

Sedgwick County

525 North Main Street 3rd Floor
Wichita, KS 67203



*Sedgwick County...
working for you*

Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, July 22, 2015

9:00 AM

BOCC Meeting Room

Board of Sedgwick County Commissioners

Pursuant to Resolution #131-2010, adopted by the Board of County Commissioners on August 11, 2010, members of the public are allowed to address the County Commission for a period of time limited to not more than five minutes.

Anyone who requires an auxiliary aid or service for effective communication, or a modification of policies or procedures to participate in a program, service, or activity of Sedgwick County, should contact the office of Robbie Berry, Sedgwick County Interim ADA Coordinator, 510 N. Main, Suite 306, Wichita, Kansas 67203

Phone: (316) 660-7058, TDD: Kansas Relay at 711 or 800-766-3777

Email: Robbie.Berry@sedgwick.gov, as soon as possible but no later than 48 hours before the scheduled event. Please include the name, location, date and time of the service or program, your contact information and the type of aid, service, or policy modification needed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

CALL MEETING TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Board of the County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kansas, was called to order at 9:05 a.m. on July 22, 2015 in the County Commission Meeting Room in the Courthouse in Wichita, Kansas, by Chairman Richard Ranzau, with the following present: Chair Pro Tem Commissioner Karl Peterjohn; Commissioner David M. Unruh; Commissioner Tim R. Norton; Commissioner James M. Howell; Mr. William P. Buchanan, County Manager; Mr. Rich Euson, County Counselor; Mr. David Spears, Director, Bureau of Public Works; Ms. Kristi Zukovich, Director, Communications; and Ms. Jill Bailey, Deputy County Clerk.

INVOCATION: Reverend Sherdeill Breathett Sr. - St. Mark United Methodist Church

FLAG SALUTE

ROLL CALL

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

RETIREMENTS

- A [15-0489](#) PRESENTATION OF RETIREMENT CLOCK TO ALETA SOBBA.
Presented by: Eileen McNichol, Human Resources Director.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Present the clock.

Ms. Eileen McNichol, Director, Human Resources, greeted the Commissioners and said, "We have the opportunity this morning to honor and thank Aleta Sobba, our Product Support Analyst I, from COMCARE, for her 25 years of service to our community, serving with dedication, commitment and pride. Aleta, congratulations on achieving the employment milestone of your retirement."

Chairman Ranzau said, "I've got a few things to talk about Aleta here first. She was hired February 16th, 1990. George Bush was president. Three of the top five songs that week were 'Opposites Attract' by Paula Abdul, 'Escapade' by Janet Jackson and 'Downtown Train' by Rod Stewart. 'Hard to Kill', with Steven Seagal, was one of the most viewed movies released in 1990.

"She's currently retiring from her position as a Product Support Analyst from COMCARE. Although in the past, she's worked inpatient billing, been a receptionist and a medical secretary position as well, but she's been in electronic medical records since 2002. Aleta also has two sons, Josh and Beau, named after Beau Bridges, but make no mistake her dog, Sasha, runs the house. She has yards of fabric that she'll now have time to work on, and she's quite a seamstress, making her granddaughter's Halloween costumes, every year. Evidently, one year, she dressed up for work as Janis Joplin, which everyone thought was hilarious.

"That being said, she also love, love, loves, John Denver. So it's time for a country road to take her home, I guess. Anyway, here to congratulate her for her many years of service and you say thank you very much for everything you've done for the citizens of Sedgwick County, and we wish you the best of luck in retirement. This clock is heavy. I'm glad to congratulate you."

Ms. Aleta Sobba, COMCARE, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Thank you. It's like Mark Anthony said that if you love what you do, you'll never work a day in your life. That is very much the journey I've had with COMCARE. There's been ups and downs, and loops to loops, but we all made it. Thank you very much."

Commissioner Norton said, "Thank you. Are you trying to impress Commissioner Unruh with those purple shoes?"

Ms. Sobba said, "I'm sorry. I'm all Shocker."

Commissioner Norton said, "Good for you, but I tell you, those purple shoes, you've got to be getting into Commissioner Unruh's head with those."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Thank you very much. I guess now we have Mr. Manager."

Mr. Ron Holt, Acting County Manager, said "Commissioner, I inadvertently left of a standard item on the agenda called Citizen Inquiry. So we need to take an off agenda item to hear from a citizen that has requested to speak this morning."

MOTION

Chairman Ranzau moved to accept the off agenda item, Citizen Inquiry, for consideration.

Commissioner Peterjohn seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

<i>Commissioner Unruh</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Norton</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Howell</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Peterjohn</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Chairman Ranzau</i>	<i>Aye</i>

APPOINTMENTS

- B** [15-0492](#) RESOLUTION REAPPOINTING MEMBERS IN THE POSITIONS OF ARCHITECT, CLASS B CONTRACTOR, PUBLIC-AT-LARGE, MEMBER REPRESENTING REAL ESTATE AND JOINT CITY/COUNTY CLASS A CONTRACTOR (BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSION (BOCC) REAPPOINTMENTS) TO THE METROPOLITAN AREA BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION DEPARTMENT BOARD OF CODE STANDARDS AND APPEALS.
Presented by: Michael Pepoon, Acting County Counselor.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Adopt the Resolution.

Mr. Mike Pepoon, Acting County Counselor, greeted the Commissioners and said, "In 2013 when the City of Wichita and Sedgwick County consolidated Code Enforcement Operations, culminating in the Metropolitan Area of Building and Construction Department (MABCD), three joint boards of the City of Wichita were created. The first board before you today is the Board of [Code] Standards and Appeals, and we have a number of appointments. The suggested appointments this morning are Architect, Greg Wilhite; Class B Contractor, Randy Harder; our Public-At-Large appointment is Daryl Crotts; Member Representing Real Estate, Warren Willenberg; and a jointly appointed Class A Contractor, Randall Coonrod. The resolution is in proper form, and I ask you approve the resolution."

MOTION

Commissioner Peterjohn moved to adopt the resolution.

Commissioner Unruh seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

<i>Commissioner Unruh</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Norton</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Howell</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Peterjohn</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Chairman Ranzau</i>	<i>Aye</i>

Chairman Ranzau said, "It is my understanding, all these appointments will be sworn in at their board meeting; is that correct?"

Mr. Pepoon said, "That's my understanding."

Chairman Ranzau said, "There's no one here today?"

Mr. Pepoon said, "That's my understanding."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Thank you. Next item, please."

Adopted

C [15-0493](#)

RESOLUTION APPOINTING MEMBERS IN THE POSITIONS OF JOURNEYMAN ELECTRICIAN AND ELECTRICAL ENGINEER, AND REAPPOINTING MEMBERS IN THE POSITIONS OF MASTER ELECTRICIAN AND JOINT CITY/COUNTY PUBLIC-AT-LARGE (BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSION (BOCC) APPOINTMENTS AND REAPPOINTMENTS) TO THE METROPOLITAN AREA BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION DEPARTMENT BOARD OF ELECTRICAL APPEALS.

Presented by: Michael Pepoon, Acting County Counselor.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Adopt the Resolution.

Mr. Pepoon said, "This is the Board of Electrical Appeals, and I recommend new appointments, Casey Belnap, replacing Ernest Nelson, for the Journeyman Electrician, Tim Lenz, replacing John Murrell, whose term expired this year as the BoCC (Board of County Commissioner's) Electrical Engineer. Our reappointments to this board are Richard Kretchmar for the BoCC Master Electrician, and the Public-At-Large appointment Brad Ragland. The resolution is in proper form, and I ask that you approve the resolution."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioners, you have the resolution before you. What's the will of the Board?"

MOTION

Commissioner Peterjohn moved to adopt the resolution.

Commissioner Unruh seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

<i>Commissioner Unruh</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Norton</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Howell</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Peterjohn</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Chairman Ranzau</i>	<i>Aye</i>

Chairman Ranzau said, "Are any of those individuals here today to be sworn in? Next item, please."

Adopted

D [15-0494](#)

RESOLUTION APPOINTING A MEMBER IN THE POSITION OF MASTER AIR CONDITIONING AND WARM AIR HEATING CONTRACTOR, AND REAPPOINTING MEMBERS IN THE POSITIONS OF HEATING AND AIR CONDITIONING JOURNEYMAN MECHANIC, MECHANICAL ENGINEER, AND JOINT CITY/COUNTY PUBLIC AT LARGE (BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSION APPOINTMENT AND REAPPOINTMENTS) TO THE METROPOLITAN AREA BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION DEPARTMENT BOARD OF APPEALS OF AIR CONDITIONING, REFRIGERATION AND WARM AIR HEATING.
Presented by: Michael Pepoon, Acting County Counselor.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Adopt the Resolution.

Mr. Pepoon said, "This is the Board of Appeals Air Conditioning, Refrigeration and Warm Air Heating. The recommended appointments are new appointment; Roger Lowenstein. The reappointments to this board are Journeyman Mechanic, Ron Love; Mechanical Engineer, Joe Samia; and Public-At-Large appointment Frank Rash. The resolution is in proper form. I ask that you approve the resolution."

Chairman Ranzau said, "What's the will of the Board?"

MOTION

Commissioner Peterjohn moved to adopt the resolution.

Commissioner Unruh seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

<i>Commissioner Unruh</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Norton</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Howell</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Peterjohn</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Chairman Ranzau</i>	<i>Aye</i>

Chairman Ranzau said, "Once again, I don't believe any of those individuals are here to be sworn in. Next item, please."

Adopted

NEW BUSINESS

E [15-0486](#) **PRESENTATION OF CAREER DEVELOPMENT CERTIFICATES.**
Presented by: Greg Baker, HR Manager of Training.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Present the Certificates.

Mr. Greg Baker, Human Resources, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I'm here with Cheryl Orme from the Division of Human Resources, and this morning we're here to recognize and thank two very special employees for their hard work and dedication to their career development, as each one of them has, this quarter, earned one or more career development certificates. There are four career development certificates available. In Supervisory Management Development, Professional Development, Transitioning to Supervisor and Diversity.

"For each certificate, each employee completes a series of classes, either online or in class. And obtaining these certificates is a very significant accomplishment, as it can be quite a lengthy process. Today we would like to congratulate these employees for their commitment to continuous improvement, and in addition, we'd like to thank those who support our Continuing Employee Development Program, including their supervisors and managers. Today we have Rachel Ryan, who has earned Transitioning to Supervisor and Professional Development. And Kelsea Naegele, who has actually earned all four certificates concurrently; an amazing accomplishment. She's earned Supervisory Management Development, Transitioning to Supervisor, Professional Development, and Diversity.

