant and Diverse Economy.

Hi-tech, advanced manufacturing and business start-up job-growth indicators

- a) Center for Economic Development and Business Research data:
- Bureau of Labor Statistics
 - County Business Patterns
 - GDP data (total and per capita growth rates)
 - Small Business Innovation Research Grants
 - Small Business Technical Transformation Grants
- b) Greater Wichita Economic Development Coalition data:
- Annual projects announcement report data

Regional service, education and retail job growth indicators

- a) Center for Economic Development and Business Research data:
- Bureau of Labor Statistics

- County Business Patterns
- b) GWEDC data:
- Annual projects announcement report data
- c) American Community Survey data:
- Annual education attainment levels for Wichita and Sedgwick County

Economic opportunities & growth indicators

- a) National Citizen Survey Benchmark Results for Wichita* - 'Wichita average rating' & 'comparison to benchmark' for the following survey questions:
- Employment opportunities
 - Shopping opportunities
 - Economic development services
 - Educational opportunities
 - Wichita as a place to work
- b) American Community Survey data:
- Annual median income for Wichita and Sedgwick County
 - Annual percentage change in the 25-40 age cohort for Wichita and Sedgwick County
 - Wichita and Sedgwick County unemployment rates

2. Invest in the Quality of Our Community Life.

Quality of life indicators

- a) National Citizen Survey Benchmark Results for Wichita* - 'Wichita average rating' & 'comparison to benchmark' for the following survey questions:
- Overall quality of life in Wichita
 - Sense of community
 - Your neighborhood as a place to live
 - Wichita as a place to live
 - Wichita as a place to raise kids
 - Wichita as a place to retire
 - Recommend living in Wichita
 - Will remain in Wichita for the next five years
 - Opportunities to attend cultural activities
 - Air quality
 - Public safety – violent crimes
 - Public safety – property crimes

*assumes continued future participation





3. Take Better Care of What We Already Have.

Plan Element: Public Safety

Building Facility Condition Indicators

- a) Wichita Public Works and Utilities Dept. (under development)
 - Building asset value (\$ million)
 - Building remaining service life (sq. footage yrs.)
 - Buildings with no remaining service life (sq. footage)
- b) Sedgwick County Information & Operations - Facilities Division
 - Building roof useful life remaining
 - Building HVAC useful life remaining

Plan Element: Transportation

Street and Bridge Infrastructure Condition Indicators

- a) Wichita Public Works and Utilities Dept. (under development)
 - Paved road network service value (\$ million)
 - Paved road network remaining service life (lane mile yrs.)
 - Paved road lane miles with no remaining service life (lane miles)
 - Bridge network service value (\$ million)
 - Bridge network remaining service life (lane mile yrs.)
 - Bridge network remaining service life (lane miles)
- b) Sedgwick County Public Works Division
 - Percentage of paved lane miles receiving preventative maintenance
 - Percentage of all lane miles with permanent pavement
 - Percentage of all lane miles with temporary pavement
 - Bridge average sufficiency rating (scale of 0 to 100)
 - Bridge percentage of inventory with sufficiency rating below 50
 - Number of bridges requiring special inspections
- c) National Citizen Survey Benchmark Results for Wichita* - 'Wichita average rating' & 'comparison to benchmark' for the following survey questions:
 - County Business Patterns
 - Street repair
 - Sidewalk maintenance

- Ease of car travel
- Ease of bus travel
- Ease of bicycle travel
- Ease of walking

Plan Element: Water, Sewer, Stormwater

Water, Sewer and Stormwater Infrastructure Condition Indicators

- a) Wichita Public Works and Utilities Dept. (under development)
 - Water, sewer, stormwater line and main network service value (\$ million)
 - Water, sewer, stormwater line and main network remaining service life (pipe inches/feet yrs.)
 - Water, sewer, stormwater line and main network with no remaining service life (pipe inches/feet)
 - Long-term water supply (mg/day/years)
 - Water treatment plant asset value (\$ million)
 - Water treatment plant capacity (million gallons/day years)
 - Wastewater treatment plant asset value (\$ million)
 - Wastewater treatment plant capacity (million gallons/day years)
- b) Sedgwick County Public Works Division
 - Number of homes and businesses in the 100 year floodplain
- c) National Citizen Survey Benchmark Results for Wichita* - 'Wichita average rating' & 'comparison to benchmark' for the following survey questions:
 - Sewer services
 - Drinking water
 - Storm drainage

Plan Element: Arts, Culture, Recreation

Building Facility Condition Indicators

- a) Wichita Public Works and Utilities Dept. (under development)
 - Building asset value (\$ million)
 - Building remaining service life (sq. footage yrs.)
 - Buildings with no remaining service life (sq. footage)

*assumes continued future participation





- b) Sedgwick County Information & Operations - Facilities Division
 - Building roof useful life remaining
 - Building HVAC useful life remaining
- c) National Citizen Survey Benchmark Results for Wichita* - 'Wichita average rating' & 'comparison to benchmark' for the following survey questions:
 - Recreation opportunities
 - City park services
 - City recreation center facilities
 - Public library services

- b) County Appraiser's Office
 - Annual number of net new dwelling units in Sedgwick County, Wichita and the Established Central Area
 - Annual net new commercial square footage in Sedgwick County, Wichita and the Established Central Area

4. Make Strategic, Value-added Investment Decisions.

Key Value-added Investment Indicators

- a) National Citizen Survey Benchmark Results for Wichita 'Wichita average rating' & 'comparison to benchmark' for the following survey questions:
 - Value of services for the taxes paid to Wichita
- b) Metropolitan Area Planning Department (MAPD), Wichita and Sedgwick County Finance Departments
 - An annual report prepared by MAPD with input from the City and County Finance Departments and a survey of the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission (MAPC) members that assesses the consistency level of capital projects funded in the city and county capital improvement programs with the investment decision-making framework components and criteria set forth in the Community Investments Plan.

b) Plan Review & Amendment

- Prepare an annual plan monitoring report containing a summary of the key performance indicators data associated with the five Plan Guiding Principles. The report would also document progress on the implementing the Plan Element Goals and Strategies
- Review the annual monitoring report with City and County Department Heads, the Advance Plans Committee, the MAPC as well as the Wichita City Council and the Board of Sedgwick County Commissioners
- Prepare list of recommendations regarding any appropriate Plan amendments
- Staff initiative Plan amendments as appropriate for consideration by the MAPC

5. Provide for Balanced Growth but with Added Focus on Our Established Neighborhoods.

Key Resource Allocation Indicators

- a) Wichita Finance Dept.
 - % of total annual capital investments in infrastructure/facilities projects located within and/or benefiting Wichita's Established Central Area and the Suburban Area

Key Growth Indicators

- a) American Community Survey
 - Annual net population growth in Sedgwick County, Wichita and the Established Central Area

*assumes continued future participation





Community Investments *Plan*
Appendix



Sedgwick County...
working for you

This page intentionally blank.



CommunityInvestmentsPlan
Appendix

Table of Contents

Wichita 2035 Growth Scenarios..... 5

- Scenario #1 – Current Trends..... 5
- Scenario #2 – Constrained Suburban Growth..... 9
- Scenario #3 – Suburban and Infill Growth Mix..... 13

Appendix - Community Trends and Challenges Ahead..... 17

Appendix - Existing Conditions & Community Infrastructure Assessment 23

Appendix - Community Engagement..... 31

- 2013 WSU Community Survey Results 31
- ACT-ICT Community Outreach Results..... 32
- April 2014 Community Investments Plan Open House Meeting Results 33
- May-June 2014 Community Investments Plan Discussion Meeting Results 34
- May-June 2014 Activate Wichita Online Survey Results..... 39
- 2015 Community Engagement 41

Appendix - Plan Adoption and Amendments 59



This page intentionally blank.



Appendix - Wichita 2035 Growth Scenarios

Wichita 2035 Growth & Community Investment Scenarios Summary Sheet

Scenario #1 – Current Trends

Scenario Vision Elements -

Wichita will experience a population and employment growth rate and development pattern (suburban and downtown) typical of the last several decades, but with a slightly higher percentage of Wichita area population growth being captured by surrounding smaller cities. The historic trend of one-fourth of Wichita's total dwelling units being multi-family will continue.

Wichita's infrastructure system investment will continue to focus on accommodating suburban growth that reflects continued housing market demand in suburban school districts and downtown redevelopment. Future suburban growth and development within the surrounding rural water district service areas will not be cost-prohibitive from a water service delivery standpoint. Substantial investments will continue to be made in improving the Kellogg freeway system, and in designing and constructing both the Northwest Bypass freeway and the South Area Parkway bypass route south of Wichita.

Wichita will continue its practice of under-investment in maintaining its existing infrastructure. Public transit will continue to be an insignificant infrastructure investment and transportation mode.

Pattern of future growth:

- Future residential growth predominately located in suburban West-Northwest Wichita and suburban East-Southeast-Northeast Wichita (about 75% of suburban infill areas existing in 2012 will be developed by 2035).
- Future employment growth within existing, established commercial and industrial areas/corridors and along emerging suburban corridors in west and east Wichita. Continued employment growth and residential redevelopment in the Downtown.
- Northwest Bypass will be a catalyst for concentrations of future new employment growth.
- Wichita's city limits will expand by 10% from 162.8 sq. mi. to 178.8 sq. mi. supporting a 17% growth in total population.
- Wichita's overall population density will increase slightly: 2,359 people/sq. mi. in 2012; 2,506 people/sq. mi. in 2035.

Future Wichita Job & Housing Growth - 2012 to 2035 (2012 is the base-year for the long-term forecasts)

Wichita population growth forecast (baseline growth forecast):

64,000 additional people - 2035 total population of **448,000** (growth rate of **0.8% per year**)

49,900 additional dwelling units - total of 205,000 dwelling units in 2035 (overall city average of **2.25 people/dwelling unit** in 2035)

Wichita employment growth forecast:

31,200 additional jobs - total of 224,400 jobs in 2035 (new job growth rate of **0.7% per year**)

Future Wichita Infrastructure Investments - 2013 to 2035

Long-term investment categories (includes existing 'needs' and 'wants' projects) and planning-level cost & revenue estimates (2011 dollars)



Investment Category #1

Bringing existing deficient Wichita infrastructure up to standard - additional \$45-55 million needed annually (Majority of these costs are to replace one-third of Wichita's aging sewer lines and one quarter of aging water lines and to improve existing local neighborhood roads to a 'good' condition)

\$1.0 billion cost est.
 - \$0 revenue allocation
\$1.0 billion gap

Investment Category #2

Ongoing Wichita infrastructure depreciation/replacement costs - \$180 million needed annually; current annual spending is approx. **\$78 million** (Annual maintenance/repair costs required to keep all existing infrastructure assets at or near current conditions - maintains a continued state of deterioration for some assets)

\$3.9 billion cost est.
\$1.7 billion revenue allocation
\$2.2 billion gap

Transportation	\$102 million annually
Water/Sewer/Stormwater	\$57 million annually
Arts/Culture/Recreation	\$19 million annually
Public Safety	\$2 million annually

Investment Category #3

Expanding existing system of infrastructure and facilities (2013-2035)

\$2.8 billion* cost est.
\$1.1 billion revenue allocation
\$1.7 billion gap

	Major new capital system expansions	
Transportation (\$1.4 billion*)	401 miles of streets	\$350 million
	42 miles of arterials	\$173 million
	New 25th Street bridge crossing	\$50 million
	NW Bypass - design/construction	\$453 million
Water/Sewer/Stormwater (\$1.2 billion*)	42 miles of stormwater arterials	\$50 million
	403 miles of stormwater lines/detention	\$365 million
	42 miles of sewer mains	\$15 million
	403 miles of sewer lines	\$145 million
	42 miles of water mains	\$8 million
	403 miles of water lines	\$91 million
	7.1 mg/day additional sewer treatment capacity	\$96 million
Arts/Culture/Recreation (\$161 million*)	15 additional parks	\$56 million
	2 additional regional libraries	\$13 million
	12 new neighborhood centers	\$25 million
	5 new swimming pools	\$13 million
Public Safety (\$38 million*)	2 additional fire stations	\$4 million
	Patrol North and South police facility renovations	\$4 million
	2 additional EMS posts	\$2 million

*Total includes capital and aggregated maintenance/operation costs



Investment Category #4

Enhancing existing infrastructure and facilities (2013-2035)

\$6.6 billion* cost est.

\$1.2 billion revenue allocation

\$5.4 billion gap

Major planned/proposed capital enhancements		
Transportation (\$4.2 billion*)	Kellogg/I-235/I-135/K-254 freeway improvements	\$946 million
	South Area Parkway - design/construction	\$345 million
	Arterial street capacity enhancement	\$641 million
	Elevated rail corridor improvements	\$242 million
	Transit bus fleet replacement	\$45 million
	Bike-Ped facilities	\$25 million
	All other projects	\$85 million
Water/Sewer/Stormwater (\$1.6 billion*)	Wastewater treatment plant nutrient removal	\$146 million
	Sewer backup mitigation	\$500 million
	Sewer main improvements	\$34 million
	Water main improvements	\$26 million
	Long-term water supply	\$230 million
	Stormwater improvements	\$112 million
Arts/Culture/Recreation (\$1.2 billion*)	Upgrades to existing parks	\$260 million
	Convention Center expansion	\$173 million
	Century II & Kennedy Plaza renovations	\$17 million
	Crystal Prairie Lake Park investment	\$150 million
	Refurbish existing recreation centers	\$85 million
	Central library & NW regional library	\$40 million
	All other projects	\$47 million
Public Safety (\$57 million*)	Patrol West and East substations	\$5 million
	Central and Bristol fire station	\$2 million
	City Hall police remodel & new helicopter	\$6 million
	N. E. EMS Post	\$1 million

*Total includes capital and aggregated maintenance/operation costs

Total cost estimates \$14.3 billion

Total revenue estimates to fund infrastructure investments \$4.0 billion

Cost/revenue gap estimate (\$10.3 billion)

Investment analysis:

- The purpose of this scenario is to illustrate a range of possible Wichita 2035 future growth patterns and infrastructure investment options.
- The gap between our future infrastructure needs & wants and our forecasted revenues is estimated at **\$10.3 billion**.
- This scenario is not fiscally constrained ... current revenue forecasts over the next 22 years are insufficient to maintain Wichita's existing infrastructure assets (Investment Categories #1 and #2) let alone enhance or expand our system of assets.
- Different growth patterns alone won't solve the cost/revenue gap.
- The long-term cost/revenue gap over the next 20 years can't be 'solved' today.
- Different service delivery models and creative ways of providing public infrastructure need to be considered. Substantial new revenues or a combination of new revenues and/or cost reductions (through project elimination or project scope adjustments/reductions) will be necessary.



Plan Development - Scenario #1 - Current Trends

"Suburban Growth Status Quo"

Highlights:

Growth and Investment Pattern:

- Continue suburban growth (west/northwest, northeast/east/southeast) reflecting market demand for new housing in suburban school districts
- Continue downtown residential and commercial redevelopment
- Continue under-investment in maintaining & replacing existing city infrastructure
- Continue expansion of Kellogg freeway system and related interchange improvements
- Design and construct the Northwest Bypass - catalyst for new retail & employment development
- Design and construct the South Area Parkway bypass around south Wichita
- Public transit remains an insignificant public investment & transportation mode


Major Growth-Driven Infrastructure Costs:

- 401 miles of new local streets and water, sewer & stormwater lines
- 42 miles of new arterial streets, water and sewer mains
- 7.1 mg/day capacity upgrades to sewer treatment facilities

Infrastructure Investment Gap:

	2013-2035
Investment Category #1 Bringing Deficient Infrastructure up to Standards - (additional \$45-55 million needed annually)	\$1.0 billion cost est. \$0 revenue \$1.0 billion gap
Investment Category #2 Ongoing Infrastructure Depreciation/Replacement Costs - (\$180 million needed annually; currently investing around \$78 million annually)	\$3.9 billion cost est. \$1.7 billion revenue \$2.2 billion gap
Investment Category #3 Expanding Existing Infrastructure System to Support Growth	\$2.3 billion cost est. \$1.1 billion revenue \$1.2 billion gap
Investment Category #4 Enhancing Existing Facilities to Improve Quality of Life	\$7.1 billion cost est. \$1.2 billion revenue \$5.9 billion gap
Total Cost Estimates	\$14.3 billion
Total Revenue Estimates	\$4.0 billion
Cost/Revenue Gap	(\$10.3 billion)

Wichita 2035 Growth & Community Investment Scenarios: Scenario #1-Current Trends



Scenario #2 – Constrained Suburban Growth

Scenario Vision Elements -

Wichita will experience a population and employment growth rate typical of the last several decades, but with a slightly higher percentage of Wichita area population growth being captured by surrounding smaller cities. Continued residential and employment growth will occur in downtown, but the pattern of future suburban growth and development is constrained by two influencing factors:

1. Prohibitive land development costs associated with water service delivery within rural water district service areas; and,
2. Deferred construction of the Northwest Bypass freeway beyond 2035 (due to lack of funds).

Suburban growth and development patterns within surrounding rural water district service areas will be constrained. Future employment growth originally anticipated to concentrate along the Northwest Bypass over the next 20 years will relocate to other established areas in west and northwest Wichita. The historic trend of one-fourth of Wichita's total dwelling units being multi-family will continue.

Wichita's infrastructure system investment will continue to accommodate suburban growth that reflects continued housing market demand in suburban school districts and downtown redevelopment. Substantial investments will continue to be made in improving the Kellogg freeway system. The South Area Parkway bypass route will be constructed around south Wichita.

Wichita will continue its practice of under-investment in maintaining its existing infrastructure. Public transit will continue to be an insignificant infrastructure investment and transportation mode.

Pattern of future growth:

- Future residential growth predominately located in suburban West-Northwest Wichita and to significantly lesser degrees in suburban East-Southeast-Northeast Wichita (about 75% of suburban infill areas existing in 2012 will be developed by 2035).
- Future employment growth within existing, established commercial and industrial areas/corridors and along emerging suburban corridors in west and east Wichita. Continued employment growth and residential redevelopment in the Downtown.
- Concentrations of future new employment growth originally anticipated with the future Northwest Bypass have relocated to areas in West Wichita along N. Maize Road, N. Ridge Road and the West Kellogg freeway.
- Wichita's city limits will expand by 8% from 162.8 sq. mi. to 176.0 sq. mi. supporting a 17% growth in total population.
- Wichita's overall population density will increase slightly: 2,359 people/sq. mi. in 2012: 2,524 people/sq. mi. in 2035.

Future Wichita Job & Housing Growth - 2012 to 2035 (2012 is the base-year for the long-term forecasts)

Wichita population growth forecast (baseline growth forecast):

64,000 additional people - 2035 total population of **448,000** (growth rate of **0.8% per year**)

49,900 additional dwelling units - total of 205,000 dwelling units in 2035 (overall city average of **2.25 people/ dwelling unit** in 2035)

Wichita employment growth forecast:

31,200 additional jobs - total of 224,400 jobs in 2035 (new job growth rate of **0.7% per year**)



Future Wichita Infrastructure Investments - 2013 to 2035

Long-term investment categories (includes existing 'needs' and 'wants' projects) and planning-level cost & revenue estimates (2011 dollars)

Investment Category #1

Bringing existing deficient Wichita infrastructure up to standard - additional \$45-55 million needed annually (Majority of these costs are to replace one-third of Wichita's aging sewer lines and one quarter of aging water lines and to improve existing local neighborhood roads to a 'good' condition) \$1.0 billion cost est.
- \$0 revenue allocation
\$1.0 billion gap

Investment Category #2

Ongoing Wichita infrastructure depreciation/replacement costs - \$180 million needed annually; current annual spending is approx. \$78 million (Annual maintenance/repair costs required to keep all existing infrastructure assets at or near current conditions - maintains a continued state of deterioration for some assets) \$3.9 billion cost est
\$1.7 billion revenue allocation
\$2.2 billion gap

Transportation	\$102 million annually
Water/Sewer/Stormwater	\$57 million annually
Arts/Culture/Recreation	\$19 million annually
Public Safety	\$2 million annually

Investment Category #3

Expanding existing system of infrastructure and facilities (2013-2035) \$2.1 billion*cost est.
\$1.0 billion revenue allocation
\$1.1 billion gap

	Major new capital system expansions	
Transportation (\$791 million*)	401 miles of streets	\$350 million
	30 miles of arterials	\$125 million
	New 25th Street bridge crossing	\$50 million
Water/Sewer/Stormwater (\$1.1 billion*)	30 miles of stormwater arterials	\$36 million
	403 miles of stormwater lines/detention	\$365 million
	30 miles of sewer mains	\$12 million
	403 miles of sewer lines	\$145 million
	30 miles of water mains	\$6 million
	403 miles of water lines	\$91 million
	7.1 mg/day additional sewer treatment capacity	\$96 million
Arts/Culture/Recreation (\$161 million*)	15 additional parks	\$56 million
	2 additional regional libraries	\$13 million
	12 new neighborhood centers	\$25 million
	5 new swimming pools	\$13 million
Public Safety (\$38 million*)	2 additional fire stations	\$4 million
	Patrol North and South police facility renovations	\$4 million
	2 additional EMS posts	\$2 million

*Total includes capital and aggregated maintenance/operation costs



Investment Category #4

Enhancing existing infrastructure and facilities (2013-2035)

\$6.4 billion*cost est.

\$1.2 billion revenue allocation

\$5.2 billion gap

Major planned/proposed capital enhancements		
Transportation (\$3.5 billion*)	Kellogg/I-235/I-135/K-254 freeway improvements	\$946 million
	South Area Parkway - design/construction	\$345 million
	Arterial street capacity enhancement	\$641 million
	Elevated rail corridor improvements	\$242 million
	Transit bus fleet replacement	\$45 million
	Bike-Ped facilities	\$25 million
	All other projects	\$85 million
Water/Sewer/Stormwater (\$1.6 billion*)	Wastewater treatment plant nutrient removal	\$146 million
	Sewer backup mitigation	\$500 million
	Sewer main improvements	\$34 million
	Water main improvements	\$26 million
	Long-term water supply	\$230 million
	Stormwater improvements	\$112 million
Arts/Culture/Recreation (\$1.2 billion*)	Upgrades to existing parks	\$260 million
	Convention Center expansion	\$173 million
	Century II & Kennedy Plaza renovations	\$17 million
	Crystal Prairie Lake Park investment	\$150 million
	Refurbish existing recreation centers	\$85 million
	Central library & NW regional library	\$40 million
	All other projects	\$47 million
Public Safety (\$57 million*)	Patrol West and East substations	\$5 million
	Central and Bristol fire station	\$2 million
	City Hall police remodel & new helicopter	\$6 million
	N. E. EMS Post	\$1 million
*Total includes capital and aggregated maintenance/operation costs		
Total cost estimates		\$13.4 billion
Total revenue estimates to fund infrastructure investments		\$3.9 billion
Cost/revenue gap estimate		(\$9.5 billion)

Investment analysis:

- The purpose of this scenario is to illustrate a range of possible Wichita 2035 future growth patterns and infrastructure investment options.
- The gap between our future infrastructure needs & wants and our forecasted revenues is estimated at **\$9.5 billion**.
- This scenario's constrained suburban growth pattern reduces the Category #3 and #4 infrastructure gap costs associated with Scenario #1- Current Trends by approximately **\$0.8 billion**.
- This scenario is not fiscally constrained ... current revenue forecasts over the next 22 years are insufficient to maintain Wichita's existing infrastructure assets (Investment Categories #1 and #2) let alone enhance or expand our system of assets.
- Different growth patterns alone won't solve the cost/revenue gap.
- The long-term cost/revenue gap over the next 20 years can't be 'solved' today.
- Different service delivery models and creative ways of providing public infrastructure need to be considered. Substantial new revenues or a combination of **new revenues** and/or cost reductions (through project elimination or project scope adjustments/reductions) will be necessary.



Plan Development - Scenario #2 - Constrained Suburban Growth

"More Compacted Suburban Growth"

Highlights:

Growth and Investment Pattern Differences from Scenario #1 - Current Trends:

- Suburban growth is constrained due to high land development costs within rural water district service areas (see map).

- Defer construction of the Northwest Bypass beyond 2030 due to lack of state and/or private investment funds. Future retail and employment growth in west & north Wichita will concentrate in existing established areas.


Major Growth-Driven Infrastructure Costs:
 401 miles of new local streets and water, sewer & stormwater lines
 30 miles of new arterial streets, water and sewer mains
 7.1 mg/day capacity upgrades to sewer treatment facilities

Infrastructure Investment Gap:

	2013-2035
Investment Category #1 Bringing Deficient Infrastructure up to Standards - (additional \$45-55 million needed annually)	\$1.0 billion cost est. \$0 revenue \$1.0 billion gap
Investment Category #2 Ongoing Infrastructure Depreciation/Replacement Costs - (\$180 million needed annually; currently investing around \$28 million annually)	\$3.9 billion cost est. \$1.7 billion revenue \$2.2 billion gap
Investment Category #3 Expanding Existing Infrastructure System to Support Growth-	\$2.1 billion cost est. \$1.0 billion revenue \$1.1 billion gap
Investment Category #4 Enhancing Existing Facilities to Improve Quality of Life -	\$6.4 billion cost est. \$1.2 billion revenue \$5.2 billion gap

Total Cost Estimates	\$13.4 billion
Total Revenue Estimates	\$3.9 billion
Cost/Revenue Gap	(\$9.5 billion)

Wichita 2035 Growth & Community Investment Scenarios: **Scenario #2-Contained Suburban Growth**



Scenario #3 – Suburban and Infill Growth Mix

Scenario Vision Elements -

Wichita will experience a population/employment growth rate typical of the last several decades, but with a slightly higher percentage of Wichita area population growth being captured by surrounding smaller cities. Continued residential and employment growth will occur in downtown, but the pattern of future suburban growth is constrained by three influencing factors:

1. Prohibitive land development costs associated with water service delivery within rural water district service areas;
2. Deferred construction of the Northwest Bypass and the South Area Parkway bypass beyond 2035 (due to lack of funding); and,
3. Increased levels of infill and redevelopment throughout the established central urban core.

Suburban growth and development patterns within surrounding rural water district service areas will be constrained. Future employment growth originally anticipated to concentrate along the Northwest Bypass over the next 20 years will relocate to other established areas in west and northwest Wichita. The historic trend of one-fourth of Wichita's total dwelling units being multi-family will continue.

Wichita's infrastructure system will continue to expand to accommodate suburban growth that reflects continued housing market demand in suburban school districts. Substantial investments will continue to be made in improving the Kellogg freeway system. However, this scenario creates the least amount of new infrastructure to maintain and replace in the future.

Wichita will increase investment levels in maintaining its existing infrastructure. Public transit will become an improved and expanded infrastructure investment/transportation mode (Wichita Transit Vision Proposal 2013) that supports increased levels of infill and redevelopment throughout the established central urban core, improves cross-town and regional connections, and provides neighborhood feeders in areas of low ridership.