Chairman Ranzau said, "Congratulations to both of you and to everyone that's on this list for all the hard work that you put in this. We greatly appreciate all the work you do for Sedgwick County and the willingness to improve yourself. Thank you."

Mr. Baker said, "Commissioners, thank you for recognizing these individuals this

morning.”

Chairman Ranzau said, “Do we have any questions or comments from Commissioners? Commissioner Peterjohn.”

Commissioner Peterjohn said, “Just a quick comment. I know there are a number of other folks, who for some reason couldn't be here, but we do have a backup list and want to provide recognition for them to and congratulate them on their accomplishments and achievement in their area. Thank you.”

Chairman Ranzau said, “Madam Clerk, next item, please.”

F [15-0472](#)

CONSIDERATION OF GRANT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$204,454 FOR OPERATIONAL COSTS OF THE JUVENILE DETENTION FACILITY. Presented by: Mark Masterson, Director, Department of Corrections.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approve the application for the grant and authorize the Sedgwick County Department of Corrections to submit the grant agreement to the Kansas Department of Corrections. If awarded authorize acceptance of the grant and establishment of budget authority as provided in the Financial Considerations section of this Request.

Mr. Mark Masterson, Corrections Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, “We’ve been informed by the Kansas Department of Corrections that we’re eligible to receive a funding award from the State Juvenile Detention Facilities Fund. These awards are made available most years, but you can’t count on them. They’re not guaranteed. The funds are provided to help support local costs for operating a Juvenile Detention Facility. In order to receive the award, we must submit a budget plan. For Fiscal Year [20]16, we’re eligible to receive the amount \$204,454. The amount is based upon the licensed capacity at the Juvenile Detention Facility.

“The plan, I propose, is to use the funds to support operational costs for our food services program. I request that you accept the award allocation and approve the plan for the use of the funds.”

Chairman Ranzau said, “Commissioners, what’s the will of the Board?”

MOTION

Commissioner Unruh moved to approve the application for the grant and authorize the Sedgwick County Department of Corrections to submit the grant agreement to the Kansas Department of Corrections.

Commissioner Peterjohn seconded the motion.

Commissioner Peterjohn said, “I noticed that we’ve got a slight increase in the award this year, just a shade under \$14,000. Is there any additional details that you can provide for that reason, Mark?”

Mr. Masterson said, “There’s been a reduction in capacity at Johnson County Facility. So our share of the award went up as their license capacity went down.”

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Okay. So it's based on then the number of youth who are involved in the program. That's what I'm hearing you say. Am I right in that regard, basically?"

Mr. Masterson said, "Just amended a little bit. It's based on the licensed capacity, not the average daily population."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Licensed capacity. Thank you for the clarification. Mr. Chairman, I plan to support this motion. Thank you."

Chairman Ranzau said, "We have a motion and a second. Madam Clerk, please call the vote."

VOTE

<i>Commissioner Unruh</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Norton</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Howell</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Peterjohn</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Chairman Ranzau</i>	<i>Aye</i>

Chairman Ranzau said, "Next item, please."

Mr. Ron Holt, said "We have an off-agenda item to consider, a resolution, if you would, please."

Chairman Ranzau said, "We had a discussion yesterday, staff, about a rate increase, and they asked the commissioners to address that issue today, because the hearing on this is Thursday, I believe."

Mr. Ron Holt, said "That's correct."

MOTION

Chairman Ranzau moved to accept the off agenda item, Westar Energy electric rate increase opposition, for consideration.

Commissioner Peterjohn seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

<i>Commissioner Unruh</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Norton</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Howell</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Peterjohn</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Chairman Ranzau</i>	<i>Aye</i>

OFF AGENDA ITEM

Chairman Ranzau said, "Is Jane here? Just go over there and give us your name and

address for the record, please."

Ms. Jane Burns, 322 South Lorraine, Wichita, KS, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Thank you so much. I have two props with me today, two grandchildren. I moved from Commissioner Peterjohn's district 62 days ago, to be on the east side of town, closer to these grandchildren and my other grandchildren. It was a huge tumultuous project, and worth it. Quality of life is worth it. I have always been a financially; fiscally responsible person. Put myself through college twice there three jobs at a time, scholarships, and student loans.

"Fiscal responsibility is certainly important, but so is quality of life. I'm addressing the budget item today. I was told I could get three minutes, and I hope to make it in two. But I do want to request, urge all of you to both balance fiscal responsibility and quality of life. When I was growing up north of North High, the highlight of my summer was to go down to the Central Riverside Zoo, which morphed into a much smaller issue. The Sedgwick County Zoo, however, is not only a massive enlargement of kid zoo's world, not only an addition to quality of life, but it's also usually, most years, the number one visitor attraction in the entire state; that is, quality of life translates into economic development. I really appreciate your taking me and my partners on today.

"Thank you so much for this moment to speak on behalf of considering quality of life issues along with, you know roads. Thank you very much."

MOTION

Commissioner Ranzau moved to receive and file the comments from Citizen Inquiry.

Commissioner Peterjohn seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

<i>Commissioner Unruh</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Norton</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Howell</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Peterjohn</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Chairman Ranzau</i>	<i>Aye</i>

Chairman Ranzau said, "Mr. Manager, I know we are working on amending our policy, but I think the intent is to have Citizen Inquiry here so we don't have to take anything off agenda, and I know we're kind of busy with the budget and stuff, but once we're through with that, we want to kind of make that a priority and finalize that."

Mr. Ron Holt, said "I made myself and note and will follow up."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Next item, please."

Approved

G [15-0496](#)

AUTHORIZE THE PUBLICATION OF THE MAXIMUM PROPERTY TAX LEVY TO FUND THE 2016 SEDGWICK COUNTY BUDGET AND ESTABLISH PUBLIC BUDGET HEARINGS ON JULY 29 AND AUGUST 6, 2015.

Presented by: Lindsay Poe Rousseau, Budget Director.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Authorize the publication of the maximum property tax levy to fund the 2016 budget and notice of the public budget hearing on August 6, 2015.

Ms. Lindsay Poe Rousseau, Budget Director, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Before you this morning is a request for authorization to publish the notice of the final public budget hearing, which also establishes the maximum budget and property tax levy for the 2016 budget. State law does require that we hold at least one public hearing on the budget each year. It further requires that we publish the time and place of that budget hearing at least 10 days prior to the hearing. This notice before you today serves that purpose. That notice, in addition to including the time and place of the hearing must include the maximum proposed budget and the maximum proposed tax levy to support that 2016 budget. This date is often referred to as the last up day, because the total budget for property tax supported funds and the maximum property tax levy cannot be increased, after this date, without republication of the required notice and holding an additional public hearing."

"As submitted to you in the 2016 proposed budget, the maximum proposed budget for Sedgwick County is \$394,143,119 to be funded with a maximum proposed tax levy of \$129,580,173. The proposed tax levy is based on an estimated mill levy rate of 29.359 mills. In addition to a public hearing, to be held in this room, on Wednesday, July 29th at 9:00 a.m., the publication outlines a second public hearing, that will also be held in this room on Thursday, August 6th at 6 P.M. Budget adoption is scheduled for August 12th and we will submit our certified budgets to the Clerk, per state law, on August 25th. I'd be happy to stand for questions. If there are none, I recommend you authorize the publication."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Thank you, Lindsay. Commissioners, what's the will of the Board? Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think this is the time where we have to make changes to the budget. At least the last number in the budget has to be changed, at this time, if we're going to do that at all this year; is that correct?"

Ms. Rousseau said, "If we're going to, this is the maximum proposed budget for the property tax funds and the maximum proposed tax levy."

Commissioner Howell said, "Do you know what it costs Sedgwick County to publish the information in the paper?"

Ms. Rousseau said, "I don't know. I can find out that information and send you a note."

Commissioner Howell said, "Now, Lindsay I did talk to you prior to this meeting, and I did make a request. I'm not sure you were able to get that together or not."

Ms. Rousseau said, "I'm not. If we could recess, I could try and put that information together."

Commissioner Howell said, "How much time do you think you would need to do that?"

Ms. Rousseau said, "I would appreciate 15 minutes, up to 30 minutes if the Board would be willing to entertain that."

Commissioner Howell said, "Let me explain what I'm after here, and I'll make that motion. But there is one item in this budget that I think has caused a lot of misunderstanding in the community, and it's been commented about widely in the news media and otherwise, and so I'd like to visit that issue a little bit, and that deals with the issue of resetting the mill levy. As we've explained that in the past, and I understand it completely. What happens, we're not allowed to set the mill levy as you've explained. We can only set the dollar value in the budget. Even today when we make the motion, we're not really setting the mill levy. We can estimate what that will be. Today, should we not make any changes, it would be approximately 29.359 mills. That's the target in this budget as it was presented. But we know what will happen. There will be some technical adjustments and it will go down. The assessed valuation will go down and the mill levy will be slightly above this 29.359, because it happens every year."

"What happens is the Appraiser's office makes changes to assessed value situation and the Clerk has to calculate that after the appeals process is moving forward. It just delivers less dollars to the county, and therefore, the mill levy, to deliver the same dollars we approved here, does require a technical adjustment each and every single year; is that correct?"

Ms. Rousseau said, "Yes, the Appraiser's office does provide that information to the Clerk's office."

Commissioner Howell said, "I wasn't here in 2010, and that was the last time I think the commission really took up the idea of trying to lower the mill levy with a vote. They intentionally lowered the mill levy in 2010. There was a vote, I think 3-2, and I think Commissioner Peterjohn was one of the ones that voted for that, and I think it's his intention to try to maintain that number, 29.359. That's been his goal, and I am sympathetic to that. I would love to see that happen. But that has created a lot of consternation and misunderstanding throughout the community. I guess my goal would be to deal with this slightly differently. I would like to see us do something every single year, from this point forward, and that would be we would estimate the amount of that technical adjustment, and we would anticipate that and intend to keep the mill levy level with this year's 2015's mill levy."

"Last year's mill levy was 29.478. And if I intend to keep it at 29.478, the average, as I understand correctly is about \$102,000 to \$105,000 is what we would expect in technical adjustments. Is that a good estimate?"

Ms. Rousseau said, "I think I would want to take a look at those numbers, but the technical adjustment actually doesn't serve to adjust the property taxes that we receive. It serves to essentially derive the same amount of dollars. And so, if we were to increase the property tax levy to 29.478 mills, like Mr. Chronis had discussed during the presentation on Monday, we actually would expect to have additional property tax revenue collections, not necessarily the levy, but collections of about \$512,000."

Commissioner Howell said, "Right. I understand that. What I'm trying to say, if my intents was after the technical adjustments were made, so I know it's going to happen down the road, and the in the process, technical adjustments are made, if we approve the budget as you just described a second ago, by next year, it will not be 29.478 [mills], it would be something slightly higher than that because technical adjustments

will be made later this year.

Ms. Rousseau said, "Typically we have seen that those technical adjustments do serve to increase the mill levy rate, but there was an instance, actually, fairly recently where the mill levy rate did actually go down as a result of the technical adjustments."

Commissioner Howell said, "Is there any way we can ascertain what an average year would deliver in terms of technical adjustment to the mill levy?"

Ms. Rousseau said, "I could take a look at what those rates have been in the recommended budget versus how it has come out November 1st. I'm not sure I have that information with me right now."

*Commissioner Howell said, "Well, if it were possible, I would like to come up with some type of reasonable science type approach to finding out what is an average amount of expected technical adjustments, and based on what the current mill levy would deliver would be about \$130,103,986 would be based on 29.478 mills. Subtract the amount of that technical adjustment, the average amount from that number, and recalculate the mill levy based on those dollars, what the difference would be. I'm not really making sense here. What I'm trying to say is, something less than \$130 million is what it's going to be, slightly. It will be \$129 million, a very small amount. And then after we get all done, when they make the technical adjustments to this, it will come back to the 29.478. That's my goal. What would it take to do that?
If I wanted to try to maintain that after technical adjustments? We don't know what it's going to be exactly, but we can try to target that."*

Ms. Rousseau said, "Well, it's very difficult, I would say, to have any type of certainty, because that variation does change quite a bit from year to year. For example, last year our estimate during recommended budget was a 1.5% growth. What we ended up seeing in November was 1.1%. Over the course of the years, those numbers have changed rather dramatically, so I think it would be pretty challenging to do that with any kind of certainty."

Commissioner Howell said, "The issue that's before us, what was proposed in the budget was an effort to make it go back to 2010 levels, and that, I think I read it has a cost of about \$512,000, I believe."

Ms. Rousseau said, "Yes, sir."

Commissioner Howell said, "So we're going to have a \$512,000 less revenue as a result of trying to target the 29.359 mill levy."

Ms. Rousseau said, "Yes, sir."

Commissioner Howell said, "I guess, if it were possible, I would like to try to target a 29.478, because that is the current rate, but after what we would expect for technical adjustments, and I don't know how we would do that, but I would ask you to give me a reasonable approach on how to estimate an average amount of technical adjustments, subtract them from the \$130,103,986, and then calculate the mill levy from that dollar figure and then after technical adjustments, hopefully, we will come right back to 29.478. Does that make sense?"

Ms. Rousseau said, "I understand the request. I'm not confident that we could do that"

to an accurate degree, especially if we were trying to do that within the next 15 minutes or 30 minutes, just because we're running up against some of the deadlines for the budget process, and that we back away from that August 25th deadline. If we were to put this off until your next meeting, which is in two weeks, am I understanding correctly that that's what you were wanting to do?"

Commissioner Howell said, "Does that give us time to publish things before the budget has to be adopted."

Ms. Rousseau said, "It would not, not according to statutory deadlines."

Commissioner Howell said, "Are we allowed to take this action on the 29th? Because we are meeting next week for public comment."

Ms. Rousseau said, "The public hearing that's scheduled now for August 6th, we would need to have at least 10 full days to advertise that. So if we were to meet on the 29th, we would not be compliant with the notice requirements."

Commissioner Howell said, "So we really have to do this today."

Ms. Rousseau said, "Unfortunately, I think so."

Commissioner Howell said, "I guess I would like you to make an effort to do what I've asked, if possible, and I would make a motion we would recess for 15 to 30 minutes and give you time to do that so I can make a motion to make that change to our budget. I apologize for not having this prepared ahead of time, but being a new Commissioner, this is one of those things that I'm still learning, but I do think it's important that we get this right. It means something to the community."

"Are we essentially trying to cut taxes this year, although I'm always in favor of tax cuts. That really isn't the intent of that line item in the budget. The line item in the budget trying to reset it back to what Commissioners did in 2010 and no Commissioner ever voted to increase taxes since then, but the tax rate has gone up slightly every year because of technical adjustments. As a result of that, there is an effort to put a technical correction back in the budget to correct what has happened over the last five years."

"I guess I would say much of that is water under the bridge, and in fact, we're treating the fire district differently than we are the rest of our budget. The fire district has no attempt to reset its mill levy, although it has also increased over the last five years. So we are a little bit inconsistent. To me, I think the intent ought to be that we would do this every year. So if I could ask for right now; I make a motion that we recess for 15 to 30 minutes to give you time to recalculate that for me, please."

Ms. Rousseau said, "Commissioner, if I could make one other suggestion for consideration, today's action just sets a maximum. It's not adopting the budget with a proposed tax levy. It's not doing any of that. It's just setting a maximum. Even if we were to adjust the mill levy rate to 29.478 mills and see how that affects both the proposed spending and the proposed tax levy, there would still be time to make those adjustments."

Commissioner Howell said, "So I can make this change after the publication, and it would still be legal to do so?"

Ms. Rousseau said, "Absolutely. This is just advertising the maximum."

Commissioner Howell said, "And for the listeners, I would like to let you know, I did try to get answers to that question this morning from two different people, and I was led to believe I had to do this at this time. So, I apologize for wasting the people's time, and I will look forward to hearing that calculation from you down the road, and I hope to make that motion. Thank you very much. I will retract my motion for recess."

Commissioner Unruh said, "You will retract your motion?"

Commissioner Howell said, "I will take it back. Withdraw my motion for recess."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "We're talking about a last up day, supposedly, but we haven't had any of the public hearings and gotten the input. In the past when this Commission has voted to raise property taxes, it did so of at public hearings. My understanding is they went ahead and republished and after the tax hike was put in place, they did so. And the concern I have, I think, for the public, in terms of the confusion, what we're trying to do here today is basically establish a framework, in terms of it's a formal presentation of the budget, but when you say it's the last up day, my understanding is that the commission can vote to whatever fees, taxes, revenue enhancements or other and also, conversely, appropriations. We still have full ability to make changes after we do this. It may entail requiring a republication, I thought I heard you say, but we can still make those changes after this date. So this is kind of a roadmap, as opposed to a destination, for the motion that we're doing today to facilitate the public discussion that we're going to have at least two public hearings. I'm perfectly amenable to getting more input as opposed to less, going down the line. So let me try and phrase this as a question, Lindsay, and not keep you standing up as long as we had Chris standing up here on Monday."

Ms. Rousseau said, "Thank you."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Hopefully you've got comfortable shoes on, but I'll try and keep it short. We've got, basically, full latitude to change county revenues and expenditures as part of this process regardless of this publication. So when we say it's the last up day, it's basically for publication and legal purposes, but it doesn't prevent the Commission from taking further action as part of this budget process and changing either revenues or expenditures, right?"

Ms. Rousseau said, "In terms of the total budget, for our property tax supported funds, this does set the limit. We could do a republication, like you say. That does require another 10 days before we hold another public hearing. So we could have some issues in terms of butting up against those statutory deadlines. But in terms of the actual budget, we do have a little more than \$18 million in the contingency reserves, and so that budget authority could be reallocated within the budget between now and budget adoption, absolutely. We also could change other revenues. This publication serves to lock in our property tax levy."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "But if a majority of this commission decided to raise the levy, like we did in 2006, there's nothing that would prevent the Commission from doing so, assuming that they go through the public hearing and republication process?"

Ms. Rousseau said, "Right. We are in kind of the last days in order to meet our deadlines for the August 25th deadline. So there is a small amount of flexibility, I would say."

Mr. Ron Holt, said "Mr. Chairman, at the expense of confusing rather than clarifying, the action you're taking today is the publication of the maximum property tax levy to fund the 2016 budget. Back to Commissioner Howell's request, if he wanted to lower the \$512,000, approving this budget today, you have full and total flexibility to do that. If you wanted to do something that would raise the \$512,000 that's tied to that 29.359 mills, then you'll have to find some other place to get that fund, or you would have to go through the process of readopting the budget and publication. But based on what Commissioner Howell has indicated that he wants to suggest and have discussions with, adopting this resolution today gives you total freedom and flexibility to do that."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Mr. Chronis, do you have anything to add before we go on?"

Mr. Chronis said, "I fear we may be getting into a ditch here."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Please dig us out."

Mr. Chronis said, "Well, I'll try. You have before you two suggested motions. The first one, the one that is on a blue sheet of paper, is the motion that would be required if you expect to advertise a budget and a tax levy that is equal to the recommended budget that was presented to you on Monday, and that has, as we said, an estimated property tax rate that is equal to the actual property tax rate, the estimated property tax rate, I think it was, in 2010. If you want to do as Commissioner Howell is suggesting and adopt a budget that has an estimated tax rate equal to the current year's tax rate, then I think the appropriate action would be to adopt the motion that is on the white sheet of paper, the alternative motion."

Commissioner Howell said, "They don't have that, I've not handed that out yet. I was reserving that until I was ready for that motion."

Mr. Chronis said, "As Mr. Holt just said, what you're doing today is adopting the maximum amount of spending authority or budget and the maximum amount of property taxes that can fund that budget. From this point forward, once that advertisement is published, you are permitted to adopt either a budget or a property tax level to fund that budget that is lower than what has been advertised but not higher. If the ad is published as is sheet of paper, then if Commissioner Howell wishes to make adjustments to try and compensate for what we might expect technical adjustments to be, those adjustments could be made subsequently."