Pattern of future growth:

- The established central urban core constitutes the central statistical development area bounded by Pawnee on the south, Woodlawn on the east, 21st Street on the north and the Wichita/Valley Center floodway on the west; supplemented by an area extending one mile beyond the perimeter of the central statistical development area.
- Increased levels of infill/redevelopment throughout the established central urban core will represent 12% of total new dwelling units forecasted for Wichita by 2035 (of which 75% will likely be multi-family units).
- Future residential growth predominately located in suburban West-Northwest Wichita and to significantly lesser degrees in suburban East-Southeast-Northeast Wichita (about 75% of suburban infill areas existing in 2012 will be developed by 2035).
- Future employment growth within existing, established commercial and industrial areas/corridors and along emerging suburban corridors in west and east Wichita. Continued employment growth and residential redevelopment in the Downtown.
- Northwest Bypass will not be a catalyst for concentrations of future new employment growth.
- Wichita's city limits will expand by 7% from 162.8 sq. mi. to 173.8 sq. mi. supporting a 17% growth in total population.
- Wichita's overall population density will increase slightly: 2,359 people/sq. mi. in 2012; 2,578 people/sq. mi. in 2035.

Future Wichita Job & Housing Growth - 2012 to 2035 (2012 is the base-year for the long-term forecasts)

Wichita population growth forecast (mid-range growth forecast):

64,000 additional people - 2035 total population of **448,000** (growth rate of **0.8%** per year)

49,900 additional dwelling units - total of 205,000 dwelling units in 2035 (overall city average of **2.25 people/dwelling unit** in 2035)

Wichita employment growth forecast:

31,200 additional jobs - total of 224,400 jobs in 2035 (new job growth rate of **0.7%** per year)



Future Wichita Infrastructure Investments - 2013 to 2035

Long-term investment categories (includes existing 'needs' and 'wants' projects) and planning-level cost & revenue estimates (2011 dollars)

Investment Category #1

Bringing existing deficient Wichita infrastructure up to standard - additional \$45-55 million needed annually
 (Majority of these costs are to replace one-third of Wichita's aging sewer lines and one quarter of aging water lines and to improve existing local neighborhood roads to a 'good' condition)

\$1.0 billion cost est.
 - \$0 revenue allocation
\$1.0 billion gap

Investment Category #2

Ongoing Wichita infrastructure depreciation/replacement costs - \$180 million needed annually; current annual spending is approx. \$78 million; proposes additional \$18 million annually (Annual maintenance and repair costs required to keep all existing infrastructure assets at or near current conditions - maintains a continued state of deterioration for some assets)

\$3.9 billion cost est.
 - \$2.1 billion revenue allocation
\$1.8 billion gap

Transportation	\$102 million annually
Water/Sewer/Stormwater	\$57 million annually
Arts/Culture/Recreation	\$19 million annually
Public Safety	\$2 million annually

Investment Category #3

Expanding existing system of infrastructure and facilities (2013-2035)

\$2.0 billion*cost est.
 - \$0.9 billion revenue allocation
\$1.1 billion gap

	Major new capital system expansions	
Transportation (\$720 million*)	369 miles of streets	\$319 million
	26 miles of arterials	\$108 million
	New 25th Street bridge crossing	\$50 million
Water/Sewer/Stormwater (\$1.1 billion*)	26 miles of stormwater arterials	\$31 million
	368 miles of stormwater lines/detention	\$336 million
	26 miles of sewer mains	\$10 million
	369 miles of sewer lines	\$132 million
	26 miles of water mains	\$5 million
	369 miles of water lines	\$83 million
	7.1 mg/day additional sewer treatment capacity	\$96 million
Arts/Culture/Recreation (\$161 million*)	15 additional parks	\$56 million
	2 additional regional libraries	\$13 million
	12 new neighborhood centers	\$25 million
	5 new swimming pools	\$13 million
Public Safety (\$38 million*)	2 additional fire stations	\$4 million
	Patrol North and South police facility renovations	\$4 million
	2 additional EMS posts	\$2 million



Investment Category #4

Enhancing existing infrastructure and facilities (2013-2035)

\$6.1 billion* cost est.
 - \$0.8 billion revenue allocation
\$5.3 billion gap

<i>Major planned/proposed capital enhancements</i>	
Transportation (\$3.2 billion*)	Kellogg/I-235/I-135/K-254 freeway improvements \$946 million Arterial street capacity enhancement \$641 million Elevated rail corridor improvements \$242 million Wichita Transit Vision Plan 2013 improvements \$200 million Bike-Ped facilities \$25 million All other projects \$85 million
Water/Sewer/Stormwater (\$1.6 billion*)	Wastewater treatment plant nutrient removal \$146 million Sewer backup mitigation \$500 million Sewer main improvements \$34 million Water main improvements \$26 million Long-term water supply \$230 million Stormwater improvements \$112 million
Arts/Culture/Recreation (\$1.2 billion*)	Upgrades to existing parks \$260 million Convention Center expansion \$173 million Century II & Kennedy Plaza renovations \$17 million Crystal Prairie Lake Park investment \$150 million Refurbish existing recreation centers \$85 million Central library & NW regional library \$40 million All other projects \$47 million
Public Safety (\$57 million*)	Patrol West and East substations \$5 million Central and Bristol fire station \$2 million City Hall police remodel & new helicopter \$6 million N. E. EMS Post \$1 million

*Total includes capital and aggregated maintenance/operation costs

Total cost estimates	\$13.0 billion
Total revenue estimates to fund infrastructure investments	\$3.8 billion
Cost/revenue gap estimate	(\$9.2 billion)

Investment analysis:

- The purpose of this scenario is to illustrate a range of possible Wichita 2035 future growth patterns and infrastructure investment options.
- The gap between our future infrastructure needs & wants and our forecasted revenues is estimated at **\$9.2 billion**.
- This scenario's constrained suburban growth pattern reduces the Category #3 and #4 infrastructure gap costs associated with Scenario #1- Current Trends by approximately **\$0.7 billion** and the Category #2 infrastructure gap costs by approximately **\$0.4 billion**.
- This scenario is not fiscally constrained ... current revenue forecasts over the next 22 years are insufficient to maintain Wichita's existing infrastructure assets (Investment Categories #1 and #2) let alone enhance or expand our system of assets.
- Different growth patterns alone won't solve the cost/revenue gap.
- The long-term cost/revenue gap over the next 20 years can't be 'solved' today.
- Different service delivery models and creative ways of providing public infrastructure need to be considered. Substantial new revenues or a combination of new revenues and/or cost reductions (through project elimination or project scope adjustments/reductions) will be necessary.



Plan Development - Scenario #3 - Suburban & Infill Growth Mix

"Urban Infill with More Investment in Transit and Existing Infrastructure"

Highlights:

Growth and Investment Pattern Differences from Scenario #1 - Current Trends:

- Suburban growth is constrained due to high land development costs within rural water district service areas (element of Scenario #2)
- Defer construction of the Northwest Bypass and the South Area Parkway bypass beyond 2030 due to lack of state and/or private investment funds.
- Increase investment levels in existing city infrastructure
- Increase levels of infill and redevelopment throughout central city area ... 12% of new Wichita dwelling units by 2035
- Improve and expand public transit (implementation of *Wichita Transit Vision 2013*)


Major Growth-Driven Infrastructure Costs:

369 miles of new local streets and water, sewer & stormwater lines
 26 miles of new arterial streets, water and sewer mains
 7.1 mg/day capacity upgrades to sewer treatment facilities
** This scenario creates the least amount of new infrastructure to maintain and replace in the future.*

Infrastructure Investment Gap:

	2013-2035
Investment Category #1 Bringing Deficient Infrastructure up to Standards - (additional \$45-55 million needed annually)	\$1.0 billion cost est. \$0 revenue \$1.0 billion gap
Investment Category #2 Ongoing Infrastructure Depreciation/Replacement Costs - (\$188 million needed annually; currently investing around \$78 million annually)	\$3.9 billion cost est. \$2.1 billion revenue \$1.8 billion gap
Investment Category #3 Expanding Existing Infrastructure System	\$2.0 billion cost est. \$0.9 billion revenue \$1.1 billion gap
Investment Category #4 Enhancing Existing Facilities	\$6.1 billion cost est. \$0.8 billion revenue \$5.3 billion gap
Total Cost Estimates	\$13.0 billion
Total Revenue Estimates	\$3.8 billion
Cost/Revenue Gap	(\$9.2 billion)

Wichita 2035 Growth & Community Investment Scenarios: Scenario #3 - Suburban & Infill Growth Mix



Appendix - Community Trends and Challenges Ahead

“The future isn’t what it used to be” *Yogi Berra*

Yogi Berra, the famous catcher for the New York Yankees once said, “Making projections is a difficult business, especially when it deals with the future.” It’s difficult to accurately predict precise numbers and totals for events and outcomes 20 years from now. However, it is possible to observe and predict general future trends. There is no crystal ball to see what the future holds for Wichita and Sedgwick County - only data-driven, informed and educated opinions and evaluations.

An analysis of fiscal, economic and demographic trends data indicate that the next 20 years of growth and development in Wichita and Sedgwick County will be different than what has occurred over the past 20 years. The City and County have entered a new era of fiscal constraint, austerity and diminishing financial resources that will likely continue into the foreseeable future. Trend data indicates that our community is aging, our minority population is growing, and the composition of the traditional family is changing (especially a rise in the number of single person households). These demographic changes will influence future housing decisions related to location, size, and type, as well as future transportation choices.

Below is a summary of important fiscal, economic and demographic trends and challenges that will likely influence future growth and development in Wichita and Sedgwick County, and impact future public investment decisions.

Fiscal and Economic

Trend/Challenge - Diminishing state and federal funding available for new construction and/or replacement of Wichita and Sedgwick County public facilities and infrastructure.

Data:

- The Federal Highway Trust Fund (18.4 cent per gallon gas tax) has for decades been a significant funding source for new roadway construction projects in the country and for Kansas, Wichita and Sedgwick County. However, this tax has steadily lost purchasing power to inflation, and the rise in fuel-efficient cars has caused revenues to flatten. The Congressional Budget Office projected in January 2012 that the Federal Highway Trust Fund, with a \$12 billion balance at the end of the 2012 fiscal year, will be depleted by fiscal year 2014.
- | Year | Balance (Billions of dollars) |
|------|-------------------------------|
| 2005 | 15 |
| 2006 | 18 |
| 2007 | 15 |
| 2008 | 25 |
| 2009 | 30 |
| 2010 | 25 |
| 2011 | 15 |
| 2012 | 10 |
| 2013 | 5 |
| 2014 | 0 |
| 2015 | -15 |
- State of Kansas funding for transportation infrastructure has declined. The State’s 2011-2020 ten-year transportation program (T-WORKS) is currently funded at \$7.8 billion. This represents a 38% reduction in funding from the previous ten-year transportation program budget of \$13 billion. Future increases in state transportation funding appear unlikely.
 - Research done in 2007 for the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission indicated that a 10% increase in vehicle fuel economy produces a 9% reduction in motor fuel use and fuel tax revenues. Rising fuel costs and vehicle fuel efficiencies have generated less vehicle miles traveled and less fuel consumption respectively. This has resulted in a trend of flat and/or declining gasoline tax revenues for the State of Kansas (and Wichita and Sedgwick County).
 - Sedgwick County approved a dedicated one-cent countywide sales tax in 1985. A half-cent is pledged to fund road and bridge projects and the other half-cent is pledged for property tax relief. This tax provides an ongoing revenue stream for road and bridge construction in Wichita and Sedgwick County (approximately \$47.9 million and \$22.4 million respectively in 2011).

Trend/Challenge - Growing structural imbalance (gap) between slowing Wichita and Sedgwick County revenues and the rising cost of maintaining existing City and County public facilities and infrastructure.

Data:


- Over the last decade, Wichita and Sedgwick County have experienced growing structural imbalances between slowing revenue streams and the increasing costs of government (especially costs associated with maintaining current assets, as well as employee pensions and health care). This gap has challenged the ability of Wichita and Sedgwick County to maintain, replace and/or expand existing public facilities and infrastructure (see Appendix - Existing Conditions & Community Infrastructure Assessment).
- A leveling off in overall ad valorem property valuation in recent years has yielded lower property tax revenues for the City and County. For the City of Wichita, property tax revenues declined by \$1.4 million between 2009 and 2011 (\$106.5 million in 2009; \$105.1 million in 2011). For Sedgwick County, property tax revenues declined by \$3.0 million between 2009 and 2011 (\$136.1 million in 2009; \$133.1 million in 2011, this decline also reflecting a half mil lowering of the County tax rate in 2010).
- Wichita has experienced slowing rates of return with other revenue sources including interest earnings, local sales tax, motor vehicle taxes, transient guest tax, gasoline tax, and franchise fees.
- Revenues (property and retail sales tax) associated with future growth and development in Wichita and Sedgwick County will not cover long-term cost liabilities associated with the maintenance and replacement of existing City and County public facilities and infrastructure assets.

Trend/Challenge - Rising fuel and energy prices significantly increase capital, operational and maintenance costs associated with City and County public facilities and infrastructure.

Data:

- The average price of gasoline has trended upward nationwide within the last decade (\$1.42 per gallon in 2001; \$2.27 in 2005; \$4.02 per gallon in 2008; \$3.50 per gallon in 2012).
- In 2001, the annual fuel cost for Wichita’s maintenance vehicle fleet was \$2.2 million. By the end of 2008, annual fuel costs rose to \$6.9 million (an increase of \$4.7 million). This increase is largely attributable to increased costs of fuel rather than increased fuel consumption.

Average Price of a Gallon of Gasoline
(in Current and Constant dollars)



- Rising fuel costs significantly increase Wichita Transit vehicle operations costs. For every \$0.10 increase annually in a gallon of gasoline, operating costs for the transit van fleet go up about \$10,000 per year. For every \$0.10 increase annually in a gallon of diesel, operating costs for the bus fleet go up about \$40,000 per year. As of 2012, Wichita Transit buses drove 1,563,624 miles annually (3.96 mpg) and the transit vans drove 716,131 miles annually (6.99 mpg).
- Rising fuel costs increase local road construction costs. During the sharp rise in oil prices in 2008, the cost of asphalt increased to approximately \$30 per square yard compared to about \$25 per square yard in 2012. That cost differential of \$5 per square yard equated to a comparative savings of \$150,000 per mile of arterial street construction for Wichita in 2012.
- There is no current research that suggests crude oil and gasoline prices will trend significantly downward over the foreseeable future. According to a report by the Victoria Transport Policy Institute (December 2012), various alternatives may replace petroleum as the primary vehicle fuel in the future but virtually all currently being developed will be more expensive than what petroleum has cost in the past.



Trend/Challenge - External factors and mandates will dictate some future Wichita and Sedgwick County public infrastructure spending priorities.

Data:

- Federal environmental legislation for wastewater management, stormwater management, water quality and air quality will continue to impact community infrastructure and shape the future operations and costs of local government in Wichita and Sedgwick County.
- Prolonged periods of extreme drought could threaten the viability of the Equus Beds Aquifer Recharge Storage project as a long-term water supply source for Wichita. Additional solutions to secure a long-term water supply for Wichita will generate significant costs.
- Under authority of the 1972 Clean Water Act, the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) may mandate by 2020, local compliance with current recommended biological nutrient removal standards for nitrogen and phosphorous in all wastewater released into the nation's waterways. Depending upon the level of required compliance, Wichita may need to invest between \$95 and \$146 million to upgrade its existing wastewater treatment facilities.
- Substantial improvements to Wichita's current sewer collection system may also be required by the EPA over the next decade to limit sewer back-up incidents. Depending upon the level of mandate, this could potentially cost the City over \$100 million per year for multiple years.
- Based on current air quality conditions, the Wichita MSA has the potential to move to a non-attainment status (not meeting air pollutant standards set by the EPA under authority of the 1970 Clean Air Act) with respect to acceptable ozone levels. The community costs of going ozone non-attainment have been estimated as follows:
 - * The Kansas Department of Health and the Environment has estimated that a vehicle inspection and maintenance program alone for the Wichita MSA could cost the community over \$13.7 million per year;
 - * City of Wichita staff estimated in 2005 that the cost to local government, local businesses, and citizens in the Wichita MSA could approximate \$10 million per year for at least ten years. A more accurate cost estimate model has not been developed.

Trend/Challenge - Wichita and Sedgwick County faces a new era of market globalization and competition with other communities regionally, nationally and globally.

Data:

- Many aspects of the Sedgwick County and Kansas economy are export oriented (civilian aircraft, aircraft parts and agricultural products) and vulnerable to instability or shifts in global economic market conditions.
- Local, regional, national and international economic uncertainty appears to be the new normal for the next several years. All levels of government throughout the world continue to wrestle with issues/impacts associated with austerity, debt, expenditures, revenues, and regulation.
- University professors Arthur C. Nelson and Robert E. Lang (*Megapolitan America*, 2011) predict the emergence of 10 megapolitan clusters in the United States by the year 2040. Within these clusters will be concentrated most of the nation's population and much of its associated economic activity. Wichita does not fall within one of the 10 megapolitan clusters predicted. This implies that Wichita could be economically less competitive. Regardless of whether these projections prove to be accurate, Wichita and Sedgwick County will need to work hard to remain competitive with other communities in the region and the nation.
- According to the Visioneering Wichita Plan 2009, roughly 20% of the young adults (25-40 yrs.) in the Wichita metropolitan area leave each year to other communities in the country, representing an estimated net annual lost investment of \$595 million for the Wichita area. This age group constitutes the future business and government leaders of our community by 2035. According to U.S. Census cohort data, the total number of people




in Wichita between the ages of 25-44 dropped by 2.4% between 2000 and 2010. A 2010 research report titled “Destination ICT: Attracting and Retaining Talent to Wichita” indicates that Wichita’s total population of 25-40 year olds declined by 2.6% between 2000 and 2007. The report states that while this loss is not significantly out of line with cities of similar size, in Wichita’s peer competitive cities (e.g. Fort Worth, Kansas City, Oklahoma City, Omaha, Tulsa) the aggregated population of 25-40 year olds grew by 2.3%.

Trend/Challenge - Employment growth rate in Wichita and Sedgwick County over the next 20 years is forecast to increase at an annual average rate slightly less than 1 percent.

Data:

- The WSU Center for Economic Development and Business Research (CEDBR) projects (2011) that the average employment growth rate in the Wichita Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) will increase during the next 25 years at an annual rate of 0.87% (with manufacturing, retail trade and health care dominant).
- The overall average annual employment growth rate in Sedgwick County has trended downward in recent decades. Between 1970 and 1987, data from the Kansas Department of Human Resources indicated an average annual employment growth rate of 2.7%. The annual employment growth rates between 1990 and 2010 in Sedgwick County have averaged around 0.7% (factoring in two recessionary periods).

**Sedgwick County
Employment Growth Rate by Decade**



Source: Woods & Poole Economics, Inc., U.S. Census Bureau, and Bureau of Labor Statistics

- According to the WSU CEDBR, long term economic growth in Kansas has been driven by growth in five key industries: health care; professional services; administration and waste services; accommodation and food services; and educational services.
- In 2011, the National Bureau of Labor Statistics reported the following national economic outlook indicators through 2018:
 - * Growth in work force by 8.2%;
 - * Aging work force (employees aged 55 or older will comprise 24% of the total labor market);
 - * More service jobs (12.5% increase) and less manufacturing jobs (9% decrease);
 - * Areas of growth ... professional and business services, health care, small-box and boutique retail, ‘middle market’ companies (annual sales between \$10 million and \$1 billion).
 - * The WSU CEDBR anticipates that retiring baby boomers will want to live close to quality, convenient health care services. This could increase Wichita’s current role as a premier south central Kansas area regional health care services center.

Demographics

Trend/Challenge - Shifting demographics: impacts of an aging population.


Data:

- Although the population of Wichita and Sedgwick County is slightly younger on average than the rest of Kansas or the nation, the population of our community is aging. The WSU CEDBR projects that the percentage of Sedgwick County residents over the age of 65 will increase from 10.9% in 2010 to 17.5 % by 2030 (a 60% increase). According to projections by the U.S. Census, one in five residents in the nation will be 65 years or older by 2030.



- The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration estimates by 2030, one out of every four drivers in the nation will be over the age of 65 with the number of drivers over age 85 four times higher than today. As our area population ages, an increasing number of less mobile seniors will require alternative transportation and accessibility choices.
- According to Arthur C. Nelson (*Reshaping Metropolitan America*, 2013), 77% of the demand for new housing construction in America between 1990 and 2010 was driven by the baby boomer generation (1946 to 1964) seeking large, single-family homes.

Nelson predicts that a major housing crisis will occur around 2020 as aging/retiring baby boomers try to sell off their large single-family homes (for which he predicts there will be a significantly reduced market demand) to downsize into smaller homes and properties. Nelson foresees two classes of seniors in America – those “aging in place” voluntarily and those “aging in place” involuntarily because they can’t sell their homes.



Trend/Challenge - Shifting demographics: impacts of changes in the traditional family and the rise in single person households.

Data:

- The U.S. Census shows that average household size in Wichita increased slightly from 2.46 persons in 2000 to 2.48 persons in 2010 (2010 national average was 2.58 persons). Due to economic necessity and lifestyle choices across the nation, there is evidence that children are residing longer with their parents and/or returning to live with parents and other family members. It is uncertain whether this will be a long-term trend.
- Between 2000 and 2010, the percentage of two member households in Wichita remained unchanged at 32%.
- From 2000 to 2010, the percentage of households with children in Wichita dropped slightly from 32.1% to 30.7%. Some researchers are anticipating that by 2030, only 20-25% of all households nationwide will have children.
- Between 2000 and 2010, the percentage of single person households in Wichita remained unchanged at 31% (2010 national average was 26.7%).
- Some researchers are projecting that by 2025, between a third and half of all households nationwide could be single person households. These demographic shifts are important since household size and composition influences choices of house size, type, configuration and location.

Trend/Challenge - Shifting demographics: impacts of the growth in minority populations.

Data:


- The U.S. Census has projected that by 2043, the majority of people in America will be non-white.
- From 2000 to 2010, the percentage of the Hispanic population in Wichita increased from 10% to 15%. The percentage of the African American population in Wichita over the last decade remained unchanged at 11%, while the Asian population grew slightly from 4% to 5%. Between 2000 and 2010, the percentage of the non-Hispanic white population in Wichita decreased from 72% to 65%. If these trends continue over the next 20 years, it is reasonable to anticipate that a significant portion of the future population growth in Wichita will occur within the Hispanic segment of the community. Due to underlying cultural and socio-economic factors, some of this growth could be concentrated within certain geographic areas of the city.



Trend/Challenge - Future 2035 population growth estimates for Wichita range between 448,000 and 485,000; for Sedgwick County, the estimates range between 610,000 and 671,000.

Data:

- The WSU CEDBR anticipates that Sedgwick County will capture the majority (86%) of population growth in the five-county Wichita Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) over the next 30 years. According to the 2010 U.S. Census, Sedgwick County and Wichita population totals were 498,365 (79.2% of MSA) and 382,368 (60.6% of MSA) respectively.



- By 2035, the total population of Sedgwick County is currently estimated for planning purposes by the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Department (MAPD) to range between 610,000 and 671,000. Wichita's share of that total County population is estimated to range between 448,000 and 485,000, with the remaining population spread among the other cities of Sedgwick County and the unincorporated area.
- Over the last two decades, the majority of the population and land development growth in Wichita has been concentrated in the northwest, northeast and southeast quadrants of the city. Based upon the shifting demographic trends previously discussed, MAPD staff anticipates that future population growth in Wichita may be more evenly dispersed throughout both the established central area and the suburban neighborhoods of the City.

Plan Application:

Baseline Growth- The development of the Community Investments Plan started with an overall baseline annual population growth rate in Sedgwick County of 0.834%, resulting in a population increase of 106,107 for Sedgwick County and a total population of 610,006 by 2035. Wichita's portion of that growth was projected at 64,058 reflecting a slightly slower growth rate of 0.673% and a total population of 448,083 by 2035. The remaining cities and rural areas in Sedgwick County would experience a slightly higher rate of growth by adding 42,048 population to their communities to bring the overall County growth rate to the 0.834% average.

Household size is expected to decline between 2012 and 2035 as a result of previously discussed demographic shifts. In 2012, household size is at 2.59 for Sedgwick County and 2.53 for Wichita. In order to accommodate Sedgwick County's population in smaller households, housing units will have to be built at a higher rate than the population growth rate. An additional 71,468 units will need to be built to achieve an average household size of 2.31 for Sedgwick County by 2035. Wichita's average household size is projected to fall to 2.25 persons per household requiring an additional 49,900 housing units.

Employment growth was projected to be 41,003 jobs, consistent with a growth rate of 0.70% for Sedgwick County and a total of 276,002 jobs by 2035. This is in line with recent trends and forecasts. Wichita's share of employment growth is projected to be approximately 76% of Sedgwick County's growth or 31,200 new jobs for a total of 242,840 jobs.

Accelerated Growth- During the Plan development process it was decided that a more aggressive growth rate needed to be considered in order to accomplish key objectives of promoting economic development and creating a successful community. The Plan Steering Committee settled on a countywide population growth rate of 1.25%. Using this accelerated growth rate, Sedgwick County would see an additional 166,869 new people for a 2035 total population of 670,768. Wichita's share of this growth would be an additional 101,458 persons for a total of 485,483 by 2035.

The accelerated growth projection assumes the same average household sizes for Wichita and Sedgwick County by 2035 as the baseline projections. This would result in 97,093 new housing units for Sedgwick County and 66,067 new housing units for Wichita. The accelerated growth projection uses the same employment participation ratios as in the baseline projection. The result is an annual growth rate of 1.011% for Sedgwick County. This would mean 63,815 new jobs for Sedgwick County by 2035 for a total of 298,814 jobs. Assuming Wichita continues to capture about 76% of the new jobs in the County, it would see 51,271 new jobs for a total of 262,911 jobs by 2035.



Appendix - Existing Conditions & Community Infrastructure Assessment

Assessment Approach

In 2011-12, Wichita and Sedgwick County with assistance from the Hugo Wall School of Urban and Public Affairs at Wichita State University completed an extensive 'order-of-magnitude' assessment of current city and county infrastructure and facility assets (City of Wichita/Sedgwick County Community Infrastructure and Facilities Status Report, November 2012). This assessment was not intended to provide a complete inventory of capital assets for operating or budgetary purposes. It was solely intended to provide a broad overview of public assets controlled by the City of Wichita and Sedgwick County.

Initial data was submitted by operating departments of Wichita and Sedgwick County on forms that requested the following information: an inventory of all infrastructure/facility capital assets including their replacement cost; life expectancy; utilization level (under, appropriate or over utilized); level of usability based on criteria of safety, security and accessibility; and asset condition based on factors of relevancy, functionality, need for repairs, age/life cycle stage, and overall condition; and associated maintenance costs and planned investments. Data was collected separately for building condition. A scale of excellent to unsatisfactory was used to assess usability and asset condition. All dollar figures are stated in constant 2011 dollars. Department data was supplemented with insurance records to determine age and asset replacement cost.