"On the other hand, if you adopt the blue motion and we do as Commissioner Peterjohn was suggesting and subsequently decide to go back to 29.478, the current mill levy, you could not do that without going back through the republication process, and you could not go back through the republication process and meet the statutory deadline for providing a certified adopted budget to the County Clerk on, or before, August the 25th. Commissioner Peterjohn, in the year in which the Commission

consciously raised the amount of property tax revenue to fund the budget, that anticipated increase was in the budget at the very beginning. It was what was advertised in the original advertisement. There was no need to republish. You're absolutely correct, that the Commission has the ability to adopt a budget at whatever level it might choose, funded with whatever property tax it might choose, provided that it goes through the republication process. But that very act of going through the republication process would consume time that we simply don't have. We could not do that and meet the statutory deadline. Now, we can certainly, at any time, we can adopt a budget and then subsequently, at any time, adopt an amendment to that budget and republish that amendment and go back through the hearing process. That is allowed under state law. But we have to do the first budget by August 25th."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Chris, if the intent is to spend an extra \$500,000, isn't it possible to pass the budget, the blue sheet, and then take money out of operations and allocate that? We have an operational contingency of about \$18 million. Couldn't you take \$500,000 and allocate that towards whatever additional spending the Commissioner wanted to do. Could we not do that?"

Mr. Chronis said, "Yes."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Chris, I have a question. Is it fair to point to one particular revenue action and tie it to revenue reduction? For example, is it fair to say that the desire to maintain the mill levy at 2010 levels has directly caused a special reduction in revenue or spending in some other area? Isn't the budget a function of multiple things, together?"

Mr. Chronis said, "Oh, yes. Yes."

Chairman Ranzau said, "I mean, for example, our growth of 1.5 percent versus 1.9 percent caused us to lose over \$500,000 in revenue. Increased health insurance costs of over \$400,000 in ObamaCare taxes is over \$430,000. I mean, it's really not fair to say any one of those things caused a specific reduction in expenditure somewhere else in the budget. They all worked together at the same time."

Mr. Chronis said, "Yes, I agree with that."

Chairman Ranzau said, "I think Commissioner Norton was next."

Commissioner Norton said, "Okay. That's fine. Personally, I think we're majoring in the minors here. This is very insignificant to the total budget that we're putting together. I've always talked to the public about this. You can talk all you want about the tax rate, but at the end of the day, it's the tax bill that shows up that people have to pay that they're more worried about. There have been years where we set the rate lower and people's tax bills went up because their assessed evaluation went up, which we don't totally control. That goes through the Department of Revenue and there's a lot of rules and regulations our Appraiser comes up with. We could say, we got you a lower tax rate, yet their tax bill still goes up because of the assessed valuation, and there are other jurisdictions that have raised their tax bill. In fact, I get a lot of questions because it's on a Sedgwick County piece of paper, that Sedgwick County raised my taxes. Well, if you looked at it, it wasn't Sedgwick County. It was a bond issue from a school district. It was a cemetery rate. It was a special assessment. It was many other things that go into the total tax bill. Generally, for me, people talk to me more about the dollars they have to spend, and that impact, than what the rate ends up being after

a technical adjustment, which is usually very small and insignificant. Along with that, for me, it's about setting a dollar amount of a budget that we need to run a responsible, financial responsible, but quality of life responsible budget for the County of Sedgwick. And that's what we're charged with doing; is setting a maximum budget today of property tax funds, not our total budget, and then let it shake out based on the appraisal that, unfortunately, comes much after we set all of this to fix the rate. I would just as soon set a 29.478 rate today and the dollar amount of that that gives us a little wiggle room."

"Commissioner Howell, if then we want to go down a little bit in how much we spend, we set that after we go through budget hearings. I think it's prudent to have a little wiggle room going into this based on the kind of feedback I've gotten from the public already. Obviously this budget contains some items that many in the public are not warm to. Now, they be very conservative. They can be very interested in quality of life issues, but at the end of the day, many people are going to weigh in one way or another. And I would rather have a little wiggle room going into the public hearings if we have to change what we've done. Now, I don't know if there's going to be any will to do that. It's not my call. But I would always rather go in with a little ability to do what the public wants us to do. The one thing that concerns me, is that it sounds like we've nailed down this budget and it is what it is and if we have public hearings, it doesn't matter, because we're going to stay the course with what we put on paper already. And I've found over the years that that's not the case. If it isn't the case, we don't even need to have the public hearings. We don't need to be transparent. We don't need to listen to anybody. We don't have to have an online ability for people to weigh in as the constituents that we serve.

"So for me, I don't have a problem with going with the second motion here, the 29.478, and the dollars it raised, because the truth is we can always spend less, and after we go through the public hearings, we can come up with a budget for property taxes of less. Is that not correct?"

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

Commissioner Norton said, "We can't go over that, and whatever the mill levy is based on the appraised values. So for me, it's about two things, a responsible budget that meets the needs of the community, whatever that dollar amount is, and we'll debate that, and then secondly, the amount of taxes that taxpayers, individual taxpayers and businesses will have to pay to meet that obligation. And the mill levy rate just kind of falls out afterwards.

It would be nice, I agree with you, Commissioner Howell, Commissioner Peterjohn, to know exactly what that was. It would be nice if the appraisal rates came in two weeks ago and we knew exactly what that number is, but we don't. We are not going to know, and there's going to be a technical adjustment whether we like it or not. It's been that way every year I've been a County Commissioner. It was that way when I was the Mayor of Hayesville, and it's that way when I was the Finance Committee Chair as a Council Member of Hayesville. You just set it and know that you're going to have a little bit of a squeaky adjustment. But truthfully, it's the dollar amount, that the total macro community pays at a microlevel on their tax bill that's important. And we have the

responsibility to do two things, try to keep costs down and be financially responsible, but to run a budget that meets the needs of our community as we see it. That's all I have."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We've had lots of discussion here. I hope it brought clarity rather than confusion out of all of this. First of all, I need to say that I'm in agreement with what I think Commissioner Howell was trying to do here. As a matter of fact, I was going to make a motion or substitute motion that did exactly what he has suggested, because I don't think that we should, before the final certified numbers are in, just arbitrarily reduce our funding stream by \$512,000, which is a number that we do know. I realize we don't quite know the quotient, yet, because we can't do that type of mathematics until the end of September. I think that it is not wise of us to move from this year's estimated revenue stream, reduce it arbitrarily, for next year, when there are just so many unknowns, and there is so many needs out there. If the way we're going currently in our budget conversation is to use cash funding for so many of the projects and use reserves and contingencies to help accomplish that, I think to reduce our revenue is not the thing to do. Definitely nobody wants to increase. There is nobody here that wants to increase that. I think we've had mill levy reductions, starting in 2009. Was that when we rolled it back one mill, and in 2010 a half a mill, and in 2011 a half a mill, because the commissions realized we could accomplish what we needed to do without that excess revenue."

"This year, because of discussions we're having and community input, I think we ought to maintain our current revenue, and that would mean not reduce it by that \$512,000 and that approximate .119 mill levy reduction but instead keep it at that same level, and then if in the next couple of weeks we say, no, we're not going to spend it. We don't need it, then we can reduce that. So far, I haven't said anything wrong, have I, Lindsay?"

Ms. Rousseau said, "No, sir."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Okay, good. And one of the reasons I think we need to keep that revenue level at least through this planning session is we really don't know about a couple of significant impacts that might happen next year. We don't know what's going to be the ongoing financial impact of the motor vehicle tax, which could be big, significant. The \$500,000 we're talking about is just going to be a small part of that. But that's a huge exposure we have. So cutting this down to a bare minimum now, I don't think is the best thing to do. The way that the county property sales tax is calculated, we reduce our mill levy, we also get a smaller portion of that one cent sales tax. Isn't that the way that formula works?"

Ms. Rousseau said, "It could. It depends on everyone else's mill levy rates."

Commissioner Unruh said, "It depends on what everyone else is doing, but we expose ourselves to less revenue from the one cent sales tax, because we reduce our mill levy. I know it's a complicated formula, but that's the result of it. That's a significant exposure, I think. And the third thing is that presently it appears that we're going to be

under restrictions from state government on property tax restrictions. I guess there is a question, whether you call it a lid or a cap, or what you call it. but nevertheless, that's something that will carry forward and restrict our ability to run our business here, and it's based on revenue.

"So if we just arbitrarily say, well, we're not going to do \$500,000, we make that decision now, I believe that perhaps it's not a big influence, but it is an influence going forward. So for those reasons, I think that I'm in agreement with what I think Commissioner Howell is going to propose after all of this conversation, if we can keep it straight. Anyway, those are my comments at this point, and I'm going to be supportive of what I think the Commissioner is going to suggest."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You've heard, I think, an extended discussion, and I would agree with Commissioner Norton's comments in terms of there's a lot less here that meets the eye in terms of major. But the confusion, complication and difficulty of understanding the lack of clarity here goes to my point that I made that I think we need to get Sedgwick County out of the property tax business. We can leave that to the other property tax jurisdictions and the county's mill levy, we do that on a revenue neutral way, if the state law can be changed to help us, have that authority to get that changed, and remove whether it's 29.47 or 29.35 or any number greater than 0. To do that would require a change in state law, but the challenge we have today is because we have a very flawed state law. In my view, it's been flawed for quite a period of time. We're in a situation here where we're discussing how the mill levy increased from 29.35 mills and I came on the commission in 2009. I was here for the initial reductions that occurred, but I have watched the mill levy increase and none of my colleagues, or myself, wanted to raise it. It's still a little bit higher today than it was in 2010. The discussion has been that the mill levy has been flat. Somehow we are taxing a little over \$.5 million more, per year. I think that's a flaw in the process. We need simplification, clarity and accountability. I think this Commission should not only set a dollar amount for their budget, but we need to set the mill levy. We don't have that authority, under state law, I'm being told. I think we should be accountable, we should set, not only the dollar amount, I think that's appropriate, but we should set the mill levy.

"In progressive parts of the country where there's accountability for elected officials, they do that. Here in Kansas, I'm sorry, we don't and we have this situation where a number of governmental bodies will say well, we didn't vote to raise the mill levy. People will say well our property taxes went up and part of it can be the appraisal process, but part of it is the fact that we have a system where because of the continuing adjustments in the entire process, we have a mill levy that increased \$.5 million, roughly.

"The tax base was a little bit smaller in 2010 than it is today, so the dollar amount is not identical. I do not remember any of my colleagues saying that they wanted to increase the mill levy, since I've been on the County Commission, but it's higher today than it was in 2010, and that's a fact. I would like to keep it where it is, for discussion purposes. I would be willing to make a motion, Mr. Chairman, when we get to the appropriate time, to keep it where the Commission has said that they wanted it to be, and promised to do so, but having said that, I can understand the point that Commissioner Howell saying when I took the Oath of Office, Sedgwick County's mill

levy was 29.47 mills. That's a fact. We are having taxation, albeit a very small way, without clarity. I think that it's incumbent upon us that we try to clarify this system. I would also like to say that I am quite interest in hearing from the public and having a budget that will meet the concerns of providing key county services, as well as trying to do the best that we can, for County Taxpayers, and that is going to be my focus, Mr. Chairman. “

MOTION

Commissioner Peterjohn moved to authorize the publication of a Notice of Public Hearing, regarding the Sedgwick County Fiscal Year 2016 Budget. Publications shall include a total budget of \$394,143,119 and an ad valorem property tax levy of \$129,580,173, which is approximately equivalent to 29.359 mills, based on the estimated assessed valuation and subject to technical adjustments.

Chairman Ranzau seconded the motion.

Chairman Ranzau said, “Commissioner Howell.”

Commissioner Howell said, “Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a number of responses I'd like to share. I disagree with Commissioner Norton that this is insignificant. The public has made this significant. I don't think, generally, they look at this as what it was intended. The comments I am reading and hearing are saying that the Commission is cutting taxes and then they've got a budget shortfall and they have to slash agencies across communities that they care about. If we were truly intending to cut taxes, I don't think we would be cutting it .119 mills. That is a technical adjustment, basically trying to counteract what's happened over the last five years. I don't think this is insignificant. It's insignificant in the fact that it's a tiny little number. It's insignificant that people don't, generally, understand mill levies, they understand dollars. I wish we could talk dollars, but we do have to be aware of the mill levy.

“The mill levy is actually what drives the dollars, so we have to have that discussion: I would disagree that this is insignificant in terms of the public perception of what we're trying to accomplish here today. I also disagree with Commissioner Norton that we're not listening to the people and that the public commentary is unnecessary if we're not going to make changes.

“I think we are going to hear from people, and I have no doubt there will be tweaks in our budget going forward. So I again will reiterate what I said before. I'm anxious to hear from people, and we are listening, and we will be making adjustments the best we possibly can, at least I intend to, to try to make this budget as good as possible.

“I do agree with Commissioner Peterjohn that the process is not ideal. The State of Kansas has set in statute the process that we have to follow, and unfortunately, we are not allowed, as a governing body, to set the mill levy. As a result of this, we have allowed the property taxes to increase year over year because of the process, not by the will of the Commission. And so, again, I would like to point out once again that when I was elected, the mill levy was 29.478. It is my intention at the end of the day, after technical adjustments, to be 29.478. I'm not going to vote for a tax increase. And I am sympathetic to the Commissioners trying to reduce it down to the 2010 level. Let me ask why the 2010 level? There's other years we could pick. We could pick 2009. We could pick something back in the 2000's, 2002. Why 2010? I think it's arbitrary. It's water under the bridge.

"At this point, I would like to not allow the mill levy to creep up as it does every year, but I think what's happened in the past is gone now, and it's time for us to address this differently. So I guess I would say 29.478 should be our target and our base going forward. And I think we need to plan on technical adjustments in the budget and make sure we compensate for that and try to maintain that level going forward. And that ought to be understood by the public that is not a tax increase, and it's not actually a tax cut, it's neither. It is trying to maintain that level. I anticipate it there will people out there that will say, well, Commissioner Howell, you voted for tax increase today. I would argue that as not true. It was 29.478 when I was elected, and I plan, I hope and plan it to be 29.478 next year at the same time, that is my goal. And so that is not a tax increase and it's not a tax cut.

"I do appreciate the comments from Commissioner Unruh. I do think that this is not the right time to make this adjustment. And I think that having options on the table is good for us. So I'm going to make an alternate motion, or a substitute motion, in just a moment. But having options going forward, if we are going to go with Commissioner Peterjohn's motion right now, that limits us going forward. And to some degree I appreciate that, having limits on ourselves is good, because as governing officials it's easy not to be principled. And so I do appreciate, believe it or not, I actually think the tax lid that the state has imposed on us is actually a good thing. These are reasonable limits, and I think we need to have boundaries that we should operate within, and so part of me would like to for that motion today, because it does force us to prioritize, it does force us to be conservative and although I do appreciate that, I'm going to be making a substitute motion. But before I do that, I want to just do two more things.

"One is a discussion about this budget being transformational and much different than before. I would say it's 99 percent the same as what we had before. It's essentially the same budget process and the same budget over all. My other changes overall. There is a desire to not depend on borrowing as we have in the past from ending balances and reduce our savings accounts, so to speak, that are set aside for different purposes. There's a desire not to lean on bonding, as we have in the past. Because it just sets you up for more difficult budgets going forward. So, I'm going to stick to those issues, going forward. I'm not going to waiver on those ideas. This is not what this is about. I do think those are good goals for the Commission, and I plan to stick to those. But with respect to this second criticism of the mill levy, I'm going to make a substitute motion."

MOTION

Commissioner Howell moved to authorize the publication of a notice of public hearing regarding the Sedgwick County 2016 budget. Publication shall include a total \$394,625,119.00 and ad valorem property tax levy of \$130,103,986.00, which is approximately equivalent to 29.478 mills based on the estimated assessed evaluation and subject to technical adjustments.

Commissioner Unruh seconded the motion.

Commissioner Howell said, "Can I add a small sentence to the end of that? Would that be in order? I would like there to be an additional understanding to that, and that would say something to the effect of, and I'll try to say this right, after historical technical adjustments, the mill levy is estimated to be approximately 29.478 mills. I'd like to add that idea to the end of that statement, and if you want me to say that more clearly,

after technical adjustments, actually I take that back. I'll make that motion when we make adjustments to this in the budget process. I will withdraw my comments and stick with my motion as written. Thank you."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Are you done?"

Commissioner Howell said, "I am done."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh said, "I don't have to say any more, I don't think."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Okay, Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate Commissioner Howell's comments concerning the requirement that voters get to approve property tax increases the way they get to approve sales tax increases, which is legislative intent in Topeka. I think that's a progressive reform that this state has needed for a long time, and allow us to catch up with three of our surrounding states that already empower their voters to make those key decisions. I want to include the voters in the process. I want to include the taxpayers in the process, make sure their voices can get heard. Because when we hold meetings like we are today during a weekday, during working hours for most folks, I know it's a challenge from a lot of people to be able to be here with us. I want to stand by my comment, though, that I think for Commissioners who made the commitments and were here when we were doing budgets in 2010 and [20]11, the word was, we're going to keep the county mill levy flat. We're not going to be raising the mill levy.

"So for those of us who were here longer than, who were back in 2010 or [20]11, this motion would be, albeit, very tiny, less than a mill increase in the property tax, and of course, just for the record, I mean, the budget challenge we face, we could continue doing business as usual. There is an easy solution to some of the budget changes, the reductions and some of the increases, some of the cuts. We could eliminate just about all the funding pain that's included with the draft budget that was presented to us Monday. Raise the mill levy a couple mills, and that spending could continue.

"Now, I wasn't elected on that platform. A commitment was made, by my view, for those of us who were here on this bench back in 2010, 2011, and we said our word was we weren't going to raise the mill levy. So I can't be supportive of this motion today, but I would, but I certainly understand the intent. I think part of the problem we've got here is tied to the fact that we've got some flawed state laws we're living under, and it's making our process more opaque, more complicated, and that creates a situation where there is less accountability and more confusion. I will not be supporting this motion today. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Lindsay, Commissioner Howell has made a substitute motion that desires 29.478 mill levy. What are the chances, when this is all said and done, that it will be exactly 29.478?"

Ms. Poe-Rousseau said, "In my experience, that's unlikely to be the exact rate."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Is it more likely that it will be higher or lower than that? What's

happened historically?"

Ms. Poe-Rousseau said, "Historically, more times than not, the rate has gone up."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Gone up, so we will actually end up with even higher than what is intended if historical, based on historical experience?"

Ms. Poe-Rousseau said, "Potentially."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Right. I won't be supportive of the substitute motion either. I do agree with Commissioner Norton that we want a responsible budget and we want to be considerate in the amount of taxes that people pay, and I believe the original motion does that. It does maintain our optionw. We have plenty of options. We have plenty of contingency dollars; we have over \$8 million just in operating contingency alone that maintains our options, so there is no need to raise the mill levy. This is not an arbitrary number. As Commissioner Peterjohn said, the previous Commission intentionally lowered the mill levy, I think, a half a mill. The intent ever since then has been to maintain that. Through technical adjustments, it has crept up.

"This is simply an attempt to maintain that. The overall tax bill is related to two things. It is related to the mill levy and the appraisal value. We can't do much on appraisal value, but we can hold the line on the mill levy. You know, I heard from, I went to thousands of doors last year and heard from lots of people. The number one thing I heard was property taxes, don't raise them. In fact, I had many, many people say lower them. Make cuts to do what you have to do to lower property taxes. I can't afford more property taxes. There's a lot of people out there hurting that live day to day. Every little bit helps. It's easy to say this is only so much amount of money, but that's how we end up incrementally increasing the burden upon taxpayers. A little bit here, a little bit there, all different layers of government. It adds up.

"Keep in mind we just had in Topeka the largest tax increase in the history of Kansas. So this is an effort to maintain the property tax levels of what the Commission intended to do. And I think that's consistent with what my constituents want to be done. That being said, there's people on both sides of the aisle. Some people say raise the mill levy. A lot of people say lower the mill levy. I don't care what neighborhood I went to, the number one biggest issue I heard was, don't raise my taxes, keep my property taxes low.

"The substitute motion does in fact raise the mill levy and the spending from the proposed, the original intent of the original motion. I think it actually does lock in a tax increase, so I'm not going to vote for this tax increase, and I think Commissioners may be disappointed that throughout the years they'll continue to see even more increases from even the 29.48 [sic], because that's what historically happens. And so we'll be back to the same point of trying to bring it back to those levels. Otherwise, it's just going to keep creeping up like it has in other municipalities. And one last thing, you can't pin one particular reduction on one particular thing, whether it be this or anything else that's going on in our budget. It all comes together, and we have plenty of options with the original motion, as I said. We have millions of dollars in contingency. We don't have to increase spending or the mill levy. So, as I've said, I won't be supportive of this motion. Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chronis, could you tell us again, what was the dollar value that this tax cut would be equivalent to? In terms of per home, a \$100,000 home, what was that number you gave us?"

Mr. Chronis said, "I don't believe I gave it to you, but my recollection is that it was a \$1.37. Yes. For a \$100,000 home, having an appraised value of \$100,000, it would amount to \$1.37."