For assessment and evaluation purposes, City and County capital assets were grouped according to the following four functional categories of general public infrastructure and facilities:

1. **Transportation** (Highways, streets, bridges, sidewalks/paths, parking facilities, transit, airport);
2. **Health & Environment** (Water, sewer, stormwater, public health);
3. **Culture/Recreation & Parks** (Libraries, arts/education facilities, parks, recreation facilities);
4. **Public Safety** (Fire, police, corrections, court facilities).


Capital assets were evaluated in terms of the following criteria to help better understand the financial obligations associated with existing City and County public infrastructure and facility investments:

- Replacement cost;
- Life expectancy;
- Level of usability based upon criteria of safety, security and accessibility;
- Utilization level;
- Asset condition based on factors of relevancy, functionality, need for repairs, age/life cycle stage and maintenance costs.

Assessment Overview

The value of combined public infrastructure and facility capital assets for Wichita and Sedgwick County exceeds \$7 billion (2011). The approximate valuation of these assets aggregated according to functional categories is depicted in the accompanying graphic:

Based upon factors of functionality, relevancy, need for repair, age and life cycle stage, almost 38% of Wichita's assets and 11% of the County assets have been rated as being 'fair/deficient' in terms of overall



condition (using a five point rating scale of ‘unsatisfactory’, ‘poor’, ‘fair/deficient’, ‘good’, ‘excellent’). Remaining City and County assets were rated as being ‘good’ or ‘excellent’.

Application of straight line depreciation calculations to combined City and County assets based upon age, remaining life expectancy and estimated cost of replacement, produced a depreciation estimate of \$242 million (split approximately one-quarter to Sedgwick County and three-quarters to the City of Wichita). This estimate is an extrapolation and assumes that infrastructure ages linearly over its expected life cycle. This figure is roughly one-quarter the size of the combined annual operating budgets of Wichita and Sedgwick County.

The adopted capital improvement programs for Wichita and Sedgwick County in 2012 show expected capital spending averaging roughly \$275 million over the next five years. Approximately 70% of those expenditures are for maintenance/repair of existing assets with the remaining 30% for the expansion of assets. Combined annual maintenance expenditures are roughly \$48 million. Based upon these accounting assumptions, Wichita and Sedgwick County are spending (2012) sufficient funds each year to maintain existing infrastructure assets at or near their current condition. If current asset conditions are below acceptable standards, then additional investment would be necessary.

The following 2012 assessment is provided for the four functional categories of public infrastructure and facilities. 2012 is the baseline year for which comprehensive information is available on both condition and capacity of assets, as well as approved planned capital expenditures for both Wichita and Sedgwick County.


1. Transportation Infrastructure (\$3.7 billion) -

(Highways, streets, bridges, sidewalks/paths, parking facilities, transit, airport)

Summary of Major Assets:


- Wichita and Sedgwick County combined transportation assets account for 54% of all City and County infrastructure (52% of total City assets and 57% of total County assets). These assets include a total of 2,500 miles of roads and streets (including over 100 miles of unpaved city streets), over 990 miles of sidewalks, 950 bridges, 54 miles of bike paths, 9 miles of bike lanes, a public transit center and facility, and two public airports.

Wichita Under-Investment in Infrastructure Maintenance



Wichita Streets Below National Pavement Index Standard

Condition and Capacity:



- Annual straight-line depreciation (adjusted for assets condition) of City and County assets in this category is estimated at \$102 million and \$46 million respectively.
- Nearly half (48%) of Wichita’s streets fall below the recommended pavement condition index (PCI) developed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and standardized by the American Society for Testing and Materials. The City is currently (2013) developing a new street condition measurement system that will more accurately identify street pavement condition and maintenance techniques that can maximize the return-on-maintenance dollars spent to extend the life cycle of existing City streets. Timely and appropriate maintenance has a significant impact on the useful life of pavement due to variations in usage, weather, construction techniques, and drainage characteristics.
- Based upon national pavement condition index standards, additional Wichita street maintenance funding needs are currently (2012) estimated at \$12 million

annually. These estimates will be adjusted once the City finalizes a new street condition measurement system.

- It is estimated that between 23% and 46% of Wichita streets have a sidewalk.
- Sedgwick County utilizes a five-year road maintenance schedule that has yielded good overall road conditions for County-maintained roads.
- Approximately 29% of Wichita's bridges and 6% of Sedgwick County's bridges are functionally obsolete and/or structurally deficient based on national assessment standards (these bridges are not hazardous or dangerous). The City has over \$69 million in needed bridge projects for which no funding has been identified.
- Road system congestion: There is less traffic congestion in the Wichita area now than five years ago. According to the 2012 Wichita Urban Mobility Report prepared by the Texas Transportation Institute, traffic congestion in the Wichita metro area expressed as a percentage of peak vehicle miles traveled decreased between 2006 and 2011 (8% in 2006; 5% in 2011). Wichita metro area traffic system congestion as a percentage of total lane-miles also decreased during this same time period (16% in 2006; 9% in 2011).
- Road system safety: Between 2005 and 2009, the number of crashes in the Wichita metro region remained steady near 10,500 per year while the overall crash rate (number of traffic crashes per one million vehicle miles traveled) declined slightly from 2.48 crashes to 2.31 crashes (WAMPO Safety Plan 2010). While the overall crash rate declined, the total number of crashes involving vulnerable road users (motorcyclists, pedestrians, and cyclists) increased from 254 crashes per year to 314 crashes per year.
- The capacity of Wichita Mid-Continent Airport is currently being enlarged with a terminal upgrade and parking improvements at a cost of \$200 million.
- Wichita Transit: An additional investment of \$20.5 million (83% federal funding) is required for the phased replacement of Transit's aging bus fleet (48 buses over the next five years). Utilizing compressed natural gas (CNG) as a cheaper fuel source for buses would require the city to make a capital investment of approximately \$3 million (80% federal funding) to install a CNG facility. Roughly 3% of the city's population currently uses public transit (12,000 individual riders annually). Recent plans to improve transit service have recommended system improvements (more routes, increased frequencies and hours of bus service) for which no funding has been identified. Future funding sources to maintain Wichita Transit operations and transit services remain uncertain after 2015.



Planned Capital Expenditures (2012):

City of Wichita Capital Improvement Program (2011-2020) -

- Following the slow-down in new home construction after 2008, the City has placed more emphasis on street projects within established areas of Wichita. The City has determined that it may get the best return on its limited road maintenance dollars by extending the life of streets that are currently in better condition rather than those streets that are in the worst condition.
- The three state-funded T-WORKS transportation projects (with local City and County matching funds) committed in the Wichita metro area through 2020 are: Kellogg/I-235 interchange improvements (\$116 million); Kellogg Freeway eastward extension from Cypress to 127th Street (\$162 million); and, improvements to K-96/I-235/I-135 interchanges (design only, no construction funds available).
- Wichita's major planned transportation improvement expenditure categories through 2020 are: *Arterial Streets* (\$584 million - \$206 million in City funds); *Freeways* (\$247 million - \$94 million in City funds); *Bridges* (\$80 million - \$73.8 million in City funds); *Transit* (\$28 million - \$4.6 million in City funds); *Airport* (\$305 million - \$194 million in City funds).



Sedgwick County Capital Improvement Program (2013-2018) -

- For future County road and bridge projects planned through 2018, system maintenance (600 miles of road; 600 bridge structures) is the first priority. Roughly 50% of County CIP funds are expended for system maintenance. System reconstruction is the second priority and new improvements (routes and bridges) are third priority.
- Sedgwick County’s major planned transportation improvement expenditure categories through 2018 are: *Roads* (\$78 million - \$70 million in County funds); *Freeways* (\$83 million - \$4 million in County funds); *Bridges* (\$16 million - \$12 million in County funds).

2. Health & Environment Infrastructure (\$2.1 billion) -

(Water, sanitary sewer, storm sewer/stormwater management, solid waste management, public health)

Summary of Major Assets:

- Wichita and Sedgwick County combined health and environment assets account for roughly 30% of all City and County infrastructure (39% of total City assets and 1% of total County assets). Wichita has 2,016 miles of sanitary and storm sewer lines, and 2,367 miles of water lines.
- Wichita operates a cell for construction and demolition waste at the former Brooks Landfill facility.
- In 2006, Wichita completed Phase I of the multi-phase Equus Beds Aquifer Storage and Recovery Project (ASR) to



supplement the Cheney Reservoir and local City well fields as the long-term water supply sources for the City. To date (2102), Wichita has spent \$254 million dollars on Phases I and II of the ASR Project.

- Wichita maintains and operates three sewer treatment facilities - Plant #2, Plant #3 and the 4-Mile Creek Plant.
- Wichita and Sedgwick County jointly own and operate the Wichita/Valley Center Floodway Control Project. Completed in 1959, this project currently consists of 108.8 miles of levees and 40.9 miles of channels that transect Valley Center, Park City, Wichita, Haysville and unincorporated Sedgwick County.
- Sedgwick County Public Health Department clinic and office facilities are currently leased or rented. Under agreement with

the City of Wichita, the Health Department will eventually take title (in eight years) to the current City-owned facility at 1900 E. 9th St. North.

Condition and Capacity:


- Annual straight-line depreciation (adjusted for assets condition) of City and County assets in this category is estimated at \$57 million and \$0.8 million respectively.
- Wichita’s water supply: Wichita’s long-term water supply needs and costs are currently under evaluation. The City is reviewing the impact and effect of long-term drought on Lake Cheney and the ASR Project, as well as the impacts of agriculture irrigation and chloride-contaminated groundwater movement. Most of the City’s long-term water supply costs will be paid by Wichita Water Utility consumers (requiring a possible increase in utility rates), supplemented with possible additional funding from other partners including the state and federal governments. The potential costs are currently unknown. Long-term options include a mix of:
 - * Additional water conservation practices;
 - * Re-using treated sewer plant water for irrigation or manufacturing;



- * Tapping into the El Dorado reservoir;
 - * Water desalination or reverse osmosis facilities.
- Wichita sewer treatment facilities current average daily demand and capacity:
 - Plant #2 (54 mg/day capacity - averaging 30 mg/day);
 - Plant #3 (3.5 mg/day capacity - averaging 0.5 mg/day);
 - 4-Mile Creek Plant (2.5 mg/day capacity - currently at design capacity)

By 2020, Plant #2 will need to be upgraded (estimated cost range of \$95 million to \$146 million) to meet federal EPA mandates for biological nutrient removal standards in wastewater discharged into lakes or rivers (requiring a possible increase in utility rates).

- Wichita's water and sewer pipe system: The age, size of pipe and material composition of the City's water lines, water valves, and sewer lines vary throughout the City, and reflect in large part the decade of building construction. Approximately 25% of the City's water lines are over 50 years old - some lines in downtown Wichita are over 100 years old. Roughly 33% of the City's sewer lines are over 50 years old. The condition of these system assets represents significant maintenance and replacement liabilities on the part of the City over the next 20 years. In 2012, funding for the City's annual water line repair/replacement budget increased from \$2.5 million to \$5.4 million. Funding for the City's annual sewer repair/replacement budget increased from \$1.5 million to \$5.4 million. Unfunded water and sewer maintenance projects totaling \$42 million have been identified by Public Works and Utilities Department.
- Substantial improvements to Wichita's current sewer collection system may also be required over the next decade to limit sewer back-up incidents, if so mandated by the EPA. Depending upon the level of mandate, this could potentially cost the City over \$100 million per year for multiple years (requiring a possible increase in utility rates).
- The overall age, condition and capacity of Wichita's water and sewer pipe system is such that the current system is not capable of providing new or enhanced services in certain older established neighborhoods and newer suburban areas without significant re-investment on the part of either the City or private developers.
- Wichita/Valley Center Floodway Control Project: The annual operation and maintenance budget is \$2 million. An additional \$1.6 million is needed annually to maintain the project to FEMA and U.S. Corps of Engineers certification and accreditation standards. Needed and desired future improvements and expansions to the project over the next 10-15 years would cost an estimated \$60 million.
- Wichita and Sedgwick County stormwater management: The Sedgwick County Stormwater Management Advisory Board has identified more than \$200 million in future stormwater infrastructure projects



county-wide and across multiple jurisdictions necessary to solve historic and chronic stormwater/flooding problems. Wichita's current \$2.0 per month ERU (equivalent residential unit) stormwater fee generates \$8.5 million annually and is insufficient to raise the additional \$76 million needed by the City to fund required City projects through 2020.

- Brooks Landfill construction and demolition cell: The current estimated life expectancy of the remaining cell is 2018. The City is proposing a new cell that would create 36 years of construction and demolition waste capacity. Design and permitting approvals should be completed by 2015.

Planned Capital Expenditures (2012):

City of Wichita Capital Improvement Program (2011-2020) -

- Wichita's priority for planned water and sewer investments is the rehabilitation and replacement of system integrity and capacity rather than system expansion. Major planned health and environment capital improvement expenditure categories through 2020 are: *Water Supply* (\$345 million); *Water Distribution* (\$236 million); *Sewer Distribution* (\$114 million); *Sewer Treatment & Facilities* (\$177 million); *Stormwater* (\$32 million - \$15.5 million in City funds).

Sedgwick County Capital Improvement Program (2013-2018) -

- Major planned health and environment capital improvement expenditure categories through 2018 are: *Stormwater* (\$5 million).

3. Culture, Recreation & Parks Infrastructure (\$0.5 billion) -

(Libraries, arts/education facilities, parks, recreation facilities)

Summary of Major Assets:

- Wichita and Sedgwick County combined culture, recreation and parks infrastructure assets account for roughly 7% of all City and County infrastructure (6% of total City assets and 14% of total County assets).
- Wichita recreation assets include 124 parks, 11 pools, 8 recreation centers and 5 golf courses. Special recreational use facilities include Lawrence Dumont Stadium, Ralph Wulz Riverside Tennis Center and the Wichita Ice Center.
- Wichita education and cultural assets include 10 public libraries, Botanica, the Great Plains Nature Center, Century II Convention Center, CityArts, Exploration Place (joint City/County), Mid-America All Indian Center, Old Cowntown Museum, Wichita Art Museum and the Wichita-Sedgwick County Historical Museum.
- Sedgwick County recreation, education and cultural assets include Lake Afton Park and Observatory, Intrust Bank Arena, National Center for Aviation Training, Sedgwick County Extension Center, Sedgwick County Park and the Sedgwick County Zoo.

Condition and Capacity:

- Annual straight-line depreciation (adjusted for assets condition) of City and County assets in this category is estimated at \$20 million and \$5 million respectively.
- Wichita recreation assets: Based on extensive public input and asset inventory work undertaken in 2008, the *Wichita Park and Open Space Plan* (PROS) recommends \$8 million annually for the replacement and/or renovation of the City's existing park and recreation assets. The City's annual spending on replacement and/or maintenance has averaged around \$2.3 million. The PROS plan recommends \$19 million be spent annually to implement recommended expansions to the City's park and recreation system. Unfunded park projects totaling \$44 million have been identified by the Park and Recreation Department.
- Wichita education and cultural assets: Asset renovation cost estimates include \$12 million for Century II, \$5 mil-



lion for Kennedy Plaza, \$30 million for a new downtown library and \$0.5 million for Westlink Library improvements. No funds have been identified for the proposed Northwest Regional Library (\$9.7 million), the proposed Southeast Wichita Community Resource Center (\$8.3 million), the recommended \$50 million retrofit of Lawrence Dumont Stadium, or the recommended \$173 million expansion to the Convention Center.

- Sedgwick County recreation, education and cultural assets: The Intrust Bank Arena has a dedicated operations and maintenance reserve fund of \$8.7 million.

Planned Capital Expenditures (2012):

City of Wichita Capital Improvement Program (2011-2020) -

- Major planned cultural, recreation and parks capital improvement expenditure categories through 2020 are: *Parks* (\$26.5 million - \$24 million in City funds); *Libraries* (\$33.5 million); *Culture/Arts* (\$18.4 million).

Sedgwick County Capital Improvement Program (2013-2018) -

- Major planned cultural, recreation and parks capital improvement expenditure categories through 2018 are: *Parks* (\$1 million); *Education* (\$1 million).

4. Public Safety Infrastructure (\$0.2 billion) -

(Fire facilities, police facilities, EMS facilities, corrections facilities, court facilities)

Summary of Major Assets:

- Wichita and Sedgwick County combined public safety infrastructure assets account for roughly 6% of all City and County infrastructure (1% of total City assets and 20% of total County assets).
- Wichita's fire facilities include 22 fire stations and a regional fire training center.
- Wichita's police facilities include 4 police substations, the City Hall Police Center and a bomb disposal range.
- Sedgwick County's public safety facilities include 15 EMS posts, 9 fire stations (Sedgwick County Fire District #1), County Sheriff's Office, Sedgwick County Jail, joint City/County Law Enforcement Training Center, Public Safety Center, juvenile and adult correction/detention facilities and work release centers.
- Wichita and Sedgwick County are providing matching funds for the construction of the new Heartland Preparedness Center, a joint law enforcement training center and Kansas National Guard facility.
- Significant portions of total public safety service expenditures for both the City and County are the staffing costs associated with the delivery of public safety services.

Condition and Capacity:

- Annual straight-line depreciation (adjusted for assets condition) of City and County assets in this category is estimated at \$1.9 million and \$10.5 million respectively.
- In Wichita, the total violent crime rate per 1,000 population has increased slightly since 2010 (5.39 in 2010; 5.59 in 2012) while the property crime rate per 1,000 population has increased notably (49.77 in 2010 to 57.38 in 2012). Nationally, property crimes rates have risen while rates for violent crimes have declined.
- Wichita residential structure fires have trended downward over the last four years (542 in 2009; 364 in 2012) as has the rate of residential structure fires per 1,000 structures (4.4 in 2009; 2.9 in 2012). Basic life support (BLS) responses for the Wichita Fire Department have trended upward since 2010 (30,633 in 2010; 33,938 in 2012) as has the rate of BLS per 1,000 population (80.1 in 200; 88.3 in 2012).
- Wichita police public safety assets: Existing Patrol East and Patrol West Substations have operational and capacity issues and are not strategically located for optimal service delivery based upon the city's current urban growth limits. The City has committed \$5 million to fund the relocation of these substations. No funds have been identified for a new Police helicopter (\$2.5 million) or for remodeling projects at the City Hall Police Center (\$3 million) and the Patrol North and South Substations (\$2.7 million).



- Wichita fire public safety assets: Due to expanded City growth, the Fire Department has recommended the construction of two additional fire stations to ensure targeted response time coverage. No funds have been identified to construct these stations (\$5.6 million total cost) or the recommended fleet center improvements to the Fire Regional Training Center (\$5.6 million).
- Sedgwick County public safety service assets: The County has initiated design work (\$2.1 million) to improve the aging Law Enforcement Training Center. Funding commitments have been made for a new County Administration Building (\$32 million cost estimate) due to the State Supreme Court directive to accommodate up to eight new judges in the 18th Judicial District at the Main Courthouse. The County has identified a need to replace EMS Post 1 and construct a new northeast EMS post. No funds have been identified for these facilities (\$2.2 million total).

Planned Capital Expenditures (2012):

City of Wichita Capital Improvement Program (2011-2020) -

- Major planned public safety capital improvement expenditure categories through 2020 are: *Fire Facilities* (\$2.8 million); *Fire Apparatus* (\$31 million); *Police Facilities* (\$5 million); *Police Equipment* (\$4 million); *Heartland Preparedness Center* (\$90 million - \$19.2 million in City funds).

Sedgwick County Capital Improvement Program (2013-2018) -

- Major planned public safety capital improvement expenditure categories through 2018 are: *Public Safety & Court Facilities* (\$1 million); *Heartland Preparedness Center* (\$30 million).




Appendix - Community Engagement

During the development of this Plan, ongoing efforts have been made to better inform, educate and engage the community in the development of the Community Investments Plan. Public outreach initiatives have included a community-wide survey, over 100 ACT-ICT community outreach meetings, eight informal Community Investments Plan public open house meetings, eight Community Investments Plan community discussion meetings and numerous presentations to community/neighborhood groups, business organizations and service clubs. The web-based Activate Wichita engagement tool has also been utilized. Summaries of these initiatives are provided below:

2013 WSU Community Survey Results

A survey of 25,000 randomly selected registered voters in Wichita and Sedgwick County was conducted by Wichita State University early in the Plan development process (January 2013). This survey reached a broad cross-section of the community. Developed with input from focus groups discussions, the purpose of the WSU survey was to create a general awareness of the infrastructure investment issues facing our community; identify initial community priorities for future public infrastructure investment; and, to get an indication (at a general level) of community willingness to pay for future public investments.

A total of 4,100 surveys were returned yielding a response rate of almost 17%. This means that the survey results have a plus or minus margin of error rate of less than 1% and are statistically valid/representative of our community. Priorities for future public infrastructure investment as identified in the WSU community survey questionnaire results are summarized in the following graphics:



It is important to recognize that the survey responses do not likely reflect a fully informed community awareness or understanding of the following factors: community trends and challenges ahead; the current condition of our public infrastructure and facility assets; or, the guiding principles of maximizing return on investment and minimizing future risk to our community.

The WSU survey results do not provide the 'answer' to the issues and questions addressed in this Plan. Rather, the survey initiated the community discussion about future community needs and wants. The survey results do provide some important preliminary community feedback on possible future public investment priorities and willingness to pay. A complete summary of the survey questions and results are contained in a separate report prepared by WSU entitled, "Wichita-Sedgwick County Community Investments Plan, Community Survey: Overview, Hugo Wall School of Urban and Public Affairs, Wichita State University, 2013."

ACT-ICT Community Outreach Results

More than 2,000 people attended 102 ACT ICT community meetings held from mid-September 2013 through January 2014 to share their vision and public investment priorities for the City of Wichita. These meetings were held in part to provide vision direction for the development of the Community Investments Plan. Attendees were also asked to indicate their public investment priorities and preferred methods/options for funding those priorities. The results of the feedback received are summarized below. A detailed compilation of all feedback received is contained in the report entitled, “City of Wichita ACT ICT Community Engagement Survey Results, Hugo Wall School of Urban and Public Affairs, Wichita State University, February 2014.”

Community Vision

Citizens in the survey showed strong value for community and toward future generations:


- Are willing to rise above their personal interest to do what is best for the community (72%)
- Have a strong commitment to preserving the future and are willing to do their part so that a better community is left for the next generation (86 – 98%)
- Willing to take responsibility to help create opportunity for all citizens IF citizens are willing to do their part (93 – 95%)

Residents shared 1,379 statements on their vision for the community. Twenty different themes arose in participant comments:

1. Top theme: Economic development -community growth, innovation, job creation and diversification, job training, business promotion
2. Second most discussed theme– arts and culture and entertainment events and amenities


Funding

How should we invest to create our community’s vision for the future?:




Priorities

Community Survey:
Residents ranked 14 different priorities and their willingness to pay for them. The top 5 priorities were:



ACT ICT:
The Top 10 Priorities for Future Public Investment



April 2014 Community Investments Plan Open House Meeting Results

Four come-and-go community open house meetings were held during the month of April (April 14, City Arts; April 16, Alford Library; April 21, WSU Metroplex; and April 28, Sedgwick County Extension Office). Total attendance was 97 people. The following is a summary of the feedback received to specific questions asked of meeting attendees:

Topic - Determining how best for Wichita to grow over the next 20 years

HANDOUT QUESTION: How best for Wichita to grow? Rank the following three Wichita growth areas according to which you think best supports the future growth, prosperity and quality of life of our community (1=best, 2=second best, 3=third best) (68 total responses)

Rank				
1	Established Urban Core	59% best	37% 2nd best	4% 3rd best
2	Downtown	34% best	54% 2nd best	12% 3rd best
3	Suburbs	7% best	9% 2nd best	84% 3rd best

General Thoughts and Comments Submitted

Recurring Comments/Themes:

- Focus growth and infrastructure reinvestment within the established urban core and the downtown – encourage infill development
- A strong downtown is important to our community and will help attract/retain younger people
- Slow spending on suburban growth – it is financially unsustainable
- Investment in a more effective public transit system is important to the future of our community
- Need to maintain and improve our existing water, sewer and local road infrastructure assets – a new central library and securing a long-term water supply are also top priorities

Unique Insights/Ideas:

- Current redevelopment projects are too modest – our City needs to be more dense
- Let the market determine future growth areas
- Keep taxes low to encourage people to stay in our community
- New growth won't solve our current infrastructure maintenance and replacement problems
- Consider artificial turf requirements in new home green spaces – prohibit planting of fescue grasses in new home construction areas
- Eliminate the use of special assessment financing tools to fund new development – costs of new streets and utilities should be included in the initial purchase cost of the lot/home
- Combine City and County public safety services
- Need to improve USD 259 schools in order to attract young families in the urban core
- Quality of life investments are needed to retain and attract new jobs, businesses and people to our community
- Public transit allows some people in our community to keep their jobs



Topic - Creating an effective infrastructure investment decision-making process for the long-term

BOARD QUESTION: Please list important criteria that you would like elected officials to consider as they make future community infrastructure spending and cost-reduction decisions.

Recurring Comments/Themes:

- Future economic growth and job creation within our community
- Quality of life investments that will retain/attract young professionals and a strong workforce – advancing community quality of life in order to promote economic development
- Investments that will support and improve public transit in our community

Unique Insights/Ideas:

- Consideration must be given to private sector development plans
- Wichita has to be a place people want to live – then the jobs will come
- Alternative transportation investments (transit, bicycle and pedestrian) are important – 1/3 of Wichita does not drive
- Priority area for investment needs to be the urban core – it will help the most people and fix what we already have
- Investments that will complement and support WSU efforts to bring new jobs to our community

BOARD QUESTION: What thoughts and comments do you have?

Recurring Comments/Themes:

- Take care of basic infrastructure needs first – maintain what we have
- Investments in libraries are key to quality of community life
- A vibrant downtown and urban core is important
- Public transit improvements need to be a priority for our community

Unique Insights/Ideas:

- Explore the development of local food systems as a way to stimulate economic development – vacant lands in the urban core could be used for local food production
- Privatize the public transit system
- Consider medical marijuana as way to raise revenues
- Super high-speed municipal internet is needed to support future business growth and educational development

May-June 2014 Community Investments Plan Discussion Meeting Results

Nine community discussion meetings were held during the month of May and June (May 15th, 22nd, 29th and June 3rd, 5th, 12th, 19th and 26th). Each meeting was organized around one of the following topic interest areas: *Business, Industry, Commerce and Transportation; Building, Development and Real Estate; Arts, Culture and Recreation; Social Services, Community Health and Wellness; Neighborhoods; Education; and, Mayor’s Youth Council*. Seven of these meetings were held at the Downtown YMCA, one meeting was held at City Arts and one meeting was held at the Wichita Country Club. Total attendance at these meetings was 96 people. The following is a summary of the feedback received to specific questions asked of meeting attendees:



Topic - Identifying long-term investment spending priorities; determining how best for Wichita to grow over the next 20 years

QUESTION: Prioritize future City spending within the following three general categories of infrastructure investment (Priority #1, #2, #3) (78 total responses)

Spending Priority			Categories of Investment
64% #1	24% #2	12% #3	Maintaining and replacing what the City currently has
21% #1	67% #2	12% #3	Making enhancements to what the City currently has
15% #1	9% #2	76% #3	Expanding the City's current system of public assets

QUESTION: Check future City spending priorities within each of the following types of infrastructure projects (85 total responses)

Maintaining and replacing what the City currently has:

	Spending Priority		
	Low	Med.	High
Repairing and maintaining existing local streets	1	23	60
Replacing and maintaining aging water & sewer lines	0	19	66
Maintaining existing parks and recreation centers	10	38	37
Maintaining existing cultural arts and entertainment facilities	20	35	30
Maintaining existing libraries	18	30	37
Maintaining existing transit system	14	25	45
Maintaining existing fire and police facilities	4	31	50

Expanding the City's current system of public assets:

	Spending Priority		
	Low	Med.	High
Constructing the NW Bypass (Goddard to Maize)	56	21	6
Adding new streets	49	30	6
Adding new water & sewer lines	28	32	25
Adding sewer treatment plant capacity	12	43	29
Adding new parks	32	38	15
Adding new fire stations and upgrading police facilities	22	46	17

Making enhancements to what the City currently has:

	Spending Priority		
	Low	Med.	High
Kellogg freeway improvements to Goddard and Butler County	37	30	18
Constructing South Area Parkway Bypass (around south Wichita)	53	24	8
Securing long-term water supply	1	15	69
Upgrading existing parks	20	39	28
Upgrading existing cultural arts & entertainment facilities	30	31	24
Upgrading existing libraries	23	24	28
Major transit system/service improvements (Transit Vision 2013)	18	23	44



DISCUSSION: What projects and investments are most critical to Wichita's future?