Commissioner Howell said, "And that's per year?"

Mr. Chronis said, "Per year, yes."

Commissioner Howell said, "So a little more than a dime per month type of deal?"

Mr. Chronis said, "Yes."

Commissioner Howell said, "If we pass the substitute motion today, we still have options to, in fact, go to exactly what the original motion stated. We still have that option going forward without having to republish? So we have more options. If we pass the substitute motion, it allows us to go between what I have motioned all the way down to numbers even below what Commissioner Peterjohn has said he wanted?"

Mr. Chronis said, "I would agree with that."

Commissioner Howell said, "It is my intention, that during the budget deliberations going forward we will, in fact, put in money. Or deal with this in such a way that it will anticipate the technical adjustments. So, I plan on lowering the total dollars generated from ad valorem tax for Sedgwick County, it will be less than \$130,103,986.00. So it will be less than that, because we're going to anticipate what that technical adjustment value is worth. So we do not change the mill levy from 29.478. And if we do that, we can estimate just a little bit high if we need to, we're going to try and target that as best we can. Lindsay is going to help with that. We might hit it on the money, we might be slightly higher or slightly lower. We've never done that before, have we? Lindsay? We've never tried to do this, have we?"

Ms. Poe-Rousseau said, "Not that I'm aware of."

Commissioner Howell said, "Okay, so we don't have any history whether we will be able to do this, and whether we will be right on the money or slightly higher. We have no history."

Ms. Poe-Rousseau said, "Right."

Commissioner Howell said, "What the Chairman was speaking to, if we do not make an attempt to keep this level because of technical adjustments, it would in fact creep up. So if we don't take a strategy to try to counteract these technical adjustments, most recent year, you said there was once recent year where it didn't, but most years it has technically, it's technically adjusted up year after year. So it does go up every year a little bit. It will not stay 29.478 if we don't make an effort to keep it there. Is that a fair assessment?"

Ms. Poe-Rousseau said, "Yes, that's reasonable."

Commissioner Howell said, "Okay. So, again, we don't know if we can hit 29.478 exactly. We are going to try to do that. That's my intent, during the budget process, is anticipate the value of the technical adjustment. We are going to adjust the budget to

compensate for that, and hopefully after technical adjustments to 29.478, I think we have no experience even trying this. So I disagree that this is something that can't be done. I think this ought to be our goal. We ought to do this every, we should do this every year in an attempt to keep the mill levy the same. Well, with that, I do want to thank Lindsay for all your work. This is a difficult job. I appreciate what you do here. With that, Mr. Chairman, I move my motion. I am done. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "As I said, I won't be supportive of this motion. Commissioner Howell's strategy would be a good ploy, would be a good approach to take in subsequent years, but I think it is important to maintain it at the levels that the Commission has intended to do over the past several years. We have a motion and a second, correct?"

Ms. Erika Rice, Deputy County Clerk, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Yes, sir."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Madam Clerk, call the vote."

Ms. Rice said, "Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh said, "This is on the substitute motion?"

Ms. Rice said, "Yes."

VOTE

Commissioner Unruh	Aye
Commissioner Norton	Aye
Commissioner Howell	Aye
Commissioner Peterjohn	No
Chairman Ranzau	No

Chairman Ranzau said, "Motion passes 3-2. Okay. Madam Clerk, next item."

H [15-0504](#)

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS' REGULAR MEETING ON JULY 16, 2015.

Presented by: Joe Thomas, Director, Purchasing Department.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approve the recommendations of the Board of Bids and Contracts.

Chairman Ranzau said, "Wait, I am sorry. We need to go back and finish the last item and do the Fire District [No. 1]. We will do that in the Fire District budget. That's right. Okay. Go ahead. Sorry."

Mr. Joe Thomas, Purchasing Director, greeted the Commissioners and said, "The meeting of the Board of Bids and Contracts for July 16, 2015 results in one item for your consideration. The item is:

1. TAX FORCLOSURE TITLE SEARCH SERVICES – TREASURER'S OFFICE FUNDING -- TREASURER'S OFFICE

"The recommendation is to accept the proposal from Security 1st Title, LLC, in the amount of \$105 per search for one year with two one-year options to renew.

"I'll be happy to answer any questions you may have and recommend approval of this item."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am pleased you sent this address out to 11 vendors. Any insight, Mr. Thomas, in terms of why we only got one response?"

Mr. Thomas said, "When the buyer followed up and contacted the remaining vendors, many of the responses was that they had a, there was a high caseload, and that the local competition, there was a lack of it. So they just said they would prefer not to provide a response."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Thank you."

Chairman Ranzau said, "What is the will of the Board?"

MOTION

Commissioner Unruh moved to approve the recommendations of the Board of Bid and Contracts.

Commissioner Norton seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

<i>Commissioner Unruh</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Norton</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Howell</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Peterjohn</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Chairman Ranzau</i>	<i>Aye</i>

Mr. Thomas said, "Thank you."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Next item, please."

Approved

CONSENT

- | | | |
|----------|--------------------------------|--|
| I | <u>15-0488</u> | ZON2008-00025 - Extension of Time to Complete Platting Requirement for a Zone Change from SF-20 Single-family Residential (SF-20) to LC Limited Commercial (LC) on property generally located south of 21ST Street North and West of 159th Street East (15621 East of 21ST Street North). (District 1). |
| J | <u>15-0490</u> | Youth Residential Center II (YRC II) Program - A Systemic Approach. |

-
- K [15-0501](#) Memorandum of Understanding between Prairie Travelers, Inc. and Sedgwick County for Construction and Maintenance of a Portion of the Prairie Sunset Trail. District 3.
- L [15-0506](#) Addendum to Master GNMA Security Purchase Agreement.
- M [15-0484](#) General Bill Check Register for July 15, 2015 - July 21, 2015.
- N **15-0485** Payroll Check Register for the July 11, 2015 payroll certification.

Mr. Ron Holt, Acting County Manager, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Commissioners, you have the Consent Agenda, items I through N, recommend your approval."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

MOTION

Commissioner Peterjohn moved to approve the Consent Agenda, with the exception of Item K.

Chairman Ranzau seconded the motion.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION

Commissioner Howell moved to approve the Consent Agenda with the exception of Item J and Item K.

Chairman Ranzau seconded the motion.

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "So we have a substitute motion, Mr. Chairman?"

Chairman Ranzau said, "Yes."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "With the exception of [Items] J and K. That's the motion in front of us?"

Chairman Ranzau said, "Yes."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Okay, I wanted to get clarity on that, and make sure that the Clerk understands, because this seems like another case where we are a little confused here. So if J and K, we are going to approve the Consent Agenda, minus J and K, is my understanding."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Yes. We have a motion and second. Please call the vote."

VOTE

Commissioner Unruh Aye
Commissioner Norton Aye

Commissioner Howell	Aye
Commissioner Peterjohn	Aye
Chairman Ranzau	Aye

Chairman Ranzau said, "And so first we will do Item J. Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Our Director, Mark Masterson, I believe he's here. Mr. Masterson, would you be willing to make a small presentation regarding what this item is all about? Then I would like to have some discussion about it, please."

Mr. Mark Masterson, Director, Department of Corrections, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Last year, and since the Judge Riddel Boys Ranch closed, about this time last year there's been much discussion about how best to proceed in strengthening our local juvenile justice system. The proposal before you I presented in detail and discussed in your backup about, so I will give a brief overview of what that plan before you is.

"It builds upon what we learned over the years working with youth and families at the [Judge Riddel Boys] Ranch. The proposal also incorporates best practice reforms through research in the field. The most effective practices identified through research are risk assessment to target services at moderate and high-risk youth to recidivate.

"To provide cognitive behavioral programming that targets specific risk factors. To engage the family throughout the process. Case planning, interventions, to strengthen parental authority, and to learn techniques to support positive change, growth, and development in their adolescence, and to structure learning with clients where new skills and behaviors are practiced, and modeled.

"The proposed program does not involve reopening or funding a residential facility. It is a different method to deliver these evidence-based programming, and to work with youth and parents. The goals are to reduce recidivism and to serve Sedgwick County youth close to home in our own community. The target population for this program are Sedgwick County youth offenders that are assessed to be at high or moderate risk, who have been committed to state's custody and are placed in a local currently existing Youth Residential Center II (YRC II) facility. The programming will include services for both males and females, and will be delivered in the community while youth are working their facility program, as well as after they transition from that facility. It is very difficult in 150 days to get in the amount of cognitive programming, but the research shows actually reduces recidivism, and that's what this plan accomplishes.

"The first component of the program provides consistent delivery of the cognitive behavioral programming by a team of individuals that would work for the Department of Corrections. The cognitive programming will be delivered in groups and needs to be done by trained individuals in strict accordance with a curriculum manual. The programming addresses criminal thinking, values and attitudes, anger management, and skill building to change behavior. The programming will be delivered by team of five individuals, one program coordinator to manage the unit and share the quality of services, track and report the outcomes that we have talked about, and provide direct

services to clients as part of the unit team. The coordinator will supervise four program providers, that means physicians, the team will be part of the juvenile field services program and housed at the offices at the Harry Street Mall. The services will be delivered at several sites in the community, including of the YRC II existing facilities. The others will come to the sites where we are delivering the programming.

"The groups will be conducted in accordance with the research. So high risk youth are served together. Moderate risk youth are served together, and males and females are served separately. That's the way the research shows that you get the best bang for the buck and the best results. YRC II placements typically average 150 days, although only half the kids actually complete a program. They end up being moved, often to detention, and then to another YRC II program. The other half return home. Providing this programming will continue services through these transitions as long as they are in Sedgwick County and until they complete the necessary level of the cognitive behavioral programming, or they are released from State custody. We anticipate serving 100 youth annually after the start up cycle. The proposal actually starts this program beginning October 1st, if you approve it will require adding five full time positions to the staffing table as well as funding some contractual and commodities services. The total budget in 2015 is \$82,190.

"The second component of the program is to adopt the family engagement model that we have talked about. It's a different way across our system of working with families. And that will require technical assistance to assist us in making that transition, but that budget expense does not occur in 2015. That would occur in 2016, and would be \$145,000.

"The total cost for the program in 2016 with both components would be \$437,400. I would be happy to answer any questions, or elaborate on anything that you would like."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mark, I have kind of viewed this, and I think the intent was just to come up with a substitute lower cost, hopefully more effective program than what we had had at the [Judge Riddell] Boys Ranch. Can you give me an idea, obviously the numbers indicate that you presented this cost would be dramatically lower then if we had the Boys Ranch programming still intact. But give me an idea in terms of how many youth we could end up going through this model program if we adopt this today."

Mr. Masterson said, "Well, on component one with the targeted programming we would be talking about 100 kids that we would serve annually. We currently have about 75 kids from Sedgwick County that are in YRC II placements. Fifty-two of them in Sedgwick County, or 68 percent of them are in Sedgwick County. Are goal is to get that up to 90 percent. And if we do that, and the repeat cycle would be probably 100 a year. And the number that we served at the Boys Ranch that completed the programming ranged from 55-75."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Okay, because, I'm glad to hear that we have a higher percentage of Sedgwick County youth going through these programs who get to stay in Sedgwick County. And is there any chance we can get that number above 90 percent?"

Mr. Masterson said, "We will certainly strive for that. I think we have an opportunity to

possibly increase the number of female beds where there has been, there's a very short supply of female beds. And presently there is 14 in Sedgwick County, and I believe there is some capacity where we could increase there. With our other focuses, we've been focused and will be continue to be on reducing the need for out of home placement by addressing things earlier. And we continue to make substantial gains, or sustain the gains that we have made in that area so both things go together."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Well let me ask, cause you kind of touched on an area that, I've talked with some folks who were involved in trying to work with young people, that the number of troubled female youth as a percentage of the total population of youth who were struggling is a higher percentage today then it was a few years ago. Would you agree with that statement, and if the ratio of females to males, who are struggling and going into these programs, if that's changed, can you give us kind of a ballpark in what direction it's moving?"

Mr. Masterson said, "Well it's very low. I think we may have, today, one female at a juvenile correctional facility. And so the numbers are, are far as going deep into the system, they are historically low. In juvenile detention, where we get kids that may not be offenders, as well as kids that are pending trials as offenders, we've seen those numbers go up significantly. So, with the definition that you talked about being troubled kids, yes, we do see an increase in females in troubled kids. We don't see a significant increase in kids in states' custody as juvenile offenders.

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Appreciate the clarification and that information. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mark, first of all, I want to compliment you for hanging in there, for staying the course in light of all the conversations that have gone on through the last couple years at least about how do we handle these young offenders in our community. And you have come up, I think, with a great alternative to the Boys Ranch. Our goal was to try to keep these people as close to home as possible, but have programming that really had the best chance of reducing recidivism. It appears this program and under your management will accomplish both of those goals. It is a significant achievement, talking about budget, in that the Boys Ranch is going to be an expensive proposition to get it back open and get it fixed the way it's usable and get it back up to speed. Then the operating costs out there are also going to be significantly more than what this proposal before us implies. So congratulations, you've done a great job. I think you've got, for the most part, all of our desires satisfied in this area.

"I suppose I had argued loudly that these young offenders are really assigned to the Secretary of Corrections, they should be in the state budget, we shouldn't burden Sedgwick County property taxpayers with this expense at all. But I think probably our citizens would be very open to this level of expense, especially with the results that we expect and keeping these folks here in our county. So I am going to be supportive, and just want to say I am glad that you stuck with it, come up with a good solution. That's all I have."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Norton."

Commissioner Norton said, "Well, I am happy with this solution, too. The housing and

the incarceration, the holding of these youth will be moved to the private side to partners, and that's kind of the three hots and a cot scenario, and the programs that we know, or were the most effective things, that affected recidivism at the ranch will carry on. In fact, be expanded. The other component that I really like is that the State virtually follows none of these kids to find out what happens to them years later. And we always follow them for a year at the ranch. Today we are going to follow them up to 36 months. Now, that's still not a longitudinal study amount, but it is better than we have ever had, and we know that the ability to reoffend comes pretty early. So hopefully if they make it three years, they are going to be, their difficulties in maneuvering social situations, criminal activities, whatever caused their problem, will go away and be resolved for the rest of their life. I like that component of it. And the family engagement part. We are really seeking out to work with families for the difficulties that cause that youth to be in the system anyway.

"Many times we know, yes, it is about anger management, it is about cognitive skills of the individual. But it's also about the environment and the parenting they got in the family unit they were with. So I think we've got a good system put together that will work with partners that have been in the community for a lot of years and are good at the YRC II part of it, but that we get to concentrate on the things that we do best. And that's not just holding young people and keeping them in a safe environment, but taking care of the issues that got them there in the first place. So, I applaud you, Mark, for staying with this. Much like Commissioner Unruh said, but I think it's going to be a better system that we can work in affecting more youths and giving more services to youths that may be at our Salvation Army that we didn't serve with programs.

"So we're covering every youth in Sedgwick County, and as I think we work with our partners, if we need to try to get to 90 percent or more, up to 100 percent, at least we have the opportunity now to do that through negotiations and use of the beds and the capacity. And I think there is plenty of capacity and the ability to grow capacity for just housing in our community. So, I think this is, I am going to be supportive of this. I'm happy that we have got to this point, and have got a better system, a better way of handling this problem in our community then maybe we have in the past. So, thank you, Mr. Chair."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to thank you for your report this morning. I'm excited that we have something new for Sedgwick County that is going to hopefully provide a solution, like we've had for JRBR in the past. It's been measured and analyzed Judge Riddel Boys Ranch actually saves taxpayer money. That's the reason that it existed, and it received much support from the community during the time. People say pay me now, pay me later. If you don't deal with the issue on the front then you'll certainly deal with it on the back end. And incarceration is much more expensive than programming.

"And I think there is a moral issue as well. If you can somehow impact a young person's life and get them on a better track we should do that. Especially when I can make an argument that it does save tax dollars. So as a conservative republican I want good government. And one of the things that JRBR did was we did performance measures out there. The state is moving towards a desire, in fact it was in the bill that I helped write and pass, in Topeka, but the state is moving towards a need for performance measures at all of these YRC II facilities. And a good thing. We need to

have accountable government. And one thing I think needs improvement in this program that I think is a good thing that should be highlighted is that we provide programming to these other providers throughout the county, we're going to be tracking the performance. And we're going to know whether this works. Is that correct, Mr. Masterson?"

Mr. Masterson said, "Absolutely."

Commissioner Howell said, "So again, that's an improvement. We'll know with confidence we're saving taxpayer dollars and that this is something we should support. The data at some, if the data somehow proves out at some point this a negative for the county, that it is not being effective and efficient, then there may be an argument down the road that we shouldn't be doing it this way either. But I am hopeful that this is going to work. This is not going to replace the need for YRC II's. There has been a lot of discussion of JRBR is bad, and we shouldn't do things like that. I mean, just to clarify, and Mr. Masterson you're free to speak your mind, are we going to continue to have YRC II's in Sedgwick County, and are they needed?"

Mr. Masterson said, "There is no doubt that we will always need out of home placements for a smaller number of people. Particularly if the changes that are being looked at in Topeka are implemented across the state to be able to prevent more kids from going to YRC II's by providing more effective services early."

Commissioner Howell said, "The reason I bring that up is because there has been some rhetoric, you know, people discussing the idea that we don't need JRBR, we don't need anything like that. It's a waste of money, it doesn't work. Those are not accurate comments. We do need them. They'll continue to be in our community. JRBR actually set the standard for the state, I think, on what we should do and how it should run, and how it should be effective. And then on that line, let me just point out historically, this was a county created program, a long long time ago. And the county fully funded it. It was not funded by the state at all. Down the road the state adopted some more program ideas and it became a joint funded program, county and state. And then later on there was a desire by County Commission to move away from county funding and push this completely off on the state."

"Unfortunately, without the programming that the county paid for and provided, the program is not going to be effective. And that's the point of this program today. This is what makes this special. The programming is what we are after. It's to help someone think differently and to understand their opportunities, to engage those, to stay in school, to graduate, to move towards a vocation. And to stay on the right side of the law, and to understand that there is plenty of supports throughout the community to help them be successful. That's what this program does. And this is \$500,000 and there's people already saying we shouldn't spend this \$500,000, we should do something else. It would cost us more if we don't do this. This is a conservative position. We need to have a program that helps kids stay out of jail. And this is important that we do that."

"I would like to point out that the Lake Afton facility is still out there. We did have a request for proposal (RFP) that we didn't have much interest at the time, but I believe there is still some community interest in that. There may be people interested in

providing more beds. And I think right now we still have a shortage of beds as of right now. I think we're hopeful in this program that Sedgwick County kids might receive some priority in the YRC II beds that are out there, but having said that, there has been a shortage of beds since Judge Riddel Boys Ranch closed, and we've had about 30 kids out of county since then, is that correct, Mr. Masterson, can you verify that? We've had about 30 kids roughly, out of county..."

Mr. Masterson said, "Yes."

Commissioner Howell said, "Since Judge Riddel Boys Ranch closed. And so the argument is that we don't need these beds, that we have plenty of beds is inaccurate. We've never had enough beds to handle these kids. And so with this program we're going to try to reach the kids wherever they are. Not just kids at Judge Riddel Boys Ranch, but kids in all the different programs. That's certainly a big improvement. Not just boys, but girls too, another big improvement. But if we don't create more beds, or say reduction in a need for these beds, then we will continue to have that program. So, this problem is not, this is not a complete solution until we have enough beds to handle all the Sedgwick County kids this is going to continue to be another subject we'll have to discuss going forward, because it's certainly a big step in the right direction.

"It's interesting that Judge Riddel Boys Ranch has had a tremendous community support over the years. But I think what's happened over the last couple of years in Sedgwick County is we've created a controversy where it didn't need to exist. There has been a lot of rhetoric that this is a program that doesn't need to be funded, it's a state program and it doesn't do it's [inaudible]. I would ask my fellow colleagues up here if anybody believes that Judge Riddel Boys Ranch was not effective, and did it not save taxpayer dollars. I think we would all agree that it was effective and it did save taxpayer dollars. It's important that we have that type of community resource to help these kids get on the right path. And for me personally, I see this as a moral obligation.