Recurring Comments/Themes:

- Securing an affordable long-term water supply for our community
- Maintaining our existing infrastructure and facilities (particularly streets, bridges, water and sewer lines) especially within the established urban core area
- Improving and expanding our existing public transit system will be important to the future of our community (more transportation and accessibility options especially for millennials, seniors and disadvantaged people in our community)
- Investing in quality of community life projects (esp. parks, libraries, cultural arts/entertainment) is needed to retain and attract people to our community

Unique Insights/Ideas:

- Investments that reduce divisions between different areas and populations of our City
- Investments that reduce our consumption of energy
- Neighborhood and urban core area investments should be done in a networked, block-by-block, coordinated manner that integrates all infrastructure category needs (e.g. water, sewer, streets, parks) and helps achieve long-term cost savings
- Investment in high-speed internet access
- Investing in revamped/retooled libraries - "media centers", to enhance quality of life and bring on-line technology access to all in our community

QUESTION: Recognizing that growth in all areas of Wichita is necessary for enhancing the quality of life in our community, rank the following three Wichita growth areas according to which you think best supports the future growth, prosperity and quality of life of our community (1=best, 2=second best, 3=third best) (83 total responses)

Rank				
1	Established Urban Core	49% best	35% 2nd best	16% 3rd best
2	Downtown	35% best	49% 2nd best	16% 3rd best
3	Suburbs	16% best	16% 2nd best	68% 3rd best

% of Respondents Living in:		Actual % of Wichita Population*in:	
Established Urban Core	45%		54%
Suburbs	39%		46%
Downtown	10%		1%
Other	6%		n/a

*2010 Census



DISCUSSION: How best should Wichita grow over the next 20 years?

Recurring Comments/Themes:

- Vitality, growth and infrastructure reinvestment within the established urban core needs to be a priority. This area has affordable housing stock as well as proximity to services and many cultural/arts/entertainment amenities
- A strong downtown is important to everyone in our community – it is what makes a community unique and attractive.
- The suburbs will remain a strong and affordable draw, especially for younger families
- Greater connectivity and mobility options (esp. bicycling, walking, transit) will be needed for all community residents

Unique Insights/Ideas:

- Identify growth areas that will generate the best return on investment over the long-term
- People look to downtown for cultural and entertainment amenities regardless of where they live in the community
- Future generations will want to live in areas of reduced travel time to their place of work, personal services and entertainment
- Encourage growth and reinvestment around centers of education (WSU Innovation Center and existing public schools) and city parks

Creating an effective infrastructure investment decision-making process for the long-term

DISCUSSION: What would you want an elected official to consider when making decisions about investing in new capital projects, modifying existing projects, or eliminating existing capital projects?

Recurring Comments/Themes:

- Consider the long-term impacts of investment decisions on future generations, and whether it impacts and benefits a larger number of citizens - greatest good for the greatest number of people
- Ensure that the scope and scale of investments is cost effective and right for our community
- Keeping our existing assets up to standard must be a priority for future investment
- Invest in projects that have multiple benefits to our community and/or build upon other projects (e.g. stormwater detention facility that also provides park/open space during dry periods)
- Investments are needed to enhance our quality of community life in order to retain our residents and attract young professionals
- Invest in projects that will help attract better paying jobs and help grow our community

Unique Insights/Ideas:

- The real question is what do we want our community to be in the next 20 years? That future vision should drive our investment decisions and priorities – the challenge is that the long-term community vision will be different for different people
- It is important to find balance in future investment decisions and to be flexible/adaptable to changing circumstances
- Ask whether our community can afford not to do the project or make this investment
- What are the investment trade-offs and down-sides of a project? How will this project take away from other important projects?
- Make targeted investments that will help people say, ‘this is the place where I want to live, work and play.’
- Do a return-on-investment calculation on the basis of ‘benefit per capita’
- Ensure that investments help foster and develop a healthy and safe community



Topic - Establishing important infrastructure investment decision-making criteria and considerations

QUESTION: Listed below are important criteria and considerations to guide future community infrastructure investment spending and cost-reduction decisions. Please check the two (2) most important and the two (2) least important. (83 total responses)

Importance		Decision-making criteria & considerations
Least	Most	
5	35	Promotes economic growth and job creation
9	44	Advances our community quality of life
7	22	Advances community health and safety
7	44	Creates a place where future generations will want to live, work and play
52	2	Priority as identified in existing adopted plans (e.g. W-SC comprehensive plan)
35	11	Essential for the future physical growth and development of our community
16	17	Demonstrated ability and commitment to maintain the project
13	7	Other (various items)

DISCUSSION: What are the most important decision-making criteria?

Recurring Comments/Themes:

- Enhancing the quality of life in our community so as to create a place where people will want to live, work and play
- Promoting economic growth/development and new job creation – creating a diversity of good jobs
- Advancing the public health and safety of our community - protecting our air and water quality
- Maintaining flexibility in order to seize opportunities and make good investments – can't be locked into existing plan priorities

Unique Insights/Ideas:

- Quality of life investments, economic growth and creating a future place where people want to live, work and play are inter-related. Without good jobs, there is nothing to attract people, and the quality of life investments cannot be sustained
- Use a holistic approach to creating quality of life in our community
- Advancing our community quality of life is important – Koch Industries has hundreds of well-paying jobs here in Wichita that they can't fill
- Just because citizens want a project or investment doesn't necessarily mean it is a good investment for our community
- Invest in projects that reinvest in our community and help to build our identity
- Invest to help support a strong public school system
- Review the history of past investments and determine which have had the greatest benefit to the community



Topic- Any other things or issues needing to be addressed or considered in the Community Investments Plan?

DISCUSSION:

Recurring Comments/Themes:

- Wichita needs to establish and improve its regional/national brand, image and identify (outsiders have a false impression of our community) – promote what we have to offer as a community
- High-speed internet access is critical to the future of our community
- Passenger rail connections to our community will be important in the future
- Need to create more walkable neighborhoods
- Need to support healthy local food systems

Unique Insights/Ideas:


- Within the 20-year plan, set shorter-term (3 to 5 year) investment priorities that can be reviewed annually
- Co-ordinate with other jurisdictions (municipal and school) on major infrastructure or facility planning and decision-making
- Create ‘street soccer’ facilities by re-using older, under-utilized city tennis courts

May-June 2014 Activate Wichita Online Survey Results


General Project Demographics

The figures below illustrate the participant demographics for the Community Investments Plan Survey which appeared on www.activate-wichita.com and closed June 26, 2014. The survey attracted 50 respondents which is 26% less than Activate Wichita’s average response rate (but still 85% more than MindMixer’s total average). The most responsive postal codes for this survey were 67203 (District VI), 67218 (District III), and 67226 (District II).

Gender Demographics



Age Demographics



Community Investment Plan Survey Summary

This survey attempted to gain feedback related to the growth scenarios proposed by the Plan Steering Committee. Participants were asked to rank from first to third the areas they felt would best support future growth, prosperity and quality of life in our community. In addition to these questions, participants identified what they liked the best and least about the Wichita 2035 growth scenarios as well as what important items elected officials should consider as they make community infrastructure spending and cost-reduction decisions.

Areas which Support Future Growth, Prosperity and Quality of Life

Respondents were asked to rank three areas of the City regarding their overall importance to supporting and developing growth in all of Wichita. The responses indicated that participants felt that development and redevelopment



in the (1) **Downtown** area ranked highest in importance (47%), followed by development and redevelopment on vacant/underutilized properties or buildings in the (2) **Established Urban Core** (43%), and finally development on vacant properties and agricultural land in the (3) **Suburbs** (68%).

Items for Elected Officials to Consider

Question 5 of the survey asked participants what things they felt elected officials should consider when making infrastructure spending and cost reduction decisions. Several responses dealt with advancing the community quality of life and having these efforts be in concert with economic growth and job creation. These respondents felt that none of the issues should be looked at in a vacuum and the inherent relationships between them should not be ignored.

Several respondents stressed how important a vibrant downtown is to future growth in Wichita. Many felt that an improved downtown would do most to attract and retain young professionals. Urban sprawl was identified as a leading cause of the decay of downtown amenities over time. Suggested improvements to downtown included a grocery store, special or free transit routes, and ample parking. In addition to downtown improvements, a number of respondents singled out sidewalk and street repair across all of Wichita as a priority they'd like elected officials to consider in their decision making. Job creation and stability was mentioned several times as well. Other items that respondents felt elected officials should consider include environmental impacts, improved library services, a focus on short commute times, reliable access to water, and increased cultural attractions.

Opinions on the Wichita 2035 Growth Scenarios

When asked what they liked most about the three presented scenarios, respondents identified numerous items. The focus on economic growth and job creation was mentioned several times. Rehabilitation of the downtown area and streets/sidewalks all over town was also identified. Many appreciated the realistic admission that there will be a significant deficit in terms of resources to address the future needs of the community. Having an honest interpretation of potential conditions was viewed as the best way to begin planning for the future.

Some criticism of the growth scenarios centered around their presentation. Respondents claimed that comparing the three options was difficult as they were currently being presented online. A significant number of responders felt that suburban development/redevelopment was focused on too much and that urban sprawl was counter-productive to solving the community's problems.

Summary

The general consensus from the 50 responses to this survey was that a focus on downtown was essential to future growth and prosperity in Wichita. It was identified as the most important area of town to focus on. It should be noted that 19 respondents claimed they lived in the established urban core area of Wichita and 17 claimed to live in the suburbs (the rest of the responses were non-committal or claimed they lived in the downtown area). When given the opportunity to provide responses to open-ended questions, respondents repeatedly focused on downtown issues and a distaste for continued suburban development. Rebuilding the core of Wichita and gaining all the advantages that come with that process seemed the most popular response offered to this survey.



2015 Community Engagement

2015 Community Meetings & Presentations on the Draft Plan

Forty-one presentations on the Draft Community Investments Plan were made from February through June 22, 2015 to a broad and diverse cross-section of community groups (see list and attendance numbers below). The total attendance at these various presentations and meetings was 738 people.

Business/Community Service/Local Government/Neighborhood Boards & Groups/Professional Associations

Access Advisory Board (21)
 Airport Advisory Board (23)
 American Institute of Architects - Wichita Chapter (7)
 American Society of Civil Engineers & Society of Professional Engineers - Wichita Chapter (36)
 American Society of Landscape Architects - Prairie Gateway Chapter (5)
 Country Overlook Neighborhood Association (9)
 Kansas CCIM Chapter of Commercial Real Estate Brokers (11)
 Mayor's Youth Council - City of Wichita (27)
 Northeast Millair Neighborhood Association (23)
 Old Town Rotary Club (9)
 Sedgwick County Advisory Council on Aging (20)
 Sedgwick County Association of Cities (14)
 Southside Democratic Club (20)
 Southwind Neighborhood Association (19)
 West Heights United Methodist Church (11)
 Westlink Neighborhood Association Annual Social (25)
 Westlink Neighborhood Association Board (7)
 Wichita Area Association of Realtors - Government Relations Board (10)
 Wichita Area Builders Association - Board (35)
 Wichita Area Builders Association - Under 40 Council (23)
 Wichita Area Builders Association - Remodeler's Council (20)
 Wichita Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Body (37)
 Wichita Arts Council (16)
 Wichita Bar Association - Real Estate Division (25)
 Wichita Bike/Ped Advisory Board (12)
 Wichita Downtown Development Corporation Board (9)
 Wichita Habitat for Humanity Board (18)
 Wichita Health and Wellness Coalition (10)
 Wichita Historic Preservation Board (9)
 Wichita Independent Neighborhoods (14)
 Wichita Independent Business Association & Wichita Nonprofit Chamber of Service (18)
 Wichita Library Board (20)
 Wichita Metro Chamber of Commerce - Government Relations Committee (13)
 Wichita Metro Chamber of Commerce - Health Alliance Committee (41)
 Wichita Pachyderm Club (30)
 Wichita Park Board (15)
 Wichita Transit Advisory Board (15)



Open House Meetings


Four come-and-go community open house meetings (61 total attendance) were also held in April and May 2015 (April 27th at Alford Library; May 4th at City Arts; May 11th at WSU Metroplex; and May 18th at Sedgwick County Extension Office).

Activate Wichita Web Survey


Since April 27, 2015, a summary of the Draft Plan along with the 11 community survey feedback questions have been posted on the City's Activate Wichita website. A total of 316 website material views have occurred (as of June 12, 2015). A total of 15 people responded to the on-line survey questions.

Aggregated Community Outreach Results


The following graphs display the total responses received from the various community meetings, presentations and Activate Wichita (as of June 12, 2015) to each of the 11 community survey questions regarding the overall direction of the Draft Plan.




Plan Guiding Policy Principle - "Support an Innovative, Vibrant and Diverse Economy" (n=373)




Plan Guiding Policy Principle - "Invest in the Quality of Our Community Life" (n=375)




Plan Guiding Policy Principle - "Take Better Care of What We Already Have" (n=372)




Plan Guiding Policy Principle - "Make Strategic, Value-added Investment Decisions" (n=373)





Plan Guiding Policy Principle - "Provide for Balanced Growth but with Added Focus on Our Established Neighborhoods" (n=372)




It is important to make public investments that support continued residential and employment growth at the suburban fringes of Wichita (n=361)







Overall, long-term transportation investments in local roads and bridges are a "very high" priority need (n=373)




Overall, long-term transportation investments in bypasses and freeway expansions are a "low-medium" priority need (n=369)




Overall, long-term transportation investments in public transit are a "low-medium" priority need (n=368)




Overall, long-term water, sewer and stormwater investments are a "very high" priority need (n=371)



Overall, long-term quality of life improvements are a "medium-high" priority investment need (n=370)



Overall, maintaining and expanding our fire, police and EMS facilities is a "high" priority investment need (n=369)



The following is a summary of all written comments submitted and received. These comments have been organized according to the major Plan elements.

2035 Plan Vision Statement and Core Community Values

- A diverse economy, not dependent on aircraft jobs, is needed - take the focus off aviation jobs and diversify our long-term employment (5).
- A diversified economy must include the creation of green jobs.
- Job growth will be necessary for this Plan to work.
- We need to focus on job creation.
- We need more economic diversity and new businesses.
- We need a plan to bring new jobs to Sedgwick County in order to keep our young people (2) ... this Plan is not innovative enough to keep our younger citizens here.
- Bringing more people to our community is good, but keeping people here is more important.
- Addressing the quality of life and educational needs of Wichita's youth is important.
- Education needs to be a high priority and it's not referenced in the draft Plan. Our schools need more support and programs to get students to realize that education is important for their future.
- A big challenge to implementing this Plan is the ever-changing elected City and County leadership that inherently brings new ideas and priorities.
- The Plan Vision statement won't happen without new leadership.
- Plan is put together well, but additional growth will require additional jobs. This will be difficult with the current County Commission not understanding the nature of job competition with other cities and states.
- We are basing this Plan on accelerated growth projections that are not realistic/practical.

Plan Guiding Policy Principles

- The Plan Vision and Guiding Policy Principles are really defined by willingness to set spending priorities.
- The five Guiding Policy Principles are too general.
- Is it possible to follow all five Plan Guiding Policy Principles at the same time ... how will you choose and prioritize between them?
- The following terms used in the five Guiding Policy Principles; 'support', 'quality', 'better', 'value-added', 'balanced', and 'added focus', need to be defined.
- Need to clarify what 'make strategic, value-added investment decisions' means.
- Quality of life keeps our young professionals, attracts people, jobs and economic growth. This will in turn generate additional revenues to invest back into our public infrastructure.
- Quality of life means different things to different people - need to better define what constitutes quality of life for our community.
- Quality of community life includes investments in affordable housing and the creation of a usable public transit system.



Future Wichita Growth Patterns & Policies

Suburban fringe:

- Projected future suburban growth will utilize agricultural land ... need to support urban infill.
- Plan needs to be more cautious about continued suburban growth (2).
- People who choose to live in the fringes of Wichita should expect to have less access to city services.
- We need to stop suburban sprawl with an urban growth boundary around Wichita.
- There is no need for further expansion of the city's suburban areas.
- Look toward raising the cost of development in the fringe areas as means of encouraging redevelopment within existing city limits.
- Stop expanding residential development further away from the established core area.

Downtown:

- Funding downtown development is not a good investment.
- Downtown is already a semi-ghost town. Can we change that, or are we just throwing money down a rat hole?
- More lighting is needed in Old Town.
- Develop downtown.

Urban Infill Strategy:

- I support the Wichita Urban Infill Strategy (2).
- I support concentrating investment and redevelopment of the City core area.
- There needs to be a high emphasis on neighborhood-level investments in the urban core area.
- It's critical that we make it easier to develop and redevelop inner-city neighborhoods.
- A similar guideline should be applied to identify priority areas for renovation and reconstruction in the established central area.
- Make sure that reinvestments to support infill growth do not take away from our continued suburban growth – we need both.
- The Plan does not include a lot of 'sustaining' practices ... a means of walking to grocery and daily shops in the core of the City.
- Some local street lights have not been working for some time (by Ray Woodman School and Truesdale).
- Public/private land banking should be incorporated into the urban infill strategy.
- The City needs to enforce its codes and ordinances including the imposition of appropriate penalties on those violators.
- Make it easier to redevelop in the core areas by removing regulatory barriers, improving infrastructure and overall quality of life.
- How will the Plan address the abandoned houses and buildings in the City?
- Abandoned residential and commercial structures convey Detroit-like decline.
- Stop the practice of 10 year tax abatements to existing businesses, even if they are in the ECA.
- Every large city allows inner city decay at the expense of those who cannot afford to live in the more prosperous suburban areas. We need to take better care of what we have already.
- USD 259 must be a partner in this planning process, otherwise, they undermine the efforts of this Plan.



- I would like to see an example of how making public infrastructure investments would increase residential redevelopment and employment growth within Wichita's Established Central Area.
- The City should not be encouraging infill development.

Plan Elements

Funding & Financing

Taxation issues:

- Instead of focusing on the \$9 billion gap which we will never be able to close without significantly raising taxes and fees, we should focus on how to best spend the \$4 billion in forecasted revenues.
- The City's stormwater ERU already addresses our stormwater funding needs.
- All of our talented, creative people and young people will move away if we do not take the financial burden off of future generations.
- Taxpayers should not pay for the costs of public infrastructure needed to support residential/employment growth at the fringes or in the Established Central Area.
- Taxes levied on local businesses are actually a tax on its customers, because that cost is passed on to the consumer.
- An innovative and diverse economy can be accomplished without large tax revenues.
- Be cautious with any future tax increases and the impact it would have on fixed and low-income households.
- The City needs to do a better job assuring citizens that our tax revenues are being spent wisely.
- Any future sales tax initiative to fund a long-term water plan should be done independent of any initiative for economic development slush fund money.
- We get what we are willing to pay for ... sometimes, we need to help people understand the cost of our community infrastructure. There are some who would be willing to have their property taxes go up in order to help pay for things.
- We can't have low taxes and significant public investment at the same time – property tax increases will be needed.
- Taxes need to be raised to accomplish the Plan.
- I support increasing our available funding by raising taxes.
- Additional funding will be required via progressive taxation.
- I don't mind paying higher taxes for bike paths, park and recreation improvements.
- Additional revenues will be needed to pay for infrastructure construction/maintenance.
- We need additional funding strategies to be included in the Plan. The gap is huge and no solutions are proposed in the Plan.
- I don't agree with a common sense approach that is limited to less regulation and low taxes.
- We must raise taxes in order to help close the gap between needs/wants and our revenue forecast.
- It is not possible to close the \$9 billion gap if the city and county are not willing to raise local taxes.
- It will be very hard to achieve our vision with low taxation. We may need to gauge how much we could raise taxes to get more money.
- I would pay more taxes if necessary to make this happen .



- I'm willing to provide more in property & sales taxes to help close the gap.
- I am willing to pay additional taxes to improve our community infrastructure (2).
- Have these public infrastructure issues been caused by a change in the taxing structure, or due to changes in the state and federal taxing system? Before our public infrastructure issues can be resolved, there needs to be a change in our culture of taxation – the wealthy need to pay more.

Incentives:

- The City needs to stop providing incentives to private developers.
- Don't pay companies to come to Wichita, or give them big tax breaks.
- The community should not be responsible for assuming the debt of businesses who leave the community.
- Targeted tax breaks smack of pay-offs and favoritism – level playing field is needed for all.
- Small businesses are the backbone of our community, but get no support other than the crazy Kansas income tax break. Big businesses get TIF support from the City, and the forecasted jobs don't always pan out.
- Look for opportunities to consolidate and redefine local government. Stay out of direct development and avoid picking winners and losers. Work with the local development community on a fair basis.
- Use public investments, not incentives, to promote green job growth, combat poverty and reduce unemployment.
- No corporate welfare investments.

Funding Priorities:

- Rather than trying to accomplish all three of the investment priorities, we should invest as much as is needed into the first priority and then move on to the others once that priority area is finished.
- Strongly agree that the first priority is to maintain and replace what we have.
- The 3rd investment priority of expanding our current system of infrastructure and facility assets should be the 2nd priority.
- I strongly endorse the fundamentals of maintaining our current infrastructure and yet adding to our assets to support new growth.
- Fund the CIP program.
- Fix what we already have.
- Don't defer maintenance and upkeep of streets, bridges, water and sewer lines (2).
- Maintaining and enhancing our existing infrastructure are the two most important priorities.
- I'm willing to pay more taxes for public transit, water supply and public health.
- I support the Plan emphasis on safety, quality of life and long-term water investments.
- Need to make investments that will keep our college students in Wichita.
- An infrastructure maintenance fund is needed. If a certain percentage of each project is set aside, then we would have the funds for upkeep. It is sad to see our investments falling apart because of a lack of maintenance (for example, bridge rails rusting that need to be replaced but could have been kept if maintained with regular painting).

Miscellaneous:

- Provide micro loans to local entrepreneurs to help create decent-paying jobs within Wichita.
- The payoff from private-public partnerships is often worth it – we need to partner with private entities to continue to redevelop downtown to support the trend among our young people for urban living.



- The payoff from private-public partnerships is often worth it – we need to partner with private entities to continue to redevelop downtown to support the trend among our young people for urban living.
- Public retirement pension plans put a strain on our city budget.
- If we grow our population and employment as projected, then we should be able to increase our forecasted revenues to help finance our future.
- Utilizing alternate energy sources (solar, wind) could reduce some of the City's costs.
- More energy efficient public buildings would lower costs and help the community.
- Public facilities should be built to LEED Platinum standards to spur the creation of ecologically sustainable building practices locally.
- What happens to capital projects that get deferred for several years?
- We need openness and accountability in the expenditure of public funds ... private contracting or internal competition may be better.
- The City needs to have greater transparency in funding public improvements.
- We can't let big money interests dictate our means of financing.

Transportation

Transit-yes

- A strong transit plan is needed.
- A dedicated funding source is needed for public transit.
- Public transit needs to be linked to roads and bridges infrastructure issues. More people who use public transit will reduce the number of vehicles on the roadway. Increased vehicular traffic increases the costs to maintain our road/bridge infrastructure and increases the need for more roads and bridges.
- Expand and enhance public transit service (e.g. to support night shift workers).
- Wichita needs to expand public transportation service hours and routes. A vibrant city provides public transportation for its residents and visitors.
- Young people want public transit ... that should be a focus.
- We need better city transit buses.
- Public transit will help the local economy and quality of life if it is a good enough that I don't need a car.
- Transit should be a higher priority than proposed in the Plan (6).
- There needs to be a higher emphasis on public transit.
- Public transit needs to be a higher priority for the core areas of Wichita ... transit is a quality of life issue (2).
- Public transit should be a medium priority rather than a low-medium priority (2).
- Public transit investments should be a medium-high priority (3).
- Public transit should have a high-medium priority.
- Investments in public transit should be a high priority (4).
- Public transit should be a very high priority (5).
- Public transportation is so important and we need a change management & marketing program to reinvent MTA and improve public perception.



Transit-no

- Public transit is nice to have but it shouldn't be subsidized by our community to support just 5% of our population. Other alternatives need to be explored including private transit options.
- The public transit cost to serve such a small percentage of our population is not cost-effective nor affordable. At a lesser cost, we could provide free cab fare for the few public transit users.
- We can't afford a public transit system if we can't afford to maintain our local streets.
- Public transit should be a low priority.
- Investment in transit should be a very low priority (2).

Local streets

- The Plan does not specifically address the City's dirt streets and the negative health impacts associated with associated dust emissions (3). USEPA Region 7 states that clean air for our children is a major concern that we need to address.
- Upgrading the dirt streets in our City needs to be a high priority.
- There are also sections of Douglas that need repair – some of our local residential streets are also in great need of repair.
- We have over 100 miles of dirt roads which create dust and health problems. What are the priorities in the Plan to address these problems?
- Local roads and bridges should be a medium priority.
- Local streets are a high investment priority.
- Local roads and bridges are a high priority rather than a very high priority.

Bike/Ped

- Bicycle and pedestrian improvements can be considered quality of life improvements.
- Bicycle and pedestrian improvements are much cheaper than the cost of freeway expansion, and they help improve health and air quality.
- More money and higher priority is needed for maintenance of our bike and pedestrian infrastructure (5).
- Greater investment is needed in constructing and maintaining bike/ped infrastructure.
- Bicycle and pedestrian projects need to be a medium priority transportation investment.
- The Plan needs more emphasis on improving active forms of transportation - sidewalks and hike/bike trails (2).

Bypasses/Freeways

- The NW Bypass is not needed.
- Bypasses and freeways are a low priority.
- Long-term investments in bypasses and freeway expansion should be a higher priority (2).
- Bypasses and freeway expansions should be a medium-high priority.

Miscellaneous

- We need to plan for a rail overpass at 21st St. North and Broadway.
- The Plan needs to address technology impacts ... high-speed fiber optic has given communities a huge return.
- The Plan needs to support continued enhancements on the west side of the City ... supporting infrastructure and facilities (libraries and public transit) has not kept up with this growth.



Water, Sewer and Stormwater

- We need to repair and maintain our water infrastructure investments in conjunction with water conservation and the development of alternate future water sources.
- Water reuse should be an important part of securing a long-term water supply.
- Need practical, low cost water sources– sewer effluent is a possible source (just need education).
- Water, sewer and stormwater needs should be a high priority rather than a very high priority.
- Saying that long-term water supply investments are a very high priority is fine, but it doesn't address how it will be accomplished. The ASR project is essentially throwing good money after bad.

Arts, Culture and Recreation

- Quality of life investments should be a low priority (2).
- All quality of life improvements categories are not of equal importance ... this single category is too broad.
- Quality of life improvements can't all be libraries, art exhibits or museums ... that's not realistic for our community.
- This community must support policies and actions that improve the quality of life for young and old alike.
- Quality of community life is an important factor young people consider in deciding where to live.
- Quality of life improvements (e.g. Zoo, Exploration Place) are key to attracting new move-ins according to real estate data. We need to fund these improvements if we are to be competitive with other cities.
- Quantity doesn't equal quality when it comes to quality of life improvements.
- Quality of life investments should be more of a 'low-medium' or 'medium' priority.
- Quality of life should be a high or very high priority (2)
- Investment in quality of life is a very high priority (5).
- Long-term quality of life improvements should be a very high priority, which includes public transit (especially for low-wage earners).
- Arts, culture and recreation should be the highest priority along with public safety and water, sewer and stormwater.
- We also need to replace the McAdams and Edgemoor public pools.
- Greater investment is needed in bike/walking paths in Grove/Dr. Glen Dey Park.
- A new downtown library is nice but not a priority given our budget issues.
- I strongly support building a new downtown library.
- A new central library is an important priority.
- We need locally-based and properly maintained "free" recreation buildings for the benefit of our school-aged children.
- Closing the neighborhood city hall eliminates connections between the core area neighborhoods and the City.
- The Plan does not address the future development of County parks.
- Higher priority needed for park maintenance.



Public Safety

- The payoff from private-public partnerships is often worth it – we need to partner with private entities to continue to redevelop downtown to support the trend among our young people for urban living.
- Provide more equipment for first responders.
- Maintaining public safety services is a high priority but expanding them should be a low priority.
- More fire, police and EMS facilities doesn't equal better facilities or service.
- Public safety infrastructure is strong and in good shape ... not a top priority
- Expanding our public safety services facilities doesn't automatically result in better service.
- Without public health services (aging, physical/mental health, addiction treatment, family crisis, etc.), there will be increased loads placed upon local law enforcement. Public health needs to guide the Plan discussion.
- Utilize smaller fire vehicles on emergency response runs.

General/Overall Comments

- The proposed Plan is “on-target” ... thank you.
- Good Plan (2)
- The Plan is very comprehensive and clear.
- The Plan is very convincing and high-level in its approach.
- The Plan is well constructed with a long-term focus.
- Solid Plan approach to current conditions.
- Great and important work!
- Excellent presentation (3)
- Thank you for a great view of our city's future potential. The Plan provides an excellent base for our future.
- Good work on the Plan (2).
- Plan is very well developed.
- The draft Plan looks good (2).
- Thank you for the proactive approach.
- Staff is to be commended for their good work.
- It's good to have a long-term plan.
- Draw a sharper distinction between this Plan and economic development efforts of Wichita and Sedgwick County.
- There were not enough details in the presentation to make any kind of assessment of this plan.
- Plan reflects a lot of hard work, but other than a guidance document, it doesn't solve the issues.
- The Plan appears to be largely a city effort focused largely on Wichita.
- More emphasis should be put on creating the decision-making framework – it would eliminate radical approvals and disapprovals.
- The Plan seems to be headed in the right direction – I have question about the 'how to make it happen' part (2)



- Andover is part of our urban area and should be included in this plan even if it is in another county.
- The Plan needs to better address the needs/impacts of the aging of our population and the growing % of our total population that it represents.
- Why is it that some businesses can water their grass while other residents are not allowed to?
- The river bank areas in Riverside Park need cleaning.
- Public funds should be diverted from the Zoo for elephants and given to help our schools. Most of the magnet schools are in bad areas of town.
- Need to provide for ongoing community awareness throughout the life of the Plan.
- A key for success is finding a way of working together for our great city and not getting caught up in meaningless bi-partisan mindsets and bickering.
- Neighborhood input is important to help shape this Plan
- Decide whether the Arkansas River is an asset or liability, and treat it as such.
- The Plan needs to emphasize connecting greenspaces and protecting our environmental resources – very important to the livability and economic viability of our community.
- City employees should be required to live within the City.
- Provide adequate housing and support to our homeless population.
- Need to ensure that the city and county are committed to implementing this Plan and making adjustments as necessary.
- The devil is in the details which this presentation does not get into.
- Like the long-term checks and balances in the plan implementation piece.
- Need more communication between the City and its citizens, especially more public input at the City Council and DAB meetings.
- Age discrimination exists in all employment sectors for those over age 50.
- Use common sense and listen to all sides of the issues.
- Instead of using the words “community investments”, you should call it what it is “taxes and spending”.
- Use common sense and listen to all sides of the issues.
- Instead of using the words “community investments”, you should call it what it is “taxes and spending”.
- The Community Investments Plan is somewhat flawed in that it must depend on a strategy being in place that will make Wichita more competitive in the region, and on adjusting our tax rates to implement the Plan.
- Spending to retain and attract new jobs and taxpayers is essential. We cannot continue to defer projects to another time when things are better. Wichita/Sedgwick County must become more competitive in the region.
- Youth employment programs are needed to help rebuild and develop new infrastructure.
- Spiritual resources and compassionate service is slowly fading from our community.
- Taxing marijuana will help fill our revenue gaps.
- A strong school system will be key to our economic prosperity and development.



Appendix - Plan Adoption and Amendments

**CERTIFICATION OF ADOPTION OF
THE
WICHITA-SEDGWICK COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

I, Dale Miller, Director of the Metropolitan Area Planning Department, and Secretary for the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, hereby certify that the attached *Community Investments Plan 2015-2035* is a true and correct copy of the new Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan adopted by the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission on November 19, 2015.


Dale Miller, Director
Metropolitan Area Planning Department



RESOLUTION

WICHITA-SEDGWICK COUNTY METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

WHEREAS, pursuant to the authority granted by the statutes of the State of Kansas, in K.S.A. 12-747 et seq., the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission developed a Comprehensive Plan, adopted by the City of Wichita and Sedgwick County in 1993, and amended in 1996, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011; and

WHEREAS, the Comprehensive Plan may be amended or a new Comprehensive Plan adopted to ensure it reflects timely and relevant information and the needs of the community; and

WHEREAS, before the adoption of any Comprehensive Plan or amendment thereto, the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission is required by K.S.A. 12-747 et seq. to hold a public hearing; and

WHEREAS, the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission did give due and proper notice by publication in the official City and County newspapers on July 30, 2015, of a public hearing to be held to consider the adoption of a new Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, on August 20, 2015, did hold a public hearing at which a quorum was present, did hear all comments and testimony relating to said adoption of a new Comprehensive Plan, and voted to adopt the Community Investments Plan 2015-2035 as the new Comprehensive Plan;

WHEREAS, the Sedgwick County Board of County Commissioners, on November 4, 2015, returned the Community Investments Plan 2015-2035, dated August 20, 2015, to the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission for further consideration, together with a statement specifying the basis for the governing body's failure to approve;

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Wichita, on November 10, 2015, returned the Community Investments Plan 2015-2035, dated August 20, 2015, to the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission for further consideration, together with a statement specifying the basis for the governing body's failure to approve;


WHEREAS, the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, on November 19, 2015, gave further consideration to the Community Investments Plan 2015-2035, dated August 20, 2015, and voted 10-3 to amend the Community Investments Plan 2015-2035, dated August 20, 2015, as outlined herein as Attachment "A";

NOW, BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission duly assembled, hereby adopts the Community Investments Plan 2015-2035, dated November 19, 2015, and attached herein as Attachment "B", as the new Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan, and also adopts those neighborhood and area plans itemized on Attachment "C" as elements of the Community Investments Plan 2015-2035, dated November 19, 2015.




BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that notice of this action be transmitted to the City Council of the City of Wichita and to the Sedgwick County Board of County Commissioners for their consideration and adoption.

ADOPTED at Wichita, Kansas, this 19th day of November, 2015.



Carol C. Neugent, Chair
Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area
Planning Commission



Dale Miller, Secretary
Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area
Planning Commission

Approved as to Form:



Jennifer Magana, Director of Law
City of Wichita



ATTACHMENT "A"

The following amendments to the Community Investments Plan 2015-2035, dated August 20, 2015, are included in the duly adopted Community Investments Plan 2015-2035, dated November 19, 2015:

Plan page 17. Add the following additional text (identified below with italics) to the first sentence of the introductory paragraph located in the left-hand column of the page:

The purpose of the Future Land Use Policies is to encourage orderly growth that meets future market demand while considering impacts to taxpayers, developers, the environment, and the community as a whole *while protecting individual property rights.*

Plan page 29. Add the following new Funding and Financing Strategy C statement (identified below with italics) under Goal 2 – Maintain a responsible and appropriate taxing level to address our community’s needs.

C. In 1985, Sedgwick County voters approved a countywide one-cent sales tax to help maintain or construct road projects as well as reduce property tax. The one-cent sales tax revenue distribution formula is determined by statute and is based on local jurisdiction property tax mill levy rates as well as population.

Plan page 30. Add the following new sentence (identified below with italics) at the end of the last sentence of the second paragraph located in the right-hand column of the page:

Opportunities for alternate, innovative solutions must be pursued.

Plan page 30. Reverse the listing of transportation investment priorities for Wichita as contained in the third paragraph located in the right-hand column of the page, from highest priority to lowest priority as follows (indicated below with italics):

*Very high priority – local streets and bridges
Medium-high priority – public transit
Low-medium priority – freeway enhancements
Low priority – new bypasses*

Plan page 30. Following the third paragraph located in the right-hand column of the page, add the following new paragraph of text (indicated below with italics) listing the transportation investment priorities for Sedgwick County:

*For Sedgwick County, the level of investment priority over the next 20 years varies across the major transportation infrastructure categories as follows:
Very high priority – local streets and bridges
Medium-high priority – freeway enhancements
Medium priority – new bypasses
Low priority – public transit*

Plan page 31. In Transportation Strategy B statement listed in the left-hand column of the page, delete “public” (indicated below with a strikethrough) from the Strategy wording as follows:

B. Develop and implement a long-term ~~public~~ transit system plan that reflects the needs of our community.



Plan page 33. In the Arts, Culture and Recreation Goal 1 statement listed in the left-hand column of the page, delete the word “premier” (indicated below a strikethrough) from the Strategy wording as follows:

Goal 1 – Improve quality of life and healthy lifestyles for all through an accessible system of ~~premier~~ arts, culture, library, recreation and open space facilities.

Plan page 33. In the Arts, Culture and Recreation Strategy G statement listed in the right-hand column of the page, delete the words “Establish a task force to” (indicated below with a strikethrough) from the Strategy statement as follows:

- G. ~~Establish a task force to~~ Identify opportunity areas and regulatory adjustments necessary to support agritourism in the unincorporated areas of Sedgwick County.



ATTACHMENT "B"

The Community Investments Plan 2015-2035, dated November 19, 2015, is incorporated herein by reference.



ATTACHMENT "C"

The following Neighborhood and Area Plans and amendments thereto are hereby adopted as elements of the Community Investments Plan 2015-2035, dated November 19, 2015:

	Adopted by <u>Wichita City Council</u>	Adopted by Sedgwick County Board of <u>Commissioners</u>
Center City Neighborhood Revitalization Plan	February 15, 2000 Ord. No. 44-495	February 9, 2000 Res. No. 19-00
Hilltop Neighborhood Revitalization Plan	August 22, 2000 Ord. No. 44-701	August 16, 2000 Res. No. 143-00
Delano Neighborhood Revitalization Plan	March 20, 2001 Ord. No. 44-896	March 7, 2001 Res. No. 35-01
Oaklawn/Sunview Neighborhood Revitalization Plan	April 9, 2002 Ord. No. 45-299	March 20, 2002 Res. No. 37-02
South Wichita-Haysville Area Plan	April 2, 2002 Ord. No. 45-248	March 20, 2002 Res. No. 36-02
McAdams Neighborhood Plan	June 3, 2003 Ord. No. 45-726	May 14, 2003 Res. No. 114-03
Midtown Neighborhood Revitalization Plan	May 18, 2004 Ord. No. 46-179	May 19, 2004 Res. No. 87-04
21 st Street North Corridor Revitalization Plan	January 4, 2005 Ord. No. 46-434	December 22, 2004 Res. No. 233-04
Urban Fringe Development Standards for Wichita and Sedgwick County	December 14, 2004 Endorsed	December 15, 2004 Endorsed
Central Northeast Area Plan Update	September 22, 2005 Ord. No. 46-657	September 14, 2005 Res. No. 158-05
South Central Neighborhood Plan	May 16, 2006 Ord. No. 47-033	May 10, 2006 Res. No. 72-06
K-96 Corridor Economic Development Plan	November 21, 2006 Ord. No. 47-304	November 15, 2006 Res. No. 166-06
47 th to 55 th Street South Joint Area Plan	June 17, 2008 Ord. No. 47-914	June 18, 2008 Res. No. 94-08
Wichita Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan	January 6, 2009 Ord. No. 48-153	December 17, 2008 Res. No. 192-08
Derby-Mulvane Joint Area Plan	September 21, 2010 Ord. No. 48-832	September 8, 2010 Res. No. 155-10
Project Downtown - The Master Plan for Wichita	December 14, 2010 Ord. No. 48-919	February 23, 2011 Res. No. 29-11



OCA150004 BID #37529-009 CID #76383

PUBLISHED IN THE WICHITA EAGLE ON December 18, 2015
ORDINANCE NO. 50129

AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING THE COMMUNITY INVESTMENTS PLAN 2015-2035, DATED NOVEMBER 19, 2015, AS THE NEW WICHITA-SEDGWICK COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

WHEREAS, pursuant to the authority granted by the statutes of the State of Kansas, in K.S.A. 12-47 *et seq.*, the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission developed a Comprehensive Plan, adopted by the City of Wichita and Sedgwick County in 1993, and amended in 1996, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011; and

WHEREAS, the Comprehensive Plan may be amended or a new Comprehensive Plan developed and adopted to ensure it reflects timely and relevant information and the needs of the community; and

WHEREAS, the City of Wichita and Sedgwick County in collaboration with the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, did initiate the development of a new Comprehensive Plan in 2011; and

WHEREAS, before the adoption of any Comprehensive Plan or amendment thereto, the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission is required by K.S.A. 12-747 *et seq.* to hold a public hearing; and

WHEREAS, the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission did give notice by publication in the official City and County newspaper on July 30, 2015, of a public hearing to consider the adoption of a new Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, on August 10, 2015, did hold a public hearing at which a quorum was present, did hear all comments and testimony relating to said adoption of a new Comprehensive Plan, and voted to adopt the Community Investments Plan 2015-2035 as the new Comprehensive Plan;

WHEREAS, the Sedgwick County Board of County Commissioners, on November 4, 2015, returned the Community Investments Plan 2015-2035, dated August 20, 2015, to the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission for further consideration, together with a statement specifying the basis for the governing body's failure to approve;

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Wichita, on November 10, 2015, returned the Community Investments Plan 2015-2035, dated August 20, 2015, to the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission for further consideration, together with a statement specifying the basis for the governing body's failure to approve;

WHEREAS, the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, on November 19, 2015, gave further consideration to the Community Investments Plan 2015-2035, dated August 20, 2015, and voted (10-3) to amend the Community Investments Plan 2015-2035, dated August 20, 2015, as outlined in Attachment "A" of the Resolution of Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission dated November 19, 2015; and



WHEREAS, the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, on November 19, 2015, did approve a Resolution adopting the *Community Investments Plan 2015-2035*, dated November 19, 2015, as the new Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan, and also adopting those neighborhood and area plans itemized on Attachment "C" of said Resolution as elements of the *Community Investments Plan 2015-2035*, dated November 19, 2015, which Resolution has been submitted to the Wichita City Council and the Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County for consideration.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE CITY OF WICHITA, KANSAS:

SECTION 1. The City of Wichita hereby approves the *Community Investments Plan 2015-2035*, dated November 19, 2015, as the new Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan, including those neighborhood and area plans itemized on Attachment "C" to the Resolution of the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission dated November 19, 2015.

SECTION 2. Notice of this action shall be transmitted to the Sedgwick County Board of County Commissioners and to all other taxing subdivisions in the planning area that request a copy of the plan.

SECTION 3. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after this adoption by the Governing Body and publication in the official City newspaper.

ADOPTED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE CITY OF WICHITA, KANSAS, this date

December 15, 2015.



Jeff Longwell, Mayor

ATTEST:


Karen Sublett, City Clerk



Approved as to form:


Jennifer Magana, City Attorney and Director of Law



(150004) Published in the Wichita Eagle on January 28, 2016

RESOLUTION NO. 008-2016

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE COMMUNITY INVESTMENTS PLAN 2015-2035, DATED NOVEMBER 19, 2015, AS THE NEW WICHITA-SEDGWICK COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

WHEREAS, pursuant to the authority granted by the statutes of the State of Kansas, in K.S.A. 12-747 *et seq.*, the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission developed a Comprehensive Plan, adopted by the City of Wichita and Sedgwick County in 1993, and amended in 1996, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011; and

WHEREAS, the Comprehensive Plan may be amended or a new Comprehensive Plan developed and adopted to ensure it reflects timely and relevant information and the needs of the community; and

WHEREAS, the City of Wichita and Sedgwick County in collaboration with the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, did initiate the development of a new Comprehensive Plan in 2011; and

WHEREAS, before the adoption of any Comprehensive Plan or amendment thereto, the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission is required by K.S.A. 12-747 *et seq.* to hold a public hearing; and

WHEREAS, the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission did give notice by publication in the official City and County newspaper on July 30, 2015, of a public hearing to consider the adoption of a new Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, on August 20, 2015, did hold a public hearing at which a quorum was present, did hear all comments and testimony relating to said adoption of a new Comprehensive Plan, and voted to adopt the Community Investments Plan 2015-2035 as the new Comprehensive Plan;

WHEREAS, the Sedgwick County Board of County Commissioners, on November 4, 2015, returned the Community Investments Plan 2015-2035; dated August 20, 2015, to the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission for further consideration, together with a statement specifying the basis for the governing body's failure to approve;

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Wichita, on November 10, 2015, returned the Community Investments Plan 2015-2035, dated August 20, 2015, to the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission for further consideration, together with a statement specifying the basis for the governing body's failure to approve;



WHEREAS, the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, on November 19, 2015, gave further consideration to the Community Investments Plan 2015-2035, dated August 20, 2015, and voted (10-3) to amend the Community Investments Plan 2015-2035, dated August 20, 2015, as outlined in Attachment "A" of the Resolution of Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission dated November 19, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, on November 19, 2015, did approve a Resolution adopting the *Community Investments Plan 2015-2035*, dated November 19, 2015, as the new Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan, and also adopting those neighborhood and area plans itemized on Attachment "C" of said Resolution as elements of the *Community Investments Plan 2015-2035*, dated November 19, 2015, which Resolution has been submitted to the Wichita City Council and the Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County for consideration.

NOW, BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF SEDGWICK COUNTY, KANSAS:

SECTION I. That after receiving a recommendation from the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, and after said Planning Commission has given proper notice and held a public hearing as provided by law, under the authority granted in K.S.A. 12-747 *et seq.*, the Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County hereby approves the Community Investments Plan 2015-2035, dated November 19, 2015, as the new Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan, including those neighborhood and area plans itemized on Attachment "C" to the Resolution of the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission dated November 19, 2015.

SECTION II. Notice of this action shall be transmitted to the Wichita City Council, and to all other taxing subdivisions in the planning area which request a copy of the plan.

SECTION III. This resolution shall become effective upon its passage and publication once in the Official County Newspaper.

Commissioners present and voting were:

DAVID M. UNRUH	Aye
TIM R. NORTON	Aye
KARL PETERJOHN	Aye
RICHARD RANZAU	Aye
JAMES M. HOWELL	Aye

Dated this 20th day of January, 2016.





BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF SEDGWICK COUNTY, KANSAS

ATTEST:



KELLY B. ARNOLD, County Clerk





JAMES M. HOWELL, Chairman
Commissioner, Fifth District



RICHARD RANZAU, Chair Pro Tem
Commissioner, Fourth District

APPROVED AS TO FORM:


ERIC R. YOST, ESQ.
County Counselor


DAVID M. UNRUH
Commissioner, First District


TIM R. NORTON
Commissioner, Second District


KARL PETERJOHN
Commissioner, Third District

**CERTIFICATION OF AMENDMENT
TO THE
WICHITA-SEDGWICK COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

I, Dale Miller, Director of the Metropolitan Area Planning Department, and Secretary for the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, hereby certify that the attached amendment to the Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan is a true and correct copy of the amendment approved by the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission on June 22, 2017.



Dale Miller, Director of the
Metropolitan Area Planning Department



RESOLUTION

**WICHITA-SEDGWICK COUNTY METROPOLITAN AREA
PLANNING COMMISSION**

WHEREAS, pursuant to the authority granted by the statutes of the State of Kansas, in K.S.A. 12-747 et seq., the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission developed a Comprehensive Plan, adopted by the City of Wichita and Sedgwick County in 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Comprehensive Plan may be amended as needed to ensure it reflects timely and relevant information and the needs of the community; and

WHEREAS, before the adoption of any Comprehensive Plan or amendment thereto, the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission is required by K.S.A. 12-747 et seq. to hold a public hearing; and

WHEREAS, the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission did give due and proper notice by publication in the official City and County newspapers on May 17, 2017, of a public hearing to be held on the adoption of certain amendments to the Comprehensive Plan (hereafter referred to as the "Amendments"); and

WHEREAS, the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, on June 8, 2017, did hold a public hearing at which a quorum was present, continued said hearing to June 22, 2017, and did hear all comments and testimony relating to said Amendments;

NOW, BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission duly assembled, hereby adopts the proposed Amendments dated June 2017, attached herein as Attachment "A", as an official amendment to the Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that notice of this action be transmitted to the City Council of the City of Wichita and to the Sedgwick County Board of County Commissioners for their consideration and adoption.

ADOPTED at Wichita, Kansas, this 22nd day of June 2017.




David W. Foster, Chairman
Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area
Planning Commission



Dale Miller, Secretary
Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area
Planning Commission

Approved as to Form:



Justin M. Waggoner, Assistant County Counselor



RESOLUTION NO. 128-2017

Published on: 7-26-17

A RESOLUTION APPROVING CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE
WICHITA-SEDGWICK COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

WHEREAS, pursuant to K.S.A. 12-747 et seq., the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission is authorized to make and amend a Comprehensive Plan subject to the approval of the governing bodies of the City of Wichita, Kansas (the "City") and Sedgwick County, Kansas (the "County"); and

WHEREAS, the City and the County have heretofore adopted in 2015 such a plan entitled, "Community Investments Plan ...a framework for the future, 2015-2035" (the "Plan"); and

WHEREAS, the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission did give due and proper notice in writing and by publication as required by law and did hold a public hearing on the adoption of certain proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, on June 22, 2017, the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission by resolution adopted the "Amendments" as part of the Plan, and recommend that the City and County approve the same.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF SEDGWICK COUNTY, KANSAS:

SECTION I. The Amendments adopted by the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission on June 22, 2017 are hereby approved for inclusion into the Plan as follows:

- a). Replace **2035 Urban Growth Areas Map** contained on pg. 19 of "Community Investments Plan ...a framework for the future, 2015-2035" with the revised **2035 Urban Growth Areas Map** and accompanying text identified as Attachment "A" to the Resolution of the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Commission dated June 22, 2017.

SECTION II. This resolution shall become effective upon its passage and its adoption and publication once in the Official County Newspaper.

SCANNED

JUL 20 2017



Commissioners present and voting were:

DAVID M. UNRUH	<u>Aye</u>
MICHAEL B. O'DONNELL, II	<u>Aye</u>
DAVID T. DENNIS	<u>Aye</u>
RICHARD RANZAU	<u>No</u>
JAMES M. HOWELL	<u>Aye</u>

Dated this 19th day of July, 2017.


BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF SEDGWICK COUNTY, KANSAS

ATTEST:



KELLY B. ARNOLD, County Clerk





DAVID M. UNRUH, Chairman
Commissioner, First District



MICHAEL B. O'DONNELL, II,
Chair Pro Tem
Commissioner, Second District

APPROVED AS TO FORM:


Justin M. Waggoner
Assistant County Counselor


DAVID T. DENNIS
Commissioner, Third District


RICHARD RANZAU
Commissioner, Fourth District


JAMES M. HOWELL
Commissioner, Fifth District

Appendix C

Sedgwick County Debris Management Plan

This page intentionally left blank.

SEDGWICK COUNTY DEBRIS MANAGEMENT PLAN

Approved:

November 8, 2017

File No. 17-836

Created by:

Sedgwick County Emergency Management

And

Sedgwick County Public Works

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	TITLE	PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Purpose	1
	Scope	1
	Enforcement	1
II.	STAFF ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	1
	Debris Project Manager (DPM)	2
	Operations	2
	Planning	2
	Finance & Administration	3
	Administration	3
	Contracts & Procurement	3
	Legal	4
	Public Information	4
	Operational Safety Officer	4
	Support Staff	5
	Staff Organizational Chart	5
	Suggested Personnel	6
	Training Schedule	6
	Estimating Staff, Procedures, and Assignments	6
III.	SITUATION AND ASSUMPTIONS	6
	Types of Disaster Events	7
	Disaster Debris Streams	8
	Forecasted Debris Types	9
	Forecast Methods	12
IV.	DEBRIS COLLECTION PLAN	15
	Eligible Debris	15
	Ineligible Debris	15
	Response Operations	15
	Recovery Operations	16
	Collecting Hazardous Waste and White Goods	17
	Hazardous Stump Removal	17
	Putrescent Waste Removal	18
	Recycling of Debris	18
V.	DEBRIS MANAGEMENT SITES	19
	Environmental Requirements	20
	Permits	21
	Site Design and Preparation	21
	Operational Boundaries	22
	Traffic Patterns	22
	Site Management	22
	Monitoring Debris Removal	23
	Methods of Material Reduction	26
	Site Closure	27
VI.	CONTRACTED SERVICES	27
	Emergency Contracting & Procurement Procedures	28
	Lump Sum Contract	28
	Unit Price Contract	28
	Time & Materials	28
	General Contract Provisions	29
	Contract Scope of Work	30
	Contract Limitations	31
	Procurement Policy	31
	Additional Contract Requirements	31
	Scope of Work for On-Call Debris Removal	31
VII.	PRIVATE PROPERTY DEMOLITION AND DEBRIS REMOVAL	32
VIII.	PUBLIC INFORMATION PLAN	33
IX.	PLAN MAINTENANCE	34
X.	ACRONYMS	34
XI.	DEFINITIONS	34
XII.	APPENDICES	36

I. Introduction

Purpose

Sedgwick County will adhere to this Debris Management Plan to respond to a natural or manmade debris-generating event. This plan is designed to identify agencies and activities that are involved in debris operations to ensure a coordinated response for final disposition of debris generated in unincorporated areas of Sedgwick County.

Scope

This Debris Management Plan will serve as a support annex to the Sedgwick County Local Emergency Operations Plan (EOP). It provides organizational structure, guidance, and standardized guidelines for field operations in the clearance, removal, and disposal of debris caused by a major debris-generating event. This Plan shall apply to all County departments and agencies. All cities within the jurisdictional boundaries are included in this plan

The Plan is designed to assist Sedgwick County staff in implementing and coordinating the removal and disposal operations to maximize cleanup efficiencies. Expedient debris removal and disposal actions will mitigate the threat to the health, safety, and welfare of all Sedgwick County residents

Enforcement

Any person deviating from the provisions of this plan may be required, at the discretion of the County Manager of Sedgwick County, to submit in writing within five (5) calendar days, an explanation for such deviation. The written explanation will be forwarded to the County Manager's Office for final resolution if required. Be advised if a city chooses not to participate in this plan, it may not receive Federal assistance even if Federal assistance is granted to the County

II. Staff Roles and Responsibilities

Per the Sedgwick County LEOP, the Sedgwick County Public Works Department is responsible for coordinating debris removal and disposal where appropriate in the unincorporated areas of the county. Similarly, the Sedgwick County Environmental Resources Division will help coordinate all solid waste management for the county. For the incorporated areas, the cities are responsible for this coordination, with the county providing secondary support if needed and available. In emergency situations, where limited local resources may require centralized coordination and prioritization, Emergency Support Function #3 (Public Works and Engineering) in the county Emergency Operations Center (EOC) will assume this responsibility.

The size and composition of a staff organized to manage debris clearance, removal, and disposal issues depends on the magnitude of the disaster and number of available response personnel. Successful debris operations require collaborative efforts between departments within Sedgwick County and with specific external agencies that have regulatory authority over debris operations. Prospective staff members will

receive general training and practice interface with other agencies responsible for debris management operations.

Immediately following a disaster event, a disaster debris management team will be established to facilitate successful coordination. Team members will consist of personnel from multiple Sedgwick County Departments and Divisions including Public Works, Environmental Resources, Emergency Management, Legal, Finance, Clerks Office, as well as other departments and divisions as applicable. Because each member of the team is responsible for implementing portions of this debris management plan in accordance with the planning goals and objectives and in compliance with Federal, State, and local laws, a Debris Project Manager will be designated to serve as the primary coordinator for all operations.

The Debris Project Manager (DPM) – This position will serve as the primary decision-maker and Incident Commander for all operations and has the following responsibilities:

- Will be knowledgeable of all Sedgwick County process, procedures, personnel, resources, and limitations;
- Overall responsibility for the operations, planning, logistics, financial, and administrative components of the debris management operations;
- Assign tasks to team members and support personnel to track the completion of tasks to ensure the quick and safe implementation of the debris removal process;
- Will be in constant contact with the Sedgwick County EOC regarding operational progress and planning needs; and,
- Responsibility for activation and deactivation of debris management operations.

Operations – This function is responsible for the supervision of force account and contract resources and overall project implementation. This section is responsible for implementing the entire debris removal operation and will perform the following tasks:

- Position equipment and resources for the response and recovery debris removal operation;
- Develop staff schedules and strategies to ensure efficient and effective response;
- Provide communication, facilities, services, equipment, and materials to support the response and recovery activities;
- Monitor and direct Sedgwick County personnel and contract labor;
- Distribute response and recovery resources;
- Operate and manage the collection, debris management site, and disposal strategies;
- Create a demolition strategy for structures (if necessary); and,
- Report progress for distribution to the debris management planning staff.

Planning – This section supports all other debris management sections in a technical and planning role. This section also provides debris quantity assumptions, economic analysis, and feasible solutions for debris operations. The following tasks will be performed:

- Forecast debris volume based on disaster type;
- Develop an estimating strategy for post-disaster debris quantities;

- Strategize and map debris haul routes;
- Select debris management sites and design the site layout;
- Determine reduction and recycling means and methods when possible;
- Identify and coordinate environmental issues with Environmental Resources;
- Assess available disposal space and determine if additional space is needed;
- Develop the debris collection strategy, if required;
- Write contract scopes of work, conditions, and specifications, if needed;
- Coordinate with other local and State jurisdictions for road clearance and operations;
- Establish a process for building damage assessment and condemnation (including public and private properties); and,
- Request and/or issue permits.

Finance & Administration – This function typically includes finance, personnel, and legal issues. This section must establish a records management system in order to collect and keep all the documentation that may be required for Public Assistance grants.

Administration – This sub-function primarily documents all debris management activities, including, but not limited to the following:

- Personnel policies;
- Labor and equipment timesheets and summaries;
- Safety procedures;
- Contract procurement procedures;
- Contracts;
- Billing and invoices (including debris hauler load tickets);
- Contracts, licenses or permits;
- Rights of Entry and Hold Harmless agreements for private property debris removal and demolition (when applicable); and,
- Debris salvage and recycling value information when possible.

Contracting and Procurement – This sub-function maintains contracts in draft form ready for advertisement or have pre-qualified contractors (see Appendix N) in place prior to the event. This individual will follow all applicable Sedgwick County procurement policies in effect at the time of the disaster. Organizational elements for this section include, but are not limited to the following tasks:

- Develop contract requirements;
- Establish contractor qualifications;
- Distribution instructions to bidders;
- Advertise bids;
- Establish a pre-disaster list of pre-qualified contractors;
- Manage the contract scope of work; and,
- Establish a post-disaster contractor procedure (if necessary).

Legal – This sub-function leads the review process for all legal matters in the debris management planning process. The following tasks will also be performed by the legal unit:

- Review all contracts;
- Review and/or establish a land acquisition process for temporary debris management sites;

- Review all insurance policies;
- Ensure environmental and historic preservation compliance before, during, and after operations (function may be tasked to Sedgwick County Environmental Resources);
- Ensure that site restoration and closure requirements are fulfilled;
- Review and/or establish a building condemnation processes if deemed necessary;
- Review and/or establish a legal process for private property demolition and debris removal; and,
- Review right-of-entry and hold harmless agreements. (Attached)

Public Information – This section will distribute information and educate citizens about debris management operations. This function will report directly to the Debris Project Manager. Various types of information distribution will be used to distribute messages including, but not limited to the following:

- Debris disposal schedules;
- Disposal methods and ongoing actions to comply with Federal, State, and local environmental regulations;
- Disposal procedures for the public and independent contractors;
- Restrictions and penalties for creating illegal dumps;
- Public drop-off locations for all debris types; and/or,
- Process for answering the public's questions concerning debris removal.

Operational Safety Officer

The DPM will also assign personnel to monitor and report on the safety of all debris management operations. The responsibilities of this position include the following:


- Communicating timely information to the DPM and EOC regarding the safety status of the debris clearing, removal, and disposal operations;
- Coordinate with the DPM to assure the appropriate Responder Safety Training is provided;
- Ensure Sedgwick County Personnel follow all Kansas Department of Labor rules and regulations;
- Monitor contractor compliance with OSHA rules and regulations;
- Report and address any accidents or injuries that occur during operations;
- Coordinate with the DPM to assure that a site-specific Safety and Health Plan is created; and,
- Provide media relations information regarding safety concerns with the DPM and acting PIO.

Appendix D provides a detailed list of safety regulations and hazards that will impact debris management operations.

Support Staff

Support staff will be assigned as needed to functional and sub functional areas to ensure efficient and effective response. Assignments and supervision will follow the Incident Command System.

Staff Organizational Chart



Suggested Personnel

The following Sedgwick County personnel are recommendations to fill the command-level positions required for debris management operations:

Debris Project Manager: Public Works Director
Public Information Officer (PIO): Sedgwick County PIO
Safety Officer: Public Works Administrative Manager
Operations: Public Works Highway Superintendent
Planning: Public Works Deputy Director
Finance/Administration: Public Works Controller/Sedgwick County Purchasing

Additional personnel will be assigned as needed and available to relieve these positions and/or to expand operations to meet growing debris management needs.

Training Schedule

Sedgwick County Public Works personnel will be trained on this debris management plan in accordance with pre-established internal policies on training.

Estimating Staff, Procedures, and Assignments

During any required debris removal events, Sedgwick County Public Works personnel will be the first workers utilized as directed by the DPM. Crew assignments will be based upon event needs and will be diverted from routine public works operations as necessary and where needed. Outside contractors will be utilized to assist the local workforce as needed, primarily in the recovery period of debris management.

III. Situation and Assumptions

The Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (P.L. 93-28), as amended, authorizes the FEMA Public Assistance Program to award Federal funding to State and local governments, Federally recognized tribes, and eligible private non-profit organizations in order to assist them in their disaster response and recovery activities.

FEMA characterizes work eligible for Public Assistance grants as either emergency or permanent work. Debris management activities are grouped into Category A (Debris Removal) and Category B (Emergency Protective Measures). Debris management activities in these categories must meet all of the following:

- Be required as a result of the disaster event;
- Be located within a designated disaster area;
- Be the legal responsibility of the local government entity;
- Be in the public interest, which is defined as work necessary to meet the following:
 - Eliminate immediate threats to life, public health and safety;
 - Eliminate immediate threats of significant damage to improved public or private property;
 - Ensure economic recovery of the affected community to the benefit of the community-at-large; or
 - Mitigate the risk of life and property by removing substantially damaged structures and associate appurtenances as needed to convert property acquired through a FEMA hazard mitigation program to use compatible with open space, recreation, or wetlands management practices

- Be of a reasonable cost, which is defined as a cost, which in its nature does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstance prevailing at the time the decision was made to incur the cost.

For debris removal work, per FEMA's 2017 Public Assistance Debris Management Pilot Program, straight-time labor and overtime costs (including benefits) are eligible for permanent employees, reassigned employees, and seasonal employees (used during the season of anticipated employment).

Types of Disaster Events

Debris forecasting predicts the amount and type of debris prior to a disaster, whereas debris estimating quantifies the amount of debris after the disaster. By forecasting the type and quantity of debris, the planning section can better define the scope of work for the debris management operation prior to the event.

The following are general descriptions of natural and manmade disasters and the associated debris caused by each:

Tornadoes – Damage from tornadoes is caused by high-velocity rotating winds. The severity of the damage depends on the velocity of the tornado funnel and the length of time the funnel is on the ground; however, damage is generally confined to a narrow path, which can be up to one-half mile wide and from 100 yards to several miles long. Tornado debris consists primarily of vegetative debris, construction materials from damaged or destroyed structures, and personal property. Tornadoes are a medium probability, high vulnerability hazard in Sedgwick County.

Rainstorms, snow/ice storms, or reservoir failure can cause severe flooding floods – Damage to structures from flooding is caused either by precipitation inundation or high-velocity water flow. Flood debris may consist of sediment, wreckage, personal property, and sometimes-hazardous materials deposited on public and private property. Additionally, heavy rains and floods may produce stream bank calving. However, flash flooding is a High probability, High vulnerability event.

Winter Storms – Debris from ice storms or snowstorms consists of significant amounts of vegetative debris and overhead utility service components. Winter storms are a medium probability, medium vulnerability event in Sedgwick County.

Earthquakes – Seismic forces along fault lines generate shock waves that cause ground shaking and surface ruptures. Sedgwick County lies to the west of the Nemaha fault line that runs north-northeast through Oklahoma, Central Kansas, and Nebraska. Because of the location, Sedgwick County would only receive minor physical effects from an earthquake. This type of damage consists of property damage, structural building materials, concrete, and asphalt. This type of event is a low probability, medium vulnerability event in Sedgwick County.

Acts of Terrorism – Terrorism includes the unlawful use of force and violence against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population, or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social objectives. Since terrorism is regarded as a criminal act, it involves coordination with law enforcement authorities, the coroner's office, and health officials before debris is handled or disposed.

Debris generated as a result of an act of terrorism is highly variable in both quantity and type, depending upon the specific means utilized by the terrorists. An act of

terrorism could generate little to no debris at all, or could result in large quantities of multiple types of debris, potentially requiring highly specialized personnel, procedures, and equipment for its removal and disposal.

Disaster Debris Streams

Typically, disasters generate a mix of different types of debris. The following figure summarized the typical types of debris for each type of disaster.

		Typical Debris Streams								
		Vegetative	Construction & Demolition (C&D)	Personal Property/ Household Items	Hazardous Waste	Household Hazardous Waste	White Goods	Soil, Mud, and Sand	Vehicles	Putrescent
Types of Disasters	Tornadoes	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Floods	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Earthquakes		X	X		X	X	X		X
	Winter Storms	X				X				X
	Acts of Terrorism	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Forecasted Debris Types

Vegetative Debris – Consists of whole trees, tree stumps, tree branches, tree trunks, and other leafy material. Because of the large volume, vegetative debris should be reduced by mulching, grinding, or burning. Collections are typically based on the size of the vegetative material or by unit.

Hazardous Trees – Type of vegetative debris that is caused by the disaster, is an immediate threat to lives, public health, safety, or improved property, has a diameter breast height of six inches or greater and one or more of the following criteria are met:

- It has more than 50% of the crown damaged or destroy;
- It has a split trunk or broken branches that expose the heartwood;
- It has fallen or been uprooted within a public-use area, and/or

- It is leaning at an angle greater than 30 degrees.

Trees located on public rights-of-way and determined to be hazardous and that have less than 50% of the root-ball exposed will be cut flush at the ground level. This cut portion will then be included with regular vegetative debris. Grinding of the resulting stump after the tree has been cut flush at the ground is not eligible debris management work.

Straightening and bracing are allowable emergency protective measures if they eliminate an immediate threat to lives, public health, safety, or improved property and are less costly than removal and disposal of the hazardous tree.

The Applicant must provide all of the following documentation to support the eligibility of removing tree limbs, branches, stumps, or trees that are still in place:

- Specifics of the immediate threat with the U.S. National Grid (USNG) location and photograph or video documentation that establishes the item is on public property;
- Diameter of each item removed (measurement must be 2 feet up the trunk from the ground for stumps and 4.5 feet up for trees);
- Quantity of material to fill root-ball holes; and,
- Equipment used to perform the work.

Hazardous Limb (Hangers) – Type of vegetative debris that is eligible for removal if the limbs are:

- Located on improved property;
- Greater than two inches in diameter at the point of breakage; and,
- Still hanging in a tree and threatening a public-use area (e.g. trails, sidewalks, paths, etc.)

Only the minimum amount of work necessary is eligible for hazardous limb removal. Pruning, maintenance trimming, and landscaping are not eligible. If the canopy of a tree located on public property extends over a public right-of-way, removal of hazardous limbs on the tree that extend over are eligible.

Hazardous Tree Stumps – Type of vegetative debris eligible for debris removal if all the following criteria are met:

- It has 50% or more of the root-ball exposed;
- It is greater than 24" in diameter, measured 24" above the ground;
- It is on improved public property or a public right-of-way, and,
- It poses an immediate threat to life, and public health and safety.

Hazardous Stump Removal

A hazardous tree or stump may be collected individually, while downed or fallen debris is collected from rights-of-way or at a designated collection

center. Determining whether to remove a hazardous stump is difficult. FEMA has established criteria to assist in making these eligibility determinations, using objective information that can be collected in the field. A stump may be considered hazardous if the following criteria are met:

- 50% or more of the root-ball is exposed (less than 50% will be flush cut);
- Greater than 24" in diameter (as measured 24" above the ground);
- On improved property; and,
- Poses immediate threat to life, public health, and safety.

FEMA's Hazardous Stump Worksheet and Stump Conversion Table are included in Appendices A and B, respectively.

Construction and Demolition (C & D) Debris -- Consists of damaged components of buildings and structures such as lumber and wood, gypsum wallboard, glass, metal, roofing material, tile, carpeting and floor coverings, window coverings, pipe, concrete, fully cured asphalt, equipment, furnishings, and fixtures.

Certain types of construction and demolition debris are reusable or recyclable. To conserve landfill space, it is prudent to separate materials for reuse or recycling when feasible. Because some construction and demolition debris may be hazardous (ex: asbestos coated materials), environmental regulations and ordinances must be included during all operations. Full documentation of these materials including debris origin, any processing (reduction or recycling), and the final disposition must be noted.

Typically, removal of construction by-products generated by repairs or rebuilding is covered by insurance policies and therefore is not part of the debris management process.

Hazardous Waste – A type of debris with properties that make it potentially harmful to human health or the environment. Generally, this type of material exhibits at least one of the following characteristics: ignitability, corrosivity, reactivity, or toxicity. Debris management activities are allowed for measures that address widespread hazardous materials contamination.

Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) – A type of debris composed of hazardous products and materials that are used and disposed of by residential, rather than commercial or industrial consumers. HHW includes some paints, stains, varnishes, solvents, pesticides, and other products or materials containing volatile chemicals that catch fire, react, or explode under certain circumstances, or that are corrosive or toxic.

White Goods – A type of debris defined as discarded household appliances such as refrigerators, freezers, air conditioners, heat pumps, ovens, ranges, washing machines, clothes dryers, and water heaters. Many white goods contain ozone-depleting refrigerants, mercury, or compressor oils, which are prohibited by the Clean Air Act to be released into the atmosphere. Certified

technicians must extract these refrigerants before disposing or recycling the white goods.

Electronic Waste (E-Waste) – A type of debris composed of electronics that contain hazardous materials such as cathode ray tubes. Examples include computer monitors and televisions.

Soil and Mud – Floods often deposit soil and mud on improved public property and public rights-of-way. Facilities commonly impacted by this type of debris may include streets, sidewalks, storm and sanitary sewers, water treatment facilities, drainage basins, and swimming pools. This type of debris on public rights-of-way can be included in the debris management process; however, removal from streams, improved and unimproved property cannot be included. Regularly scheduled maintenance reports for improved public property and public rights-of-way will be kept that indicate pre-disaster soil, mud, and sand levels.

Vehicles – A type of debris that includes vehicles that have been moved from private property onto improved public property and public rights-of-way. To remove this type of debris, the following characteristics must be met:

- The vehicle or vessel presents a hazard or immediate threat that blocks ingress/egress in a public-use area;
- The vehicle is abandoned (e.g., the vehicle is not on the owner's property and the ownership is undetermined);
- Sedgwick County follows local ordinances and State law by securing ownership, and,
- Sedgwick County verified chain of custody, transport, and disposal of the vehicle.

Putrescent Materials – Type of debris that will decompose or rot, such as animal carcasses and other fleshy organic matter. The USDA's National Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) and the Kansas Department of Health and Environment have developed specific disposal guidelines for animal carcasses.

Infectious Waste – Type of debris capable of causing infections in humans, including contaminated animal waste, human blood and blood products, isolation waste, pathological waste, and discarded sharps (needles, scalpels, or broken medical instruments).

Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear-Contaminated Debris – Type of debris that has biological, chemical, radiological, or nuclear contamination. This type of debris usually would happen as a result of a Weapon of Mass Destruction (WMD) event. Eligibility for this type of debris removal will be made by FEMA based on applicable Federal statutes, regulations, policies, and other guidance documents.

Garbage (Household Waste) – Type of debris that is waste generated during non-disaster situations and regularly picked up through normal municipal waste collection methods. Common examples of garbage include food,

packaging, plastics, and papers. This type of debris is not eligible for debris management activities.

Forecast Methods

After the disaster parameters and geographic extent are established, specific debris volumes can be quantified by using historical information available through Sedgwick County Emergency Management & Homeland Security or the National Weather Service or by using forecasting models. If historical data is not available or insufficient, quantitative and qualitative forecasting models can be used to supplement the debris volume quantification.

Qualitative Forecasting

Qualitative forecasting will consist of “windshield tours” and “pass through” of the impacted portions of the unincorporated sections of Sedgwick County. The City’s may use this same method with assistance from the DPM. These actions will note the location, vegetative cover, and estimated percentage of area impacted. These estimates will be the basis of the overall debris forecast.

Quantitative Forecasting

The information gathered as part of the qualitative forecasting will be reported to Sedgwick County’s Geographic Information System (GIS) which will establish the number of habitable structures in the review area as well as land-use of the noted properties. Based on this information, the following estimations can be applied.

Buildings – Several basic techniques have been established to forecast destroyed building debris quantities. These techniques can be used to forecast debris quantities prior to an event or estimate quantities after an event.

Residential Buildings – A formula for estimating the debris quantities from a demolished single-family home and associated debris is as follows:

$$L \times W \times S \times 0.20 \times VCM = \text{_____ cubic yards of debris (cy)}$$

- L = Length of the building in feet
- W = Width of the building in feet
- S = Height of building in stories
- VCM = Vegetative Cover Multiplier Always use medium in our County 1.3 as a variable

The VCM is a measure of the amount of debris within a subdivision or neighborhood. The descriptions and multipliers are described as:

- Light (1.1 multiplier) includes new home developments where more ground is visible than trees. These areas will have a sparse canopy cover.

- Medium (1.3 multiplier) generally has a uniform pattern of open space and tree canopy cover. This is the most common description for vegetative cover.
- Heavy (1.5 multiplier) is found in mature neighborhoods and woodlots where the ground or houses cannot be seen due to the tree canopy cover.

The following table can be used to forecast debris quantities for totally destroyed single-family, single-story homes in the applicable vegetative cover category.

Typical House Size	Vegetative Cover Multiplier (cy)			
	None	Light (1.1)	Medium (1.3)	Heavy (1.5)
1000 ft ²	220	220	260	300
1200 ft ²	240	264	312	360
1400 ft ²	280	308	364	420
1600 ft ²	320	352	416	480
1800 ft ²	360	396	468	540
2000 ft ²	400	440	520	600
2200 ft ²	440	484	572	660
2400 ft ²	480	528	624	720
2600 ft ²	520	572	676	780

The amount of personal property within an average flooded single-family home has been found to be:

- 25-40 cy for homes without a basement
- 45-50 cy for homes with a basement

Mobile homes have less utilized space due to their construction and use. The walls are narrower, and the units contain more storage space. Therefore, the typical mobile home generates more debris by volume than a single-family home. Historically, the volume of debris from mobile homes can be found to be:

- 290 cy of debris for a single-wide mobile home
- 415 cy of debris for a double-wide mobile home

Outbuildings – All other buildings volumes may be calculated by using the following formulas:

$$(L \times W \times H \times .33)/27 = \text{cubic yards of debris}$$

- L = Length of the building in feet
- W = Width of the building in feet
- H = Height of the building in feet
- 0.33 is a constant to account for the "air space" in the building
- "27" is the conversion factor from cubic feet to cubic yards

Vegetation – This type of debris is the most difficult to estimate due to the random sizes and shapes of trees and shrubbery. The following serves as a guide for forecasting and estimating vegetative debris:

- Each home is estimated to have an associated 3.65 cubic yards of this type of debris
- Treat debris piles as cubes, not a cone (when estimating)
- 15 trees, 8 inches in diameter = 40 cy (average)
- One acre of debris, 3.33 yards high = 16,117 cy

The following factors will be used to convert woody debris from cubic yards to tons:

- Softwoods: 6 cubic yards = 1 ton
- Hardwoods: 4 cubic yards = 1 ton
- Mixed Debris: 4 cubic yards = 1 ton
- Construction & Demolition: 2 cubic yards = 1 ton

Several truckloads may need to be tested to confirm these factors during actually debris management activities.

IV. Debris Collection

Eligible Debris

Eligible debris removal work must meet the following criteria:

- The debris was generated by a major disaster event;
- The debris is located within a designated disaster area;
- Federal assistance may be available with debris removal on Federal aided Roadways if the Emergency Relief Program is activated through the Federal Highway Administration;
- Any other debris considered to be a public hazard as determined by the debris removal safety officer;
- The debris is located in R.O.W; and,
- The debris removal is the legal responsibility of Sedgwick County.

Ineligible Debris

The following are not eligible for debris removal work:

- Any debris removed from an eligible applicant's unimproved property or undeveloped land;
- Any debris removed from a facility that is not eligible for funding under the Public Assistance Program (ex: private owned cemeteries and golf courses); and,
- Any debris removed from Federal lands or facilities that are under the direct authority of Federal agency or department, and USACE navigable waterways.

Response Operations

Sedgwick County will use its own labor force and equipment to remove debris during this phase. In circumstances when the existing labor force is not sufficient, or when specialized services are required, Sedgwick County may supplement its

work efforts by activating local or regional mutual aid agreements or by awarding short-term debris removal contracts for specific work.

Priorities

Response operations will primarily focus on the emergency access routes and main arterials within Sedgwick County. Based on the incident, planning staff members will identify which roads and streets are essential to emergency operations so local resources can be optimally managed and directed. The Emergency Snow Routes would be a good starting point within the cities with such designated routes.

Prior to and immediately following the event, extricating people and providing access to health care facilities are the top priorities; therefore, the major arterial road routes are given priority for the emergency services staff such as police, fire, and ambulance services.

Overall priority to roadways will be prioritized by the event; however, specific considerations are as follows:

- Fire, police, and ambulance service routes to affected areas
- Access routes to trauma centers, hospitals, critical care units, and jails
- Major arterial routes
- Roads and streets to the debris management center and emergency operations center
- Supply routes to emergency supply distribution centers
- Roads and streets to government facilities
- Communication towers and systems access
- Utility access routes
- Routes to shelters

Recovery Operations

These activities begin after the emergency access routes are cleared and the residents return to their homes and begin to bring debris to the designated disposal site.

The implementation of disaster debris collection immediately after the disaster event assures the public that recovery efforts are in progress and that the community will return to normal quickly. The main method of debris collection is through a collection center(s).

Source-Segregated Debris Collection

This method requires residents to sort the debris by material type. This method offers the potential of high salvage value and efficient recycling/reduction processing. The County offers information through pamphlets and its web site on recycling sites within Sedgwick County.

Collection Centers

This type of collection method directs residents to transport their debris to a common location in the county where roll-off bins or dumpsters are located. Associated costs are generally low since the public essentially accomplished the material collection and separation themselves when possible; however, site monitoring is required to ensure against debris cross-contamination

Collecting Hazardous Waste and White Goods

The three most common types of debris that will need special handling are hazardous waste, white goods, and electronic waste.

Household Hazardous Waste (HHW)

HHW should be separated from the other debris when possible. The Sedgwick County HHW Facility will accept this material and, when possible, set up a remote HHW collection area at the Collection Centers.

White Goods

White goods include all appliances and household machines that contain refrigerants and other fluids that are regulated the Kansas Department of Health and Environment and can only be reclaimed by certified technicians and disposed of a permitted facility. Sedgwick County Environmental Resources provides information on their web site and in pamphlets on businesses that will properly recycle these appliances to avoid accidental release of hazardous fluids.

Electronic Waste (E-waste)

E-waste consists of any broken or damaged piece of electronic equipment. Categories include communications equipment, computer equipment, television and video equipment, electronic tools, lighting, medical equipment, etc. Sedgwick County Environmental Resources provides information on their web site and in pamphlets on businesses that will properly recycle e-waste.

Hazardous Stump Removal

A hazardous tree or stump may be collected, while downed or fallen debris is collected from rights-of-way. Tree and stump collection prices are typically based on the size of the tree or stump and charged by unit. Determining whether to remove a hazardous stump is difficult. FEMA has established criteria to assist in making these eligibility determinations, using objective information that can be collected in the field. A stump may be considered hazardous if the following criteria are met:

- 50% or more of the root-ball is exposed (less than 50% will be flush cut)
- Greater than 24" in diameter (as measured 24" above the ground)
- On improved property
- Poses immediate threat to life, public health, and safety.

FEMA's Hazardous Stump Worksheet and Stump Conversion Table are included in Appendix A and B, respectively.

Putrescent Waste Removal

Putrescent materials such as dead animals will not be shipped to county temporary landfill operations. The Kansas Department of Agriculture and/or the Kansas Department of Health and Environment will be contacted to determine the most effective method of disposal. If on-site burial is considered Sedgwick County Planning and Zoning, Kansas Department of Health and Environment, and Kansas Wildlife and Parks would need to be notified of such actions.

Recycling of Debris

- Recycling reduces mixed debris volume before it is hauled to a landfill. When possible, recycling is attractive and strongly supported by Sedgwick County because there may be an economic value to the recovered material if it can be sorted and sold. A portable Recovery Facility could be set up at the site. Metals, wood, and soils are prime candidates for recycling. The major drawback is the potential environmental impact of the recycling operation. In areas where there is a large usage of chemical agricultural fertilizer, the recovered soil may be too contaminated for use on residential or existing agricultural land.
- Tornadoes may present opportunities to contract out large-scale recycling operations and to achieve an economic return from some of the prime contractors who exercise their initiative to segregate and recycle debris as it arrives at the staging and reduction sites. Recycling has significant drawbacks if contracts are not properly written and closely monitored.
- Specialized contractors should be available to bid on disposal of debris by recycling, if it is well sorted. Contracts and monitoring procedures should be developed to ensure that the recyclers comply with local, tribal, State and Federal environmental regulations.
- Recycling should be considered early in the debris removal and disposal operation because it may present an opportunity to reduce the overall cost of the operation. The following materials are suitable for recycling.

Metals. Tornadoes and Wind Storms may cause extensive damage to mobile homes, sun porches, and barns and out buildings. Most of the metals are non-ferrous and suitable for recycling. Trailer frames and other ferrous metals are also suitable for recycling. Metals can be separated using an electromagnet. Metals that have been processed for recycling can be sold to metal recycling firms.

Soil. Cleanup operations using large pieces of equipment pick up large amounts of soil. The soil can be transported to the staging and reduction sites where it is combined with other organic materials that will decompose over time. Large amounts of soil can be recovered if the material is put through some type of screen or shaker system. This procedure can produce significant

amounts of soil that can either be sold or recycled back into the agricultural community. This soil could also be used at local landfills for cover. It is more expensive to transport and pay tipping fees at local landfills than to sort out the heavy dirt before moving the material. Monitoring and testing of the soil may be necessary to ensure that it is not contaminated with chemicals.

Wood. Woody debris can be either ground or chipped into mulch. Then the mulch may be given to citizens.

Construction Material. Concrete block and other building materials can be ground and used for other purposes if there is a ready market. Construction materials and wood can also be shred to reduce volume. This construction material could also be used at local landfills for cover. Were Sedgwick County does not have such a resource of grinding of concrete, we would be forced to contract this out which may or may not be feasible to cost benefit ratio. Two local Construction & Demolition Landfills can receive this material.

Residue Material. Residue material that cannot be recycled, such as cloth, rugs, and trash, can be sent to a transfer station for disposal.

- **Household Hazardous Waste:** Waste of such that can be reused in a safe manner. Many household hazardous waste materials can be reused for many applications rather than entering the product into the waste stream. Sedgwick County has a strong HHHW program supported by the Kansas Department of Health and Environment. This includes a program to recycle paint and a Swap & Shop where residents can take selected materials home for free.
- **White Goods:** White goods such as washers, dryers, refrigerators, freezers can be recycled for their salvage value of metal. Waste Connections has a contractor at their transfer station that extracts the Freon and oils from the units before they are sent to be recycled. This would continue for a disaster event.
- **Vehicles:** Motor vehicles (trucks, cars, motor homes, tractors) that would become debris as a result of a disaster could be recycled or determined if operational or salvageable by private contractors.
- **Electronic Waste:** As we have discussed earlier in this plan e-waste is recyclable and could be segregated at a debris site.

V. Debris Management Sites

Depending on the type of disaster debris and scale of the event, Temporary Debris Management Sites (DMS) will be necessary as transfer stations. The DMS location could temporarily store, reduce, segregate, and/or process debris before it is hauled to its final disposition. The County will prioritize site locations based on safety, resources, and practicality of location. The priority in terms of general types of locations will be as follows: public paved property, private paved property, public unpaved property, and private unpaved property. A list of potential temporary DMS is included in Appendix H.

The temporary DMS site review ensured the following:

- Does not exist in an environmentally or historically sensitive area such critical animal and plant habitats, sole source aquifers, freshwater well fields, historic districts, or archeological sites.
- Does not exist in Superfund site or area within a 100-year floodplain without proper permission.
- Takes into consideration any disproportionately high or adverse impacts on minority or low-income populations.

Environmental Requirements

A baseline environmental collection study will also be conducted prior to a DMS establishment. This baseline data is essential in assuring that the land is returned to its original condition following the end of all debris management operations. The following methods may be used to document new or updated baseline data:

- Videotape and/or Photograph the Site – Thoroughly videotape and/or photograph (ground or aerial) each site before beginning any activities.
- Document Physical Features – Note existing structures, fences, culverts, irrigation systems, and landscaping that can help evaluate possible damage claims made later.
- Investigation of the Historical Significance – Research the past use and ownership of the property to document any issues regarding the existence of historic structures or archeological sites.
- Sample Soil and Water – Soil and groundwater samples may be collected prior to use of the site if it is not a government-owned site. Planned HHW, ash, and fuel storage areas may also be sampled prior to site setup.

As operations proceed additional data may be collected throughout the operation for closeout and quality assurance reasons. The data can be compared to the previously established information in order to determine any remediation that may be necessary. The following tools can be utilized:

- Sketch Site Operation Layout – DMS operations may grow, shrink, or shift on the site. It is important to track reduction, hazardous waste collection, fuel, and equipment storage in order to sample soil and water for contaminants.
- Document Quality Assurance Issues – Document operations that will have a bearing on site closeout, such as petroleum spills at fueling sites, hydraulic fluid spills at equipment breakdowns, installation of water wells for stock pile cooling or dust control, discovery of HHW, and commercial, agricultural, or industrial hazardous and toxic waste storage and disposal.
- Restoration of Site – Final restoration of the landscape must be acceptable to the landowner, but within reasonable expectations. Therefore, the restoration of the landscape will be planned for as early as possible during debris management operations.

Sedgwick County's objective with regards to the potential environmental impact at all sites is to ensure that safety precautions are taken to organize the site in such a way as to provide a safe and organized use of the location throughout the event, and that measures are taken to reduce the chance of ground, air, and water contamination after all the materials have been collected. This objective may be accomplished in a variety of ways and will be the responsibility of the Sedgwick County Environmental Resources Division.

Permits

Environmental permits and land-use variances may be required to establish a temporary DMS. Several agencies may be involved in issuing permits and granting land-use approvals. The need for these permits may be satisfied by changes established in a declared disaster in Sedgwick County; however, a listing of permits that may be necessary include the following:

- Waste processing and recycling operations permit
- Temporary land-use permits
- Land-use variances
- Traffic circulation strategies
- Air quality permits
- Water quality permits
- HHW permits
- Fire department burn permits

Agencies involved in issuing permits and granting land-use approvals includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Wichita Environmental Health Department
- Wichita/Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Department
- Kansas Department of Health and Environment (www.kdheks.gov)
 - Bureau of Waste Management (www.kdheks.gov/waste)
- Kansas Department of Agriculture (<http://agriculture.ks.gov/>)
- Kansas State Historical and Preservation Office (www.kshs.org)

Site Design and Preparation

The topography and soil/substrate conditions will be evaluated to determine the best site layout. When planning site preparation, the designer will consider ways to make site closure and restoration easier. Upon site closeout, the uncontaminated soil can be re-spread to preserve the integrity of the tillable soils.

Operational Boundaries

These boundaries or areas clearly define the difference in use areas at the DMS. Earthen berms, temporary barriers, or any other physical restriction may be used to aid in traffic circulation and the minimization of amazing debris at the DMS. Common operational areas may include the following:

- Reduction
- Recycling
- Tipping areas (unloading)
- Loading areas for processed debris to go to its final destination
- Drop-off centers for the general public (this may include vegetative, recycling, or construction and demolition debris)
- HHW storage
- Monitoring locations at both the ingress and egress points
- Equipment, fuel, and water storage

The reduction, recycling, tipping, and loading areas need ample room for large equipment operations. Depending on the scale of the operations, each debris stream may and should have its own tipping area and will be designed accordingly.

General public drop-off areas for recycling, reduction, and construction and demolition debris may be included within the DMS, but will be carefully designed for passenger vehicle traffic and public safety. Any HHW storage will be close to the public drop-off center yet restricted so that qualified personnel may process the waste appropriately.

Monitoring areas will be located at ingress and egress points.

Equipment and fuel will have a designated storage area and signs posted appropriately. The fuel storage areas need to be designed to contain spills. Every effort will be made to have water readily available at all times. Water storage areas will be strategically positioned throughout the site and identified appropriately. Water Storage may come as a tender truck from a fire department or the local entity overseeing the DMS. Appendix C contains a sample DMS layout with operational boundaries.

Traffic Patterns

The traffic circulation needs to be well defined throughout the entire site. Although traffic signs and barricades aid in directing traffic, flag directors and law enforcement personnel may need to be on site to direct traffic.

Site Management

The management of the DMS will be under the control of Sedgwick County Public Works personnel to ensure operational efficiency and to meet strategic goals.

Site Manager

This position is responsible for supervising the overall day-to-day operations, maintaining daily logs, preparing site progress reports, and enforcing safety and permitting requirements during site operations. Furthermore, the site manager has oversight for monitoring the activities of the debris removal contractors and onsite debris processing contractors to ensure they comply with the terms of their contracts. The site manager is also responsible for site security and traffic control. These functions can be delegated to assigned personnel if appropriate and available.

Debris Monitors

Operational monitors will be placed at ingress and egress points in order to quantify debris loads, issue load tickets, inspect and validate truck capacities, check loads for hazardous waste, and perform quality control checks as necessary.

Safety Personnel

Safety personnel are responsible for traffic control and ensuring that site operations are in compliance with Federal and State occupational safety regulations.

Monitoring Debris Removal

The purpose of monitoring debris removal is to (1) verify that the work completed by the contractor is within the scope of work of the contract and (2) documentation is provided to ensure operations have meet all local, State, and Federal laws, regulations, and guidelines.

Debris Monitoring Duties

To do this debris monitors will minimally perform the following roles:

- Measure and certify truck capacities (recertify on a regular basis);
- Complete and physically control load tickets (in monitoring towers and the field);
- Validate hazardous trees, including hangers, leaners, and stumps (use appropriate documentation forms);
- Ensure that trucks are accurately credited for their loads;
- Ensure that trucks are not artificially loaded to maximize reimbursement (i.e., debris is wetted, debris is not compacted, etc.)
- Ensure that hazardous waste is not mixed with loads
- Ensure that all debris is removed from trucks at the DMS
- Report to project manager:
 - Mobilization and use of improper equipment
 - Contractor personnel safety standards are not followed
 - General public safety standards are not followed
 - Completion schedules are not on target
 - Debris removal work does not comply with all local, State, and Federal ordinances and regulations

- Ensure that only debris specified in the scope of work is collected and identify work as potentially eligible or ineligible;
- Monitor site development and restoration of DMS;
- Ensure daily loads meet permit requirements; and
- Ensure that work stops immediately in an area where human remains or potential archeological deposits are discovered.
- Ensure the route to the DMS is free of debris that may have fallen off trucks while hauling to the site. Might need a cleanup crew that just follows the route picking up fallen debris.

Debris Monitoring Methods

Additional documentation requirements depend on how the debris is collected and processed. The following methods and systems may be used to monitor and document the work completed by Sedgwick County resources and/or by contractors.

Debris Monitoring Reports – This type of report is important for time-and-materials contracts that may be used during the response phase of the operations. Monitoring documentation for time-and-materials contracts includes:

- Actual labor hours worked
- Actual equipment hours operated
- Type and specification of equipment used

Truck Certification Form – This type of report allows the monitor to identify the truck itself and its hauling capacity in a standardized manner. The standard list of requirements includes:

- Size of hauling bed in cubic yards
- License plate number
- Truck identification number assigned by the owner
- Short physical description of the truck

Recertification of the hauling trucks on a random and periodic basis may be implemented for contract compliance and reimbursement considerations. Appendix I contains a sample truck certification form.

Load Ticket System – The term “load ticket” refers to the primary debris-tracking document. A load ticket system tracks the debris from the original collection point to the DMS, Transfer Station(s) or C&D landfill(s). By positioning debris monitors at each point of the operations (collection, DMS, and/or final disposition), the eligible scope of work can be properly documented.

Each monitor keeps a copy of the load ticket and the driver/contractor keeps two copies for billing purposes. Appendix F includes a copy of the load ticket that will be used by Sedgwick County personnel during debris management personnel. Upon activation, the load ticket will be printed sequentially by the Sedgwick County Printing Office.

Each load ticket will be printed as a five-part form with the following jurisdictional origin numbering code system.

Note: Color Code for Jurisdiction: County, City, Township

JURISDICTION	CODE	JURISDICTION	CODE
Sedgwick County Govt	Co-1	Erie Township	TS-4
City of Andale	Ci-3-1	Garden Plain Township	TS-5
City of Bel Aire	Ci-2-1	Grand River Township	TS-6
City of Bentley	Ci-3-2	Grant Township	TS-7
City of Cheney	Ci-3-3	Greeley Township	TS-8
City of Clearwater	Ci-3-4	Gypsum Township	TS-9
City of Colwich	Ci-3-5	Illinois Township	TS-10
City of Derby	Ci-2-2	Kechi Township	TS-11
City of Eastborough	Ci-3-6	Lincoln Township	TS-12
City of Garden Plain	Ci-3-7	Minneha Township	TS-13
City of Goddard	Ci-2-3	Morton Township	TS-14
City of Haysville	Ci-2-4	Ninnescah Township	TS-15
City of Kechi	Ci-3-8	Ohio Township	TS-16
City of Maize	Ci-3-9	Park Township	TS-17
City of Mount Hope	Ci-3-10	Payne Township	TS-18
City of Mulvane	Ci-2-5	Riverside Township	TS-19
City of Park City	Ci-2-6	Rockford Township	TS-20
City of Sedgwick	Ci-3-11	Salem Township	TS-21
City of Valley Center	Ci-2-7	Sherman Township	TS-22
City of Viola	Ci-3-12	Union Township	TS-23
City of Wichita	Ci-1	Valley Center Township	TS-24
Afton Township	TS-1	Viola Township	TS-25
Attica Township	TS-2	Waco Township	TS-26
Eagle Township	TS-3		

The following is the disposition of each load ticket part.

- Part 1 (White) – Site or Origin Representative
- Part 2 (Green) – Disposal Site Monitor
- Part 3 (Canary) – Debris Site Representative
- Part 4 (Pink) – Driver or Contractor

Monitoring Tips

Contractors must always be monitored closely to ensure compliance with the scope of work. Appendix J includes monitoring tips that address common types of contractor abuse.

Methods of Material Reduction

There are three main types of reduction methods to consider and use during debris management operations; incineration, chipping/grinding, and recycling. The type(s) used will be based on operational goals, site availability, and personnel availability.

Incineration – Burning vegetative debris is a very common reduction method because it has up to a 95% reduction rate. The incineration process requires a minimum of three steps, to include:

- Unloading the debris
- Moving the debris into an incinerator
- Removing the ash from the incinerator to final disposition, which may be an appropriately constructed area at the DMS or a C&D landfill

There are several incineration methods available for volume reduction.

Uncontrolled Open-Air Incineration – This method reduces debris with no control over how much or how quickly it is allowed to burn. The use of this type of reduction will be limited due to its lack of environmental control.

Controlled Open-Air Incineration – This method reduces vegetative debris by burning debris within a contained fixed area. This reduction can be used freely because it presents little environmental damage and is cost-effective.

Air Curtain Pit Incineration – This method effectively expedites the volume reduction process while substantially reducing the environmental concerns caused by open-air incineration. Specifically, this type of reduction uses a pit constructed by digging below grade or building above grade and using a blower unit. The burning chamber is usually no more than 8 feet wide and 9-14 feet deep. Sedgwick County owns a portable air curtain burner. A pit is already in place at the Sedgwick County Public Works West Yard.

Portable Air Curtain Incinerators – This method uses the same concept as air curtain pit incineration, except this method utilizes pre-manufactured pits rather than onsite constructed earthen pits. These types of incinerators are the most efficient because they have been pre-engineered to precise dimensions to complement the blower system.

Setbacks and buffer zones need to be established within and around the reduction sites not only for the public safety, but also for the safety of debris operations. A setback of at least 100 feet will be maintained between the

debris piles and the incineration area. A 1,000 foot buffer zone will be established between the incineration area and the nearest building to create room for emergency vehicles to maneuver. All burning operations are subject to environmental regulations set forth in K.A.R. 28-19-647(d.-e.).

Chipping/Grinding – This method calls for the vegetative debris to be chipped or ground. This method reduces volume by 75%. Because of the remaining volume, the benefit of this reduction method is increased by identifying alternate use of residual material such as recycled wood chips used for agricultural purposes or as fuel for industrial heating. Plastics will be eliminated completely from debris prior to performing this method. Sedgwick County owns a portable Tub Grinder that is located at the Sedgwick County Public Works West Yard.

Recycling – This method captures pre-identified types of debris materials for recycling and/or reuse. Currently, businesses in Sedgwick County have the capability to recycle metals such as aluminum, tin, and various other scrap metals. Community recycling centers are currently available in Sedgwick County for residential-type recycling, e-waste, white goods, and household hazardous waste. Information about local recycling businesses can be found on the Sedgwick County Environmental web site or in their pamphlets.

Site Closure

When the site operations are complete, the property must be restored to its original condition before returning the site to the property owner. This restoration includes the removal of all traces of operations and possible remediation of any contamination that may have taken place during the operations. The site, whether owned or leased by Sedgwick County, must be brought back to its environmental state, prior to it being returned to the owner.

The final environmental site evaluation is an extension of the environmental monitoring program. Similar testing as completed in the baseline study may be conducted to confirm that the site has been returned to its pre-activity state. Test samples may be taken at the same locations as those of the initial assessment and monitoring program. Based on the results of the testing, additional remediation may be required.

All operational documentation will be collected and organized and then submitted to Sedgwick County Emergency Management and Homeland Security for review. If needed, these documents will be incorporated into disaster reimbursement request per pre-determined processes established by county policy.

VI. Contracted Services

It may be necessary to contract for debris removal services if the magnitude of the disaster is beyond the capabilities of Sedgwick County, mutual aid agreements, and volunteer labor.

Emergency Contracting & Procurement Procedures

Type of Contract

Sedgwick County will use Request For Proposal (RFP) and/or Request For Bid (RFB) contracts to solicit bids and award contracts in non-disaster times. Contractors will be paid based on the number of cubic yards of eligible debris hauled per truckload to the temporary debris management site(s).

If additional contracted labor is needed during debris management operations, additional contracts may need to be instituted. The following list of contract types may be instituted.

Lump Sum – Work within a prescribed boundary with a clearly defined scope (including finite timeframe) and a total price. There are two common uses of the lump sum contract which are as follows:

Area Method – This technique defines the geographical boundary in which the debris is to be collected. By providing geographical boundaries, the quantity of debris may be forecasted or estimated based on topography and land use.

Pass Method – This technique describes the number of times debris will be collected from the curbside within a specified geographical boundary. Limiting the number of passes for an area keeps the scope of work known.

Unit Price – Work done on an item-by-item basis with cost determined per unit. The quantities of work to be completed are estimated by Sedgwick County and included in the bid solicitation process. The estimated quantity of work described in the bid solicitation can be adjusted to reflect a more accurate quantity when debris operations are under way and the true extent of the disaster is realized.

Time and Materials – Contractor bills Sedgwick County for labor, equipment, materials, and overhead. This type of contract is used when the scope of work necessary to achieve an outcome is unknown. Moreover, this type of contract establishes hourly rates for labor and equipment that will be used to perform specific tasks. Solicitation for a time and materials contract will include descriptions of the types of work items that would be required for debris removal, debris processing, and recycling.

Sedgwick County will establish the maximum number of hours this type of contract can work or set an operational ceiling of actual work. Sedgwick County will carefully monitor these contracts by requiring contractors to provide daily work reports and other control measures as deemed necessary.

This type of contract is the least preferred and is typically only used for initial emergency work or when there are complex life-saving activities dependent on the removal of debris.

FEMA reimburses costs incurred using three types of contract payment obligations: fixed-price, cost-reimbursement, and, to a limited extent, time and materials (T&M). The specific contract types related to each of these are described in FEMA's Procurement Guidance for Recipients and Sub-recipients, under 2 C.F.R. Part 200 (Uniform Rules).

The Applicant must include required provisions in all contracts awarded; and, maintain oversight to ensure contractors perform according to the conditions and specifications of the contract and any purchase orders.

FEMA does not reimburse costs incurred under a cost plus a percentage of cost contract or a contract with a percentage of construction cost method.

FEMA advises against the use of T&M contracts and generally limits the use of these contracts to a reasonable time based on the circumstances during which the Applicant could not define a clear scope of work (SOW). T&M contracts do not provide incentives to the contractor for cost control or labor efficiency. Therefore, FEMA may reimburse costs incurred under a T&M contract only if all of the following apply:

- No other contract was suitable;
- The contract has a ceiling price that the contractor exceeds at its own risk; and,
- The Applicant provides a high degree of oversight to obtain reasonable assurance that the contractor is using efficient methods and effective cost controls.

The Applicant should define the SOW as soon as possible to enable procurement of a more acceptable type of contract.

General Contract Provisions

To protect the interests of Sedgwick County, specific items will be included in the contract to minimize the potential conflicts with the contractor. These items may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Basis of payment – Basis of payment is usually based on the volume and/or weight of the contractor's loads
- Duration of the contract – To ensure that debris removal is conducted expeditiously, the contract will include specific timelines for work to be completed
- Performance measures – Sedgwick County will implement progress payments for services as specific performance tasks have been meet and documented.
- Agreement to restore collateral damage – A contract provision will include a requirement that the contractor is to restore and/or repair (at the contractor's expense) all damaged infrastructure back to pre-existing conditions if the damage was caused by their activities
- Termination
 - Termination for Cause. In the event of any breach of the terms or conditions of this Agreement by Contractor, or in the event of any

proceedings by or against Contractor in bankruptcy or insolvency or for appointment of receiver or trustee or any general assignment for the benefit of creditors, County may, in addition to any other remedy provided it by law or in equity or other right reserved to it elsewhere in this Agreement, without any liability to Contractor on account thereof, by written notice, terminate immediately all or any part of this Agreement, procure the goods, equipment and/or services provided for herein elsewhere, on such terms and under such conditions as are reasonable in the sole discretion of County, and Contractor shall be liable to pay to County any excess cost or other damages caused by Contractor as a result thereof.

- Termination for Convenience. County shall have the right to terminate this Agreement for convenience in whole, or from time to time, in part, upon thirty (30) days' written notice. Upon receipt of such termination notice, Contractor shall not incur any new obligations and shall cancel as many outstanding obligations as reasonably possible. In such event, County's maximum liability shall be limited to payment for goods or equipment delivered and accepted and/or services rendered.
- Reduction in Funds. It is understood that funding may cease or be reduced at any time. In the event that adequate funds are not available to meet the obligations hereunder, either party reserves the right to terminate this Agreement upon thirty (30) days' written notice.

Contract Scope of Work

Will reference one of the following:

- Eligible Work
- Work eligible under FEMA Public Assistance regulations, policies, and guidance
- Work performed on public property and/or public rights-of-way

Units of work must be viewed uniformly to prevent work on one piece of debris on multiple occasions (ex: removing a leaning portion and the cutting the stump to the ground cannot be two separate unit costs).

Contract Limitations

- Avoid “piggyback contracts” with neighboring jurisdictions
- Use caution with shared contracts
- Cost plus percentage of cost contracts will not be used
- Avoid contracts with any phrase that implies, insinuates, or otherwise uses phrases that indicate FEMA pre-approval

Procurement Policy

Sedgwick County jurisdictions will follow the Board of County's Commissioners Resolution or City's Ordinance for all emergency procurement rules, regulations, limitations, and exceptions.

Additional Contract Requirements

- For all contracts, the following minimum bonding requirements will apply:
 - A bid guarantee from each bidder equivalent to 5% of the bid price
 - A performance bond on the part of the contractor for 100% of the contract price
 - A payment bond on the part of the contractor for 100% of the contract price

Scope of Work for On-Call Debris Removal

Purpose: Sedgwick County can have storm debris generated by high winds, ice storms, tornadoes and flooding events. Depending on the severity of the storm, the County may sponsor dumpsters for onsite disposal, arrange for packer truck collection in certain neighborhoods, or offer sites for residents to bring their tree waste to for free disposal. In order to best serve the community after a storm event, the County wants to have pre-event unit-price contracts in hand to help expedite an immediate response.

Scope of Work: The companies should bid on the following items:

- Charge for delivering each dumpster
 - Note if mileage variations will occur, and what they are
- If applicable: Charge per size of dumpster: 30 cubic yard and 40 cubic yard
- Charge for collecting dumpster
- Tonnage fee
- Any Overtime Charges (include Saturday and Sunday)
- Costs associated with Packer trucks:
 - Hourly costs per driver
 - Overtime costs
 - Mileage
 - Tonnage fee
- Any other ancillary costs

Response Time: The Company must provide a guaranteed time frame for dumpster and packer truck response. Once they receive our request, how long will it take to get a dumpster in place or packer truck in place (maximum time may be based on mileage to event).

VII. Private Property Demolition and Debris Removal

County staff, contractors or other representatives will not enter onto private property to collect debris. In the event that damage is not abated and/or debris is not removed and such conditions are deemed to constitute a dangerous health or nuisance condition, necessary governing authority will be provided by the Sedgwick County Board of Commissioners.

If deemed appropriate due to the scope of the disaster and/or debris generated by such a disaster, the County Board of Commissioners along with City Officials may take additional formal executive action to authorize collection of debris on private property provided such authorization ensures that the applicable property owner(s) execute a waiver or release of liability developed by Sedgwick County in coordination with FEMA or other applicable State & Federal agencies.

Prior to any removal of debris from the private property, the following documentation will be sent to FEMA's Federal Coordinating Officer FCO:

- Documentation confirming the existence of an immediate threat on public property (44 CFR 206.224(a));
 - Immediate threat to life, public health, and/or safety
 - Immediate threat to improved property determination
 - Removal will expedite economic recovery of Sedgwick County
- Documentation of the legal authority to enter that property (44 CFR 206.223(a)(3);
- Documentation that a legally authorized official has ordered the exercise of public authority to enter private property to perform debris removal (44 CFR 206.223(a)(3); and
- Indemnification for the Federal government and its employees, agents, and contractors from any claims arising from the removal of debris (44 CFR 206.9).

The FCO will approve or disapprove in writing Sedgwick County's request. If approval is granted, debris removal can begin with the pre-determined scope of work; however the following documents will be created during debris management operations:

- Right-of-Entry – This document must be signed by the property owner and will include a hold harmless agreement and indemnification applicable to the project's scope of work.
- Physical Documentation – Photos will be taken to show the condition of the property prior to the beginning of the work. Pictures will document the address and scope-of-work on the private property.
- Private Property Debris Removal (PPDR) Assessment – A property specific assessment will be created to establish the scope of eligible work. The PPDR can be a map or other documentation system that serves as a guide indicating the location of the eligible items of work that present an immediate threat relative to the improved property or rights-of-way.
- Documentation of Environmental and Historic Review – Documents environmental and historical preservation compliance as established in 44 CFR Parts 9 and 10 as well as any relevant Kansas or Sedgwick County resolution, Statute, or ordinance.

Additional documentation may be required by the FCO on a case-by-case basis to demonstrate the proposed work is in compliance with all Federal, State, and local laws and regulations.

VIII. Public Information Plan

Distribution Strategy

Public information related to debris management will be submitted to the public in as many ways as possible. Although there will be an operational PIO designated by the Debris Project Manager, this position will work in cooperation with the Sedgwick County PIO to facilitate the distribution of public information. The following communication vehicles will be considered when performing this function:

- Media – This includes local television, radio, newspapers, Social Media, or community newsletters that reach the impacted area(s).
- Internet Sites – Information will be posted to the Sedgwick County Government webpage (www.sedgwickcounty.org)
- Public forums – This includes interactive meetings at a local government building(s).
- Direct Delivery Products – This includes door hangers, direct mail, fact sheets, flyers within bills, billboards, etc.

Using these various communication methods will ensure the distribution of information even if power, utilities, and other infrastructure have been damaged during the disaster. Providing this information to the workers in the field is also a critical way to distribute vital information.

The PIO may choose to establish a Debris Information Hub if the size of the debris management process warrants it. This may include a direct Sedgwick County hotline or information may be routinely submitted to the regional 2-1-1 system.

Through the listed mechanisms, the public will be encouraged to do the following:

- If possible, separate debris materials – burnable materials, non-burnable materials, household hazardous waste (HHW), and recyclable materials;
- Keep debris materials from fire hydrants;
- Report illegal debris material dump sites; and
- Review all debris removal routes and schedules

The -Sedgwick County Print Shop will be used to print all materials needed for Debris Management activities. If operational demands exceed the capabilities of the Print Shop, contractors or mutual aid may be required to supplement the printing of the necessary items.

IX. Plan Maintenance

As a support annex to the Sedgwick County LEOP, this Plan will be reviewed on an annual basis for necessary changes or additions to continue to meet operational and legal requirements.

X. Acronyms

C&D	Construction & Demolition
DMS	Debris Management Site
DPM	Debris Project Manager
EOC	Emergency Operations Center

FCO	Federal Coordinating Officer
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
GIS	Geographic Information System
HHW	Household Hazardous Waste
K.A.R.	Kansas Administrative Regulations
KDEM	Kansas Department of Emergency Management
KDHE	Kansas Department of Health and Environment
LEOP	Local Emergency Operations Plan
NRCS	National Resources Conservation Service
PIO	Public Information Officer
PPDR	Private Property Debris Removal
R.O.W.	Right of Way
ROOT-BALL	The tightly packed mass of roots and soil produced by a plant
TDMS	Temporary Debris Management Site
USACE	United States Army Corp of Engineers
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
VCM	Vegetative Cover Multiplier
WMD	Weapon of Mass Destruction

XI. Definitions

Disaster-generated debris: Any material, including trees, branches, personal property and building material on public or private property that is directly deposited by the disaster.

Improved property: Any structure, facility, or equipment that was built, constructed, or manufactured. Examples include houses, sheds, car ports, pools, and gazebos. Land used for agricultural purposes is not improved property.

Legal responsibility: A statute, formally adopted State or local code, or ordinance that gives local government officials responsibility to enter private property to remove debris or to perform work to remove an immediate threat.

Private property: Land and structures, to include contents within the structures, built on land that is owned by non-governmental entities.

Private road: Any non-public road for which a subdivision of the State is not legally responsible to maintain. Private roads include roads owned and maintained by homeowners associations, including gated communities, and roads for which no entity has claimed responsibility. Local police, fire, and emergency medical entities may use these roads to provide services to the community.

Appendices

Appendix A:	Hazardous Stump Worksheet
Appendix B:	Stump Conversion Table
Appendix C:	Sample DMS with Operational Boundaries
Appendix D:	Operational Safety Awareness & Regulations
Appendix E:	Federal Guide Load Ticket
Appendix F:	Sedgwick County Sample Debris Load Ticket
Appendix G:	Landfills and Debris Management Sites in Sedgwick County
Appendix H:	Temporary Debris Management Sites
Appendix I:	Truck Certification Form
Appendix J:	Debris Monitoring Tips
Appendix K:	Debris Notification Sheet
Appendix L:	Right of Entry
Appendix M:	Debris site check off
Appendix N:	List of Preferred Vendors

APPENDIX A: Hazardous Stump Worksheet

Hazardous Stump Worksheet

Applicant: _____ Date: _____
 Applicant Representative: _____ Signature: _____
 FEMA Representative (if available): _____ Signature: _____
 State Representative (if available): _____ Signature: _____

	Physical Location (i.e., Street address, road, cross streets, etc.)	Description of Facility (ROW, Park, City Hall, etc.)	Hazard		GPS (decimal degrees, 00.000000)		Tree Size (Diameter)	Eligible		Fill For Debris Stumps CY	Comments (See attached sketch, photo, etc.)
			Yes	No	Latitude (N)	Longitude (W)		Yes	No		
1											
2											
3											
4											
5											
6											
7											
8											
9											
10											

APPENDIX B: Stump Conversation Table

Stump Conversion Table

Diameter to Volume Capacity

The quantification of the cubic yards of debris for each size of stump in the following table was derived from FEMA field studies conducted throughout the State of Florida during the debris removal operations following Hurricanes Charley, Frances, Ivan and Jeanne. The following formula is used to derive cubic yards:

$$\frac{[(\text{Stump Diameter}^2 \times 0.7854) \times \text{Stump Length}] + [(\text{Root Ball Diameter}^2 \times 0.7854) \times \text{Root Ball Height}]}{46656}$$

0.7854 is one-fourth Pi and is a constant.

46656 is used to convert cubic inches to cubic yards and is a constant


The formula used to calculate the cubic yardage used the following factors, based upon findings in the field:

- Stump diameter measured two feet up from ground
- Stump diameter to root ball diameter ratio of 1.3.6
- Root ball height of 31"


Stump Diameter (Inches)	Debris Volume (Cubic Yards)	Stump Diameter (Inches)	Debris Volume (Cubic Yards)
6	0.3	46	15.2
7	0.4	47	15.8
8	0.5	48	16.5
9	0.6	49	17.2
10	0.7	50	17.9
11	0.9	51	18.6
12	1	52	19.4
13	1.2	53	20.1
14	1.4	54	20.9
15	1.6	55	21.7
16	1.8	56	22.5
17	2.1	57	23.3
18	2.3	58	24.1
19	2.6	59	24.9
20	2.9	60	25.8
21	3.2	61	26.7
22	3.5	62	27.6
23	3.8	63	28.4
24	4.1	64	29.4
25	4.5	65	30.3
26	4.8	66	31.2
27	5.2	67	32.2
28	5.6	68	33.1
29	6	69	34.1
30	6.5	70	35.1
31	6.9	71	36.1
32	7.3	72	37.2
33	7.8	73	38.2
34	8.3	74	39.2
35	8.8	75	40.3
36	9.3	76	41.4
37	9.8	77	42.5
38	10.3	78	43.6
39	10.9	79	44.7
40	11.5	80	45.9
41	12	81	47
42	12.6	82	48.2
43	13.3	83	49.4
44	13.9	84	50.6
45	14.5		

APPENDIX C: Sample DMS Layout with Operational Boundaries

West Public Works Yard Layout



Sedgwick County North Location Layout



APPENDIX D: Operational Safety Awareness & Regulations

Potential Hazards

Sedgwick County responders along with contracted workers may face the following potential hazards while performing debris management operations:

• Unstable work surfaces	• Roadside work
• Structural integrity	• Driving
• Flying debris (eye injuries)	• Breathing dust
• Heavy equipment	• Falling Ice & Debris
• Electrical	• Carbon monoxide
• Excessive noise	• Smoke inhalation
• Falls from heights	• Potential chemical exposures
• Molds	• Bites and stings
• Blood-borne diseases	• Water and food sanitation
• Personal sanitation and Hygiene	• Traumatic stress
• Confined spaces	

Safety Regulations

Sedgwick County personnel are subject to the rules and regulations of the Kansas Department of Labor, while contracted personnel are subject to OSHA regulations. However, since these regulations are often tied together, the following list of regulations will be considered before, during, and after all debris management activities.

- 29 CFR 1910.1200 (HazCom)
- 29 CFR 1910.120 (Hazwoper)
- 29 CFR 1910.134 (Respiratory Protection)
- 29 CFR 1910.146 (Confined Spaces)
- 29 CFR 1910.1030 (Bloodborne Pathogens)
- 29 CFR 1926.20-35 (General Construction),
- 29 CFR 1910.23 (Fall Protection),
- 29 CFR 1915.159 (Fall Arrest Equipment)
- 29 CFR 1910.132 (Personal Protective Equipment),
- 29 CFR 1910.137 & 29 CFR 1910.332 (Electrical safety),
- 29 CFR 1910.147 (Lockout/Tagout), and
- All other local, State, or Federal safety regulations.

Health Concerns

Exposure to potentially hazardous conditions may require immunization and/or monitoring from public health experts. Specific considerations include tetanus, hepatitis A, or other vaccines as recommended by the Sedgwick County Public Health Department.

Appendix E Federal Guide Load Ticket

Sample Debris Load Ticket

LOAD TICKET		
TICKET NUMBER:		00001
CONTRACT NUMBER: _____		
PRIME CONTRACTOR'S NAME: _____		
DATE: _____		
DEBRIS QUANTITY		
Truck No:	Capacity (CY): _____	
Load Size : Cubic Yards _____		
or Tons _____		
Truck Driver: _____		
DEBRIS CLASSIFICATION		
	Burnable _____	
	Non-Burnable _____	
	Mixed _____	
	Other _____	
LOCATION		
Zone/Section	Dumpsite	
	Time	Contract Monitor
Loading		
Dumping		

APPENDIX F: Sample Sedgwick County (KS) Debris Load Ticket

LOAD TICKET	Ticket #
Debris Source Address: GPS Coordinates:	Unloading Address: GPS Coordinates: Site Monitor: <hr/>
Date:	Arrival Time:
Municipality (Source) ID Code: _____	Contractor, if applicable
Truck #	Truck Driver
Debris Quantity Cubic Yards: _____ Or Tons: _____	Type of Debris (check all that apply) <input type="checkbox"/> Tree <input type="checkbox"/> Brush <input type="checkbox"/> Wood <input type="checkbox"/> Other: Explain _____ <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>


APPENDIX G: Landfills and Debris Management Sites

There are several locations within Sedgwick County that could be used during debris management activities. Sedgwick County also uses an out-of-county landfill that could be used during debris management activities. They are as follows:

Landfill	Owner /Operator	Access	Accepts
Brooks C&D Landfill 4100 N. West St. 316-722-0601	City of Wichita	Businesses and Public	C&D and Yard Waste
CDR North C&D Landfill 4250 W. 37 th St. N. 316-942-8666	Cornejo & Sons	Businesses and Public	C&D
Evergreen Recycle 302 W. 53 rd St. N. 316-832-0400	Evergreen Recycle	Businesses and Public	Wood and Yard Waste
Waste Connections Transfer Station' 4300 W. 37 th St. N. 316-941-4320	Waste Connections	Businesses and Public	MSW
Waste Disposal Transfer Station 5550 W. 55 th St. S. 316-522-3633	Waste Disposal, LLC	Businesses and Public	MSW
Sedgwick County's Household Hazardous Waste Facility 801 Stillwell 316-660-7458	Sedgwick County	Small Quantity Generators & Public	HHW
Colwich Brush Pile 500 S. 8th St. 316-796-1025	Colwich	Colwich Residents	Tree Debris and Brush
Goddard Public Works Yard 1206 S. 199th St. W. 316-794-2441	Goddard	Goddard Residents	Tree Debris and Brush
Clearwater Brush Dump 10750 S 151 st Street W 620-584-2311	Clearwater	Clearwater Residents	Tree Debris and Brush
Haysville Brush Pile 401 S. Jane 316-529-5940	Haysville	Haysville Residents	Yard Waste, Concrete, Metal, Used Oil, Tree Debris
Valley Center Brush & Compost Site 531 W. Clay 316-755-7320	Valley Center	Valley Center Residents	Yard Waste, Brush and Tree Limbs
Plumb Thicket Landfill NE 150 th Road, West of NE 50 th Avenue Harper, Kansas 620-896-2229	Waste Connections	Businesses and Public	C&D and Yard Waste

Note: Call for hours of operation. None of these facilities will accept radioactive material or animal carcasses with the exception of Plumb Thicket that will accept dead animals. Only the HHW Facility will receive hazardous materials and car batteries. Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) includes all types of yard waste. Check SedgwickCounty.org for locations to dispose of or recycle special materials

**BROOKS CONSTRUCTION & DEMOLITION LANDFILL
4100 N WEST STREET
WICHITA, KANSAS**



**CORNEJO & SONS CONSTRUCTION & DEMOLITION CDR LANDFILL
4250 W 37TH STREET, NORTH
WICHITA, KANSAS**



**EVERGREEN RECYCLE
302 W 53RD STREET, NORTH
WICHITA, KANSAS**



**WASTE CONNECTIONS TRANSFER STATION
4300 W 37TH STREET, NORTH
WICHITA, KANSAS**



**WASTE DISPOSAL TRANSFER STATION
5550 W 55TH STREET, SOUTH
WICHITA, KANSAS**



**HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE COLLECTION SITE
801 W STILLWELL AVENUE
WICHITA, KANSAS**




**COLWICH BRUSH PILE
500 S 8TH STREET
COLWICH, KANSAS**



**GODDARD PUBLIC WORKS YARD
1206 S 199TH STREET, W
GODDARD, KANSAS**



CLEARWATER BRUSH DUMP
10740 S 151ST STREET W
CLEARWATER, KANSAS



HAYSVILLE BRUSH PILE
401 S JANE STREET
HAYSVILLE, KANSAS



**VALLEY CENTER BRUSH & COMPOST SITE
531 W CLAY STREET
VALLEY CENTER, KANSAS**



**PLUMB THICKET CONSTRUCTION & DEMOLITION LANDFILL
NE 150TH ROAD, WEST OF NE 50TH AVENUE
HARPER COUNTY, KANSAS**



APPENDIX H Potential Temporary Debris Management Sites (TDMS)

Sedgwick County has identified three sites that may be used for the temporary storage, reduction, and overall management of disaster-related debris until final disposition is made at a permanent landfill. Additional sites may be necessary, depending on the location of the storm debris.


	Sedgwick County West Public Works Yard	Sedgwick County Northeast Storm Debris Land	Wichita-Valley Center Floodway
Ownership	Sedgwick County	Sedgwick County	Wichita and Sedgwick County
Location	4701 S. West St	69 th St N. between Greenwich Rd. and 127 th E., north of Payne Township Building	East side of south Meridian, located between 63 rd St. S. and 71 th St. S.
Size	30 acres	20 acres	30 acre site, 10 acres used for debris management
Access Route – Ingress	Quarter mile west of West St. S. on 47 th St. S. on north side of road	6/10 of a mile east of Greenwich Road on 69 th St. N. on north side of road, entrance is east of Payne Township Building entrance	1/4 mile south of the intersection of 63 rd St S. heading west of Meridian and Meridian, entrance is on the east side of Meridian
Ingress Road Types	Paved on West St., gravel on 47 th St. S., gravel/dirt on site	Paved on Greenwich Rd., gravel on 69 th St. N., dirt on site	Paved on Meridian, dirt on site
Access Route – Egress	Exit onto 47 th St. S. and head east to West St.	Exit onto 69 th St. N. and head west to Greenwich Rd.	Exit onto Meridian
Egress Road Types	Gravel on 47 th St. S. to West St where it is paved	Gavel on 69 th St. N. to Greenwich Rd. where it is paved	Meridian is paved
Approved Debris Streams	Tree Debris	Tree Debris	Tree Debris
Environmental Status	No known special status	No known special status.	Floodplain

TEMPORARY SITES HAVE BEEN ALSO SELECTED FOR CITIES WITHIN SEDGWICK COUNTY FOR EITHER BRUSH OR DEBRIS AS STATED ON THE MAPS TO FOLLOW.

**SEDGWICK COUNTY WEST PUBLIC WORKS YARD
4701 S. WEST STREET
WICHITA, KANSAS**











**SEDGWICK COUNTY NORTHEAST STORM DEBRIS LAND
12010 E 69TH STREET N
WICHITA, KANSAS**



**WICHITA-VALLEY CENTER FLOODWAY
63RD STREET SOUTH & MERIDIAN AVENUE
WICHITA, KANSAS**



APPENDIX I: Truck Certification Form

DUMP TRUCK	
Measurements	
Truck Measurements	Length (L) = <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/> Width (W) ft = <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/> Height (H) ft = <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/>
Hoist Measurement	Length ₁ (L ₁) ft = <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/> Width _H (W _H) ft = <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/> Height _H (H _H) ft = <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/> Length ₂ (L ₂) ft = <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/>
Radius	Radius ft = <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/> Height (H) = <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/>
Calculations	
Bed Volume (Basic)	$(L \times W \times H) / 27 =$ <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/> cyd
Hoist Volume	$((L_1 + L_2) / 2) \times W_H \times H_H / 27 =$ <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/> cyd
Radius Volume	$(3.14 \times R^2 \times H) / 27 =$ <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/> cyd
Total = <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/> cyd	
Cubic Yards	
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 30%; text-align: center;">  </div> <div style="width: 30%; text-align: center;">  </div> <div style="width: 30%; text-align: center;">  </div> <div style="width: 20%; text-align: center;">  </div> </div>	
EXTRA TRAILER	
Measurements	
Truck Measurements (Basic)	Length (L) = <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/> Width (W) ft = <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/> Height (H) ft = <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/>
Hoist Measurement	Length ₁ (L ₁) ft = <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/> Width _H (W _H) ft = <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/> Height _H (H _H) ft = <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/> Length ₂ (L ₂) ft = <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/>
Radius	Radius ft = <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/> Height (H) = <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/>
Calculations	
Bed Volume (Basic)	$(L \times W \times H) / 27 =$ <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/> cyd
Hoist Volume	$((L_1 + L_2) / 2) \times W_H \times H_H / 27 =$ <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/> cyd
Radius Volume	$(3.14 \times R^2 \times H) / 27 =$ <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/> cyd
Total = <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/> cyd	
Cubic Yards	
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 60%; text-align: center;">  </div> <div style="width: 30%; text-align: center;">  </div> </div>	
ROUND BOTTOM TRUCK	
Measurements	
Truck Measurements	Length (L) ft = <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/> Diameter (D) ft = <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/>
Calculations	
Approx. Volume $(3.14 \times (D/2)^2 \times L) / 27 =$ <input style="width: 100px;" type="text"/> cyd (round bottom portion only)	
Cubic Yards	
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 60%; text-align: center;">  </div> <div style="width: 30%; text-align: center;">  </div> </div>	

General Information

Applicant: _____ **Monitor:** _____
Contractor: _____ **Date:** _____
Measurement Location: _____ **County:** _____
Declaration Number: _____

Truck Information

Make	Year	Color	License


Truck Measurements
Performed By: _____ **Date:** _____
Volume Calculated By: _____ **Date:** _____
Both Checked by: _____ **Date:** _____

Driver Information


Name: _____
Address: _____
Phone Number: _____

Owner Information


Name: _____
Address: _____
Phone Number: _____



Truck Identification



Truck Capacity



Photo

(See reverse for calculation worksheet)

APPENDIX J: Debris Monitoring Tips

Debris monitoring is a critical piece of the overall operation. By avoiding the following fraudulent acts, operational compliance is maintained.

Inaccurate Truck Capacities – Trucks will be measured before operations and load capacities will be documented by truck number. Periodically, trucks will be pulled from operations and reassessed.

Trucks Not Fully Loaded – Do not accept the contention that loads are higher in the middle and if level would fill the truck.

Trucks Lightly Loaded – Trucks arrive loaded with treetops with extensive voids in the load. Trucks need to be loaded to their full capacity with front end loaders or other similar equipment.

Trucks Overloaded – Trucks cannot receive credit for more than the measured capacity of the truck or trailer bed even if material is above the sideboards.

Changing Truck Numbers – Trucks are listed by an assigned vehicle number and capacity. There have been occasions where truck or trailer numbers with a smaller carrying capacity have been changed to one with a larger capacity. Periodically re-measuring the trucks will identify this issue.

Reduced Truck Capacity or Increased Truck Weight – There have been occasions where trucks have had heavy steel grating welded two to three feet above the bed after being measure, thus reducing the capacity or inflating the weight of the load. Periodically re-measuring the trucks will identify this issue.

Wet Debris When Paid by Weight – Excessive water added to debris will increase the weight of the load. When the contractual unit cost is based on weight, this increases the cost to Sedgwick County. This can be detected during monitoring if there is excessive water dripping from the truck bed.

Multiple Counting of the Same Load – Trucks have been reported driving through the disposal site without unloading, then re-entering with the same load. This can be detected by observing the time of departure and the time of arrival recorded on the driver's load ticket.

Picking up Ineligible Debris – Monitors will have a good understanding of eligible debris and any time limits imposed on picking up specific types of debris.

Appendix K: Debris Notification Sheet

Your area has been involved in a disaster event

Please avoid placing debris over Fire Hydrants and Gas Meters and in the street.

To assist in the debris clean up please separate the following at the curbside.

To Expedite Cleanup efforts please separate as follows in separate piles:

Trees and Vegetation

White goods (washing machine, refrigerators)

Clean construction debris (2x4's and such, plywood)

Metals

Household hazardous chemicals (Paints, bug killers, cleaning products)

Personnel Property

We thank you for your cooperation through these trying times; any questions please call your local contact at

Appendix L: Right of Entry

RIGHT OF ENTRY AGREEMENT

I/We _____, the owner(s) of the property, commonly identified as
_____, Sedgwick, State of Kansas,
(street) (city/town) (county)

do hereby grant and give freely and without coercion, the right of access and entry to said property in the County/City of _____, to Sedgwick County, its employees, agents, contractors, and subcontractors thereof, for the purpose of removing and clearing any or all storm-generated debris of whatever nature from the above described property.

It is fully understood that this permit is not an obligation to perform debris clearance. The undersigned agrees and warrants to hold harmless Sedgwick County, its elected and appointed officials, employees, agents, contractors, and subcontractors, against any and all loss or damage, except to the extent such loss and/or damage arises out of Sedgwick County's, or its elected and appointed officials', employees', or agents' negligence and/or willful, wanton or reckless conduct in the performance of debris clearance. The property owner(s) will mark any storm damaged sewer lines, water lines, and other utility lines located in the described property.

I/We (have _____, have not _____) (will _____, will not _____) receive any compensation for debris removal from any other source including Small Business Administration (SBA), National Resource Conservation Service (ANRCS), private insurance, individual and family grant program or any other public assistance program. I will report for this property any insurance settlements to me or my family for debris removal that has been performed at government expense. For the considerations and purposes set forth herein, I set my hand this _____ day of _____, _____.

Owner

Owner

Appendix M: Debris site check off

Disaster Debris Management Site Selection Worksheet

Site Name _____

Site Address _____

Estimated Size in Acres _____

Estimated Volume of Debris Able to Hold (cubic yards) _____

(Note: Assume up to 16,000 cubic yards/acre and only 40 percent of site available for debris storage.)

Primary Local Government Point of Contact:

Name _____ Phone _____ Email _____

Secondary Local Government Point of Contact:

Name _____ Phone _____ Email _____

Preferred Disaster Debris Management Site Criteria

- The site is owned or controlled by municipal or state government.
- The site has easy access, including being near the area of debris generation, easy to enter and exit, and near transportation arteries.
- The site is ready to use as a debris management site without extensive site modifications.
- The debris storage and handling areas would be at least 100 feet from property lines.
- To the maximum extent possible, the site location minimizes potential environmental and public health impacts, including considering setbacks from public water supplies, surface water bodies, and residential dwellings and avoiding areas such as flood plans, drinking water Zone IIs, and Areas of Critical Environmental Concern.

If any of these criteria are not met, please explain why not and how any concerns regarding that criterion would be addressed: _____

Anticipated Site Activities

(Note: intended for use only in declared disaster, NOT for routine operation.)

- A site plan and layout has been prepared that considers the management and operating practices recommended in this guidance.

What types of disaster debris do you expect to manage at this site? (e.g., vegetative waste, C&D debris, hazardous household products, etc) _____

What debris processing or other handling activities do you expect to conduct at this site? (e.g., sorting and transfer for recycling, chipping vegetative waste, transfer of trash for disposal, etc.) _____

Please summarize any other benefits or concerns with using this site as a debris management site.

Appendix N: List of Preferred Vendors

Waste Connections and Mayer Specialty Services, LLC were pre-selected as potential debris management vendors during disaster response and recovery operations. Selected information for each company is listed below:

Company	Waste Connections	Mayer Specialty Services LLC
Corporate Address:	2745 N Ohio Street Wichita, Kansas 67219	831 Industrial Road Goddard, Kansas 67052
Firm Size:	National	Local
Licensed in Kansas:	Yes	Yes
Primary Contact:	Herschel West, Owner/Manager Phone: (316) 838-4920 (Rolls Over)	Todd Mayer, Owner/Manager Phone: (316) 794-1165
Evening Phone:	(316) 253-8023	(316) 617-3392
Dedicated Equipment:	Trash dumpsters open top & large construction containers, portable restrooms, debris clean-up & removal	Debris removal
Quoted Price:	Determined per Incident	Determined per Incident

The specific Proposals for each company will be determined at the time of the incident.