"I would like to make two motions. One of those would be to accept this program, or to embrace this program. But the second, before I do that I would like to make another motion if it's in order, and I'll ask our counselor, I guess, to verify that. I'm going to be making a motion regarding the name of this program. And I'll just go ahead, I'll just say what I want to say now, I guess, and you can tell me if this is order. I would like to make a motion that this program shall be known as the James V. Riddel Boys and Girls Alternative Program, as far as the acronym it would be JRBGP. It's Judge Riddel Boys and Girls Alternative Program. So it's for boys and girls, it's not a ranch any longer. But it maintains the purpose of what Judge Riddel Boys Ranch provided to the community. And this program, of course, it increases the outcomes; it provides performance measures throughout the community, so we know that it's working. And it broadens the reach to all the boys and girls across our community that need that type of help. So, I would like to make that motion, Mr. Counselor, if it's okay, that this program shall be known as the James V. Riddel Boys and Girls Alternative Program, and I believe we have support from that family that this is something that they would like to see happen, as well."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Can we just combine the two motions together?"

Commissioner Howell said, "If that's okay, I'll make a second, an addition to that motion that we would approve this program, establish the budget authority as provided in the financial considerations section, and implement staffing table changes outlined in the attached budget impact statement as provided in the backup materials. Is that an acceptable motion, Mr. Counselor?"

Mr. Pepoon said, "Yes it is."

MOTION

Commissioner Howell moved to approve the program, name the program the James V. Riddel Boys and Girls Alternative Program, establish the budget authority as provided in the financial considerations section, and implement staffing table changes outlined in the attached budget impact statement as provided in the backup materials.

Commissioner Peterjohn seconded the motion.

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "If I can add just a brief remark. The late Judge Riddel, and still has family in the community. He was a long serving jurist, and the driving force behind this, I think, at the time a pioneering effort that did tremendous positive impacts in this community. And I strongly support the idea of providing recognition to Judge Riddel and publicly commend him, his role in this community was huge and I think that this is very appropriate, and that one of the reasons why I seconded the motion, thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "I'll say I'll be supportive of this motion. You know, if this issue has been going on for a few years now. Several years ago when I asked some questions about the possibility of privatizing Judge Riddel Boys Ranch, and that was not well received. I had a lot of predictions that the sky would fall and we couldn't make it happen. But essentially what we have done here through a long contorted route is we have privatized everything at Judge Riddel Boys Ranch except for these programs that we think make a difference.

"The housing and feeding and education and things like that will be provided by the private institutions, but we'll provide the programming that we think made the difference and reduced the recidivism. And so this a good way to approach this issue. And I appreciate the work by Mark Masterson and his staff. You know, the previous plan was to shut down Judge Riddel Boys Ranch and just abandon these youth in this problem, and not address it. But I want to say thanks to Commissioner Howell and Commissioner Peterjohn for their steadfast resolve to help solve this problem. We were able to push this issue and push the Manager and staff to come up with a solution that would address this issue, and I think the community will be better off because of it.

"It's unfortunate we probably could have had this solution three years ago if there would have been the will to look at alternatives, but there wasn't. Good thing is we're there now, we're going to implement it, we are going to move forward. And this is a very good thing for our community, and thanks to everybody for all their support. Madam Clerk, call the vote."

VOTE

Commissioner Unruh	Aye
Commissioner Norton	Aye
Commissioner Howell	Aye
Commissioner Peterjohn	Aye
Chairman Ranzau	Aye

Chairman Ranzau said, "Now we have Item K, I believe. Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is an item that's been a long time going on, and we have got another governmental body that's involved in this, too, and I am going to make a motion that we defer this item and be in a position to bring it back up at a future date. I anticipate that with additional information and some other things that are going on, I think this MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) may be just a little premature at this time. I know there's some additional information I have been seeking. I have gotten some, haven't had as much time to review it as I would like."

MOTION

Commissioner Peterjohn moved to postpone Item K.

Commissioner Ranzau seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

Commissioner Unruh	Aye
Commissioner Norton	Aye
Commissioner Howell	Aye
Commissioner Peterjohn	Aye
Chairman Ranzau	Aye

Chairman Ranzau said, "I think with that, we are now done with the Consent Agenda. Unless the Manager tells me otherwise, we've addressed all of those. The next issue is the legislative issue, which we have none. Then we will move to the 'Other' section of this meeting. Commissioners, do you have anything for 'Other'? Commissioner Peterjohn."

OTHER

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "I would just mention for the record that last Saturday I was over at the Veterans [Memorial] Park here in the City of Wichita, and there was a change of command ceremony for the Army Reserves that was held at that time, it's a

wonderful facility. My compliments to the city on that, all the feedback I heard from talking with folks who were at that park for the Army Reserve, U.S. Army Reserve Chain of Command event. It went very well. I'm sorry, I misspoke. I said Saturday, it was actually Sunday morning at 10:00 a.m. But I wanted to provide a brief report on that significant event, in light of some of the challenges we have been facing recently.

"Mr. Chairman, I also would be remiss if I didn't point out historically that July 22nd is an important day in American history. In 1893, a young lady, Catherine Lee Bates, was so inspired after making a trip to the top of Pikes Peak that she ended up writing a song that some have argued ought to replace the Star Spangled Banner as our national anthem. I am not going to get into that controversy, but I will say that America the Beautiful song that she initially was inspired to write on this date in 1893 occurred. And also on the aviation front in 1933, Wiley Post completed the first solo flight around the world, which I think both major events deserve some recognition, and I wanted to provide that for the record this morning. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Thank you, Commissioner. I would like to take a few minutes about, to talk about an issue that's come up, or been created by our local newspaper with respect to Sedgwick County, the relationship between Sedgwick County and Wichita. I know there is an intent by some of our progressive friends over there to make it look like we are fighting and not getting along. I am here to say as far as I am concerned, there is no fight. And while we do have some differences of opinion, I have met with the Mayor three times since he's gotten elected, last time we met for an hour and a half, even though the meeting was an hour, scheduled for an hour, got along very well. We're talking about lots of issues.

"So this idea that there's somehow a fight, and we need to bury the hatchet, or this, that and another, that this Commission is trying to single out the city and work against them simply isn't true, at least as far as I am concerned. I am not aware of any Commissioners here who have that attitude. Certainly we do take some different positions on some issues, whether it be legislative or otherwise. I mean, we do have a different viewpoint on some things, like elections, annexation, cronyism, property rights. But when we take positions at the legislature, we don't sit down and say look and see what the city feels about this, and take an opposite viewpoint. We look at the issues themselves and figure out in our estimation what is best for our citizens. And we take those view, and that's the positions we take. We have amended our legislative platform, we made some changes to the KAC (Kansas Association of Counties) platform. Just because we let known our differences with the KAC doesn't mean we don't like the counties that are in KAC and we're fighting with them. No. We just have differences of opinion. And that's okay. You know, you can have differences of opinion with your friends, your family, doesn't mean you are fighting all the time, you are not getting along. We just have differences of opinion. I think some of the positions that we take, you know, aren't supported by some people in the community, particularly our progressive friends at the liberal, and there's been attempts in the past to mislead people and make them think things are happening that weren't, and a variety of things. But I think this is a clear attempt to make this Commission look bad, put everything on this Commission, they want to influence future elections. I get that, okay. That's what, you know, progressivism, a lot of progressives do, they want to mislead the public.

"You know, the central theme of this article here wants to make it seem like this is a difference between two types of conservatism. You know. Those terrible tea party conservatives, and then the mainstream conservatives. That's not what it's about. It's

about conservative values versus progressive values. Okay? And that's okay. We can have that debate. We can have disagreement. But some want to try to marginalize, you know, conservative values. I would argue this county is at this time moving to the center. We are moving the county back towards the center, back to core American values. This country, state, county over time has moved so far to the left, we don't recognize core American values. I am talking about things like fiscal responsibility, individual freedom, property rights, individual responsibility, which is very important, limited government. Those are our core values that shape the decisions that we make here at the county. And local municipalities tend not to focus on those sorts of things. So they have different viewpoints. If you look at the agendas of the KAC or the League of Municipalities, even NACo (National Association of Counties), which is one organization we decided to get out of, you will see that the values are very contradictory to that.

"So I understand that some in the community are threatened by these core American values, because they don't promote the progression idea of more government in the lives. Some will use their positions, you will see this a lot with respect to this, with respect to the budget, and they will leave out a lot of information and try to put things together that don't really correlate, but that's part of the struggle. We have two different views of this world, and we will continue to debate about that. But no matter what our differences are, I am committed to continue to meet with the Mayor and have dialogue and work together on whatever we can, but that being said, when we have issues we're going to, this Commission will sit down and look at the issues and see what's best for the people.

"Okay, we're not going to take a knee-jerk reaction and decide to base our position on what's best, or what's best during the best convenience for the governmental entities, but what about the people, the core American values personal property rights is very important and that shapes a lot of these decisions, so we'll move forward. The media can talk about whether we're fighting this, that, or another, but the major and I have not yet had any fights. If we do, I'm sure you'll hear about it. But in the mean time, we'll continue our conversations and we'll move this county forward. Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Mr. Chairman, just in the category of 'Other', I mention that recently just before the [Sedgwick] County Fair I was out visiting with City Council in Cheney, and my door is always open to all citizens, and that included all the elected officials, whether they are in townships, cities, school boards, or anything else that are in Sedgwick County. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "I think next we have need for a Fire [District No. 1] Agenda."

The Board of County Commissioners recessed, into the Fire District No. 1 meeting, at 11:12 a.m. and returned at 11:16 a.m.

Chairman Ranzau said, "I believe we do have need for an Executive Session. Commissioner Peterjohn."

MOTION

Commissioner Peterjohn moved to recess into Executive Session for 35 minutes to consider consultation with legal counsel on matters privileged in the attorney client

relationship relating to legal advice, contract negation and personnel matters of non-elected personnel, and that the Board of County Commissioners return to this room from Executive Session no sooner than 11:55 a.m.

Commissioner Unruh seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

<i>Commissioner Unruh</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Norton</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Howell</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Peterjohn</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Chairman Ranzau</i>	<i>Aye</i>

Chairman Ranzau said, "We are now moved to Executive Session."

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Board of County Commissioners recessed into Executive Session at 11:20 a.m. and returned at 12:28 p.m.

Chairman Ranzau said, "We are now back from Executive Session, there was no binding action taken. Is there anything else to come before the Board, Mr. Manager?"

Mr. Holt said, "No, sir."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Then we are adjourned."

ADJOURNMENT

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

*RICHARD RANZAU, Chairman
Fourth District*

*KARL PETERJOHN, Chair Pro Tem
Third District*

*DAVID M. UNRUH, Commissioner
First District*

TIM R. NORTON, Commissioner
Second District

JAMES M. HOWELL, Commissioner
Fifth District

ATTEST:

Kelly B. Arnold, County Clerk

APPROVED:
