

Sedgwick County

525 North Main Street 3rd Floor
Wichita, KS 67203



*Sedgwick County...
working for you*

Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, August 12, 2015

9:00 AM

BOCC Meeting Room

Board of Sedgwick County Commissioners

Pursuant to Resolution #007-2016, adopted by the Board of County Commissioners on January 20, 2016, members of the public are allowed to address the County Commission for a period of time limited to not more than five minutes or such time limits as may become necessary.

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 Crissy Magee, Sedgwick County ADA Coordinator, 510 N. Main, Suite 306, Wichita, Kansas 67203. Phone: 316-660-7056, TDD: Kansas Relay at 711 or 800-766-3777

Email: Crissy.Magee@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 9:04 a.m. on August 12, 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. Ron Holt, Acting County Manager; Mr. Michael Pepoon, Acting County Counselor; Mr. Kelly B. Arnold, County Clerk; Mr. Chris Chronis, Chief Financial Officer; Mr. David Spears, Director, Bureau of Public Works; Ms. Kristi Zukovich, Director, Communications; and Ms. Angela Lovelace, Deputy County Clerk.

GUESTS

*Ms. Ellen Estes, League of Women Voters
Mr. Harold Henderson, 1010 Ingress Drive*

INVOCATION: Pastor Tim Lytle, Unity Church of Wichita.

FLAG SALUTE

ROLL CALL

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

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

A [15-0521](#)

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF JULY 1, 2015.

All Commissioners were present.

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioners, you have the item before you, what is the will of the Board?"

MOTION

Commissioner Peterjohn moved to approve the minutes for July 1, July 15, and July 20, 2015.

Chairman 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, "Next item, please."

Approved

B [15-0523](#)

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF JULY 8, 2015

Chairman Ranzau was absent.

Chairman Ranzau said, "Chairman Ranzau: Commissioners, what is the will of the Board?"

MOTION

Commissioner Peterjohn moved to approve the minutes of July 8, 2015.

Commissioner Howell 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	Abstain

Chairman Ranzau said, "Next item, please."

Approved

C [15-0524](#)

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF JULY 15, 2015.

All Commissioners were present.

Action for Item C was taken with Item A.

D [15-0537](#)

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF JULY 20, 2015.

All Commissioners were present.

Action for Item D was taken with Item A.

PROCLAMATIONS

E [15-0403](#)

PROCLAMATION DECLARING THE 95TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 19TH AMENDMENT.

Read by: Chairman Richard Ranzau.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Adopt the proclamation.

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioners I have the following proclamation to read into the record:

PROCLAMATION

In celebration of the 95th anniversary of the 19th amendment, we remember the women – and men – who fought for equal rights between the genders in the United States of America; and

WHEREAS, while complete equality between the genders still has yet to be realized, the suffrage movement of 1920 remains a significant milestone; and

WHEREAS, any person born within the last 95 years has lived in a world where women can vote and run for office; and

WHEREAS, even after 95 years, women in elected positions are the minority by a large margin; and

WHEREAS, let not the courage of the women and men of the suffrage era be in vain; and

WHEREAS, Sedgwick County supports women in elected positions and encourages women to seek opportunities to become involved in the democratic process through casting their votes and running for office.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that I, Richard Ranzau, Chairman of the Board of Sedgwick County Commissioners, do hereby proclaim August 26, 2015 as

THE 95TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 19TH AMENDMENT

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

MOTION

Commissioner Peterjohn moved to adopt the Proclamation.

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, "We have Ellen Estes to receive the proclamation."

Ms. Ellen Estes, League of Women Voters, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Thank you, Commissioners. Thank you so much for letting us be here today. We would highlight the fact that on August 26, when the nation and Wichita celebrates the 19th Amendment, the passage of the 95th Anniversary of the 19th Amendment, we are going to have a huge event, a big to-do, at Hughes Metroplex. The event will include Nancy Landon Kassebaum Baker, she will be welcoming former Insurance

Commissioner Sandy Prager, as a key note speaker. Joel Docking will provide a challenge to women at the program to commemorate the actual signing of the 19th amendment. We are going to have patriotic music by Carla Burns, Sharon Cranford and the East High Instrumental Music Department. This event is co-sponsored by the WSU (Wichita State University) Department of Political Science, Women's Studies, and the Hugo Wall School of Public Affairs. Thank you."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Thank you very much. Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As a person who has occasionally pointed out the history, the fact that Kansas actually allowed women to vote in school board elections, prior to the adoption of the 19th Amendment is very significant. I would throw out to you, as an interesting historical footnote, I have been able to confound a few folks by saying, can you explain this political paradox to me; 19th Amendment was adopted in 1920, but the first woman was elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1916."

Ms. Estes said, "From Wyoming."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "No, Montana."

Ms. Estes said, "Okay."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "I am 99.9 percent sure on that one."

Ms. Estes said, "I am sorry. Wyoming is the Equality State. Yes."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Wyoming was first also in some aspects of women's voting, and women's suffrage, and of course the paradox is, women didn't have the right to vote, how did she get elected?"

Ms. Estes said, "I think her husband got her in."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Actually, I don't think she was married. But having said that, the states at the time had the power to determine their qualifications for elections, and they exercised that right and Montana was one that gave votes, the right to vote to women before the adoption of the 19th Amendment, which is how she got elected to Congress in 1916. I want to thank you ladies for coming down here and giving me this opportunity to segue off of this significant and wonderful anniversary. Thank you."

Ms. Estes said, "We also had a woman Mayor in Argonia, too, before 1920."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Norton."

Commissioner Norton said, "I am not going to fight anybody over the history of what states did what, because I don't know any of that stuff. For me it is a personal thing. My great-grandmother was a suffragette, and was active in the movement. My mother was a strong woman, got a journalism degree in 1927 from the University of Missouri, at a time when women weren't. I have a very strong wife that is involved in my political career, and watching politics, and understanding what it is to be an elected official's spouse, and I have five granddaughters that I hope will be active in civic engagement, and understand their community, and care and so thank you for

what you do to hold up the banner, to continue to make us think about gender equality, and all equality when it comes to voting rights, when it comes to the political process, when it comes to being engaged, because the democracy does not work, if it leaves anybody behind. It does not work. It is for everyone. So thank you very much for coming today, I fully support the proclamation, and go get 'em."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Thanks, everybody, for being here today. Madam Clerk, next item, please."

Adopted

CITIZEN INQUIRIES

F [15-0545](#) REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS REGARDING POSSIBLE REOPENING OF THE LAKE AFTON PUBLIC OBSERVATORY.
Presented by: Harold D. Henderson, Wichita.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Receive and file.

Chairman Ranzau said, "Please give us your name and address for the record."

Mr. Harold Henderson, 1010 Ingress Drive, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I represent Kansas Astronomical Observers; the local telescope owners and users club, as well as other interested parties that would like to address the Commission on this matter. We all got caught, a little bit by surprise, on July 14th when Wichita State University announced they no longer wanted to have anything to do with Lake Afton Public Observatory and wanted to close it. Over the 34 year history of Lake Afton Public Observatory, the county has been a partner with that, providing land and the building as the landlord.

"Wichita State [University] provided staff, administration. Early on the City of Wichita and USD 259 also had parts to play in that. This unfortunate turn of events, at Wichita State University, driven by whatever internal budgets and focus of personnel that they have that is driving this, leaves us to an opportunity. And that opportunity is for the local telescope club with their expertise and knowledge in the field of astronomy and public presentation, as well as the greater public in the form of public support, volunteers, as well as public money, in donations, to assume administration of Lake Afton Public Observatory. At this point I would ask if the County Commission has any questions about this plan."

Chairman Ranzau said, "I will just say that I think you have met with each of the Commissioners, and as far as I know, we are all supportive of your endeavors, and encourage you. And we are willing to work with you to get accomplished the agreement for Wichita State [University]."

Mr. Henderson said, "I thank you for the support. I have met with each of you, one to one basis in the past. I would urge you to please contact the administration at Wichita State University on behalf of the county, and inform them that you do have a favorable opinion of this matter. It is currently being run up the flagpole at the university staff level. I believe they are going to be meeting with the Vice President of the University, either tomorrow or Friday, and words of encouragement from the County Commission would be greatly appreciated."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Thank you, I will be happy to provide that word of encouragement. I have already contacted folks I know at the university, although I don't think they are part of the staff group you alluded to. I wanted to take this opportunity to commend your group for willing to stand up and step up in this matter, and I think it's a wonderful facility. I have been out there a number of times with my children, seeing other folks, and I think it's wonderful that you all are undertaking this effort, and wanted to publicly commend you. Thank you."

Mr. Henderson said, "Thank you, Commissioner."

MOTION

Chairman Ranzau moved to receive and file Mr. Henderson's comments.

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, "Thank you, very much."

Mr. Henderson said, "Thank you for your time."

Chairman Ranzau said, "At this time we have need to address the Fire District budget, so we are going to recess the regular meeting board of Sedgwick County Commissioners."

Board of County Commissioners Recessed into Fire District Number 1 meeting at 9:16 a.m. and returned at 9:23 a.m.

Chairman Ranzau said, "Next item, please."

Received and Filed

NEW BUSINESS

G

[15-0543](#)

ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE PROPERTY TAX POLICY OF THE SEDGWICK COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS WITH RESPECT TO FINANCING THE ANNUAL BUDGET FOR 2016.

Presented by: Lindsay Poe Rousseau, Budget Director.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Adopt the Resolution.

Mr. Chris Chronis, Chief Financial Officer, greeted the Commissioners and said, "On July 15th, you received a recommended budget that was proposed to be funded with property taxes in the amount of \$129,580,173. A week later you authorized us to

publish a budget ad that provided a maximum amount of property taxes that would be higher than that by about \$500,000. Between those two numbers, is a threshold that is identified through a formula contained in state law, and the impact of that formula is that if our property taxes, for operations, increase by more than the rate of CPI (Consumer Price Index) with some other adjustments from one year to the next, you are required, before you consider the budget, to adopt a resolution declaring your policy to adopt property taxes in excess of that threshold. The recommended budget is below the threshold. The maximum amount of property taxes that you might adopt for the budget is above the threshold. We don't know where the final budget is going to end up, but we think to be prudent, it would be appropriate for you to adopt the resolution that's before you. If you should end up adopting a budget that requires property taxes in excess of the threshold, then subsequently we will publish a notice of that resolution, in the paper, as is required by state law. If you adopt a budget that is below the threshold, then we are not required to publish the notice. The reason that our property taxes are above CPI, this year, is because of the odd formulation that's contained in that state law. As I said, it applies to property taxes that are imposed for operations. It excludes property taxes that are imposed for debt service.

"In 2016, we are proposing to shift property taxes from what formerly were debt service payments to operations. We are reducing our debt service in 2016. As I explained in the budget presentation that I gave a month ago, our total property taxes, for 2016, are expected to increase 1.1 percent, compared to CPI growth of 1.6 percent when we look only at the taxes for operations, we exceed that 1.6 percent threshold; hence the need to adopt this resolution. If you have any questions, I would be happy to try and answer them. If you don't have any questions, then I would recommend that you adopt the resolutions before you."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Just a clarification, Chris. We spoke the last time you outlined kind of the budget procedure, that if we exceeded certain numbers, you would have to go back and republish everything. Is this the equivalent in terms of republication from a time frame point of view?"

Mr. Chronis said, "No, this is not. You would have to go back through the entire process, republish the budget, conduct new public hearing; before adoption, if you wanted to levy property taxes in an amount greater than were contained in the budget ad that you authorized on July 21st.

"What we are talking about now are property taxes that are below that threshold, but higher than the amount that were in the recommended budget."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Thank you."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a question. Can you tell us approximately, what is the threshold above the proposed budget, how much, between the proposed and the threshold at that would be calculated?"

Mr. Chronis said, "Approximately \$100,000."

Commissioner Howell said, "So, if we spent \$100,000 more than the proposed budget this would not be necessary. Anything more than that would require..."

Mr. Chronis said, "If you levied property taxes, about \$100,000 more than what are

included in the recommended budget. We would be required to adopt the resolution and publish the resolution, publish a notice of the resolution."

Commissioner Howell said, "Okay. And then as we make changes to the budget, we make changes and we pull money from contingency parts of our budget, does that, in fact, raise the property tax. Would it make this necessary?"

Mr. Chronis said, "If the action is to move budget authority from a contingency account to a departmental account that would not necessarily require additional property taxes. It would not change the total amount of either spending or funding of the budget; it would simply change where the spending occurs."

Commissioner Howell said, "I am with you and Thank you, very much. Chairman, that's all I have."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Unruh."

MOTION

Commissioner Unruh moved to adopt the resolution.

Commissioner Norton seconded the motion.

Chairman Ranzau said, "Chris, I will say in general, I like the idea of controlling our growth, the CPI and some of those factors, but the fact is it doesn't show how the law is written right now, it doesn't show the whole picture of what we are doing as far as our property tax mill levy, since it excludes the debt service and the fact that we are reducing that. I think that's something we need to look at in the future perhaps amending that statute. It makes it look like we are exceeding those limits, but when you look at the whole picture, we are not; is that correct?"

Mr. Chronis said, "Yes."

Chairman Ranzau said, "You said 1.1 percent, we are actually controlling that."

Mr. Chronis said, "Yes."

Chairman Ranzau said, "I didn't support the decision to increase the base budget and possibly increase the mill levy, but nevertheless, I will be supportive of this, because I think in the end we are actually doing what legislators actually wanted to do, but it is really a function more of the law and what is being excluded. I think we are being fiscally responsible. That being said, I think we can actually find the solution to the budget that doesn't require this, but we will see what happens after we move through today. Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am in agreement that we have taken the right steps, and I think this is unfortunate, the legislative intent was to try and have a tool in place to show what's happening when local governments raise their mill levy, at least in the case of counties, and I think it at some other local units, not all local units, by the state legislature. I think it is a fraud attempt, in my opinion, because I think much better would be to frankly give us the authority to set mill levy as well as the dollar amount of budget and if there is a desire to raise the mill levy, that we do like more advance states do, like three of our neighbors states, basically take these to the polls and the voters get to decide whether the mill levy is increased or not. Having said that, I am uncomfortable with this process and I would like to see a change. I will not be supporting this motion this morning. Thank you."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Please call the vote."

VOTE

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

Chairman Ranzau said, "Motion passes 3-2. That was an interesting makeup. Something tells me this won't be the last. Well, I think this next item we might just skip over and go...I am kidding. Madam Clerk next item, please."

H [15-0540](#)

ADOPTION OF THE 2016 SEDGWICK COUNTY BUDGET AND THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

Presented by: Ron Holt, Acting County Manager.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Adopt the Resolution for the 2016 Sedgwick County Operating Budget and the Capital Improvement Program.

Mr. Ron Holt, Acting County Manager greeted the Commissioners and said, "For this budget we held two public hearings and an online public hearing since July 20th. At the July 29th public hearing, there were 43 speakers, at the August 6th public hearing, there were 48 speakers. We reported and read into the record for the public hearing, as of a little bit before 6:00 on the August 6th, there are 116 online comments. Of those in favor of the recommended budget. The remaining of those were some iteration of don't cut this, or don't cut that, or cut it in less amounts than had been identified. Since the August 6th public hearings, we have had additional 222 comments; all of those except two were in favor of not implementing the cuts that had been proposed.

"I have copies of all of those comments from the public hearing that I have will give to the Clerk, to make them part of the record for this meeting. The recommended 2016 Sedgwick County operating budget, \$394,143,119. The proposed budget includes \$129,580,173 property tax levy, which is approximately equivalent to a property tax rate expressed in mills of 29.359 mills.

"Sedgwick County's five-year Capital Improvement Program includes the building remodeling and repairing of public facilities and infrastructure, funding for the 2016 capital budget, \$61,894,742, includes \$3,556,376 for facilities and drainage projects, \$58,338,366 for road and bridge projects. Program also includes a rigorous inspection and maintenance program of county infrastructure that protects investments in existing roads, bridges and drainage structures. Again, the recommended budget includes appropriations of \$394,143,119, and as I mentioned, funded in part with a tax levy of \$129,580,173. This property tax, as we mentioned, requires an estimated tax rate expressed in mills of 29.359 mills, based on estimated assessed valuations. After discussion from Commissioners regarding some possible adjustments, the maximum budget, as Chris just pointed out in the last item, was published for Sedgwick County, at \$394,625,119, funded in part with a property tax levy of \$130,103,986. Again, which is approximately equivalent to a property tax rate expressed in mills of 29.478 mills. The spending plan for the 2016 capital budget, again, totals \$61,894,742, and the funding plan, which provided revenue to support the program cost covers all of these costs in 2016. For 2016 funding for the program includes \$22,749,617 cash, \$39,145,125 from other funding sources, for a total

funding of the \$61,894,742. The majority of the funding for the 2016 budget, capital improvement budget from intergovernmental revenue, \$39,145,125, for the interchange of I-235, and U.S. 254. You have in your packets, Commissioners, a resolution to adopt that includes all of those numbers, but there are indications that there are changes that are going to, or at least going to be discussed about those numbers. So Chris Chronis, our Chief Financial Officer, who will be acting as navigator this morning, and Lindsay Poe Rousseau will be flying the airplane.

"We have loaded a computer application called levy live, so that as you, and if you need to have discussions about changes in the budget, they will be able to show you what impact those changes have on the bottom line. So without any further discussion from me, I would say, Mr. Chairman, I'll turn the discussion to the bench and deem you take whatever actions that need to be done as appropriate."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Ron, thank you. First, I want to say thank you to you and Chris, Lindsay and all of the staff that does a lot of hard work. I know you have been doing a lot of hard work for months, and it hasn't slowed down any since the proposed budget was introduced. You are working with five different Commissioners that probably have 15 different ideas how to do things, and I appreciate all the hard work, the information that you have put out, and the assistance that you have given. Just remember; it is almost over for this year. And we will get to an end point. Also want to say that I want to thank all the public for all the input that we have gotten throughout this process. You know, we have listened to people, we have attempted to juggle the different view points, and now we have come to the point that we have to make an informed decision. It won't be easy. No one is going to get everything that they want. They call it making sausage, and that's what we are going to do here today, and try to address the viewpoints. It is a challenge when you have very passionate people on all sides saying they want to be represented, because we do represent other people.

"You have people who are passionate saying keep all the cuts, you have people who say don't keep any cuts, and you have people who say keep some cuts and not others. It is a challenge to juggle all those views in one single vote, but that's what we will do today. We absolutely thank everybody for all their input in the process. I am going to make a motion with respect to capital project before we do any major stuff here. Commissioner Norton."

Commissioner Norton said, "I just wanted to enter into the record, if you will allow me to, a letter that I received from for Wichita, an advocacy group that the KU (Kansas State University) Medical School and their board. I have received a lot of emails, but not put all of them in the record. Anything that I have gotten written I have tried to make sure it got into the public record. If you will allow me to, I will submit that. I have gotten another 150 emails. It's about 70 percent saying 'quit the cuts' and about 30 percent saying 'stick to the cuts', that I have received recently. I won't enter all those into the record because they were to me personally, it wasn't in a written form that I can produce. I can make those available, I have saved all of them, as I have responded to them, but I did want to enter that into the record today. That's all I have."

Chairman Ranzau said, "We do have two EMS stations on the CIP watch list, I think they scored equal amounts. EMS has come to us, subsequently to the budget being processed, and came up with a plan to fund the southeast EMS through some cash reserves they have, just for this purpose, and so we need to at least attempt to amend the CIP program, to accomplish that. So I am going to make this motion."

MOTION

Chairman Ranzau moved to add the southeast EMS (Emergency Medical Service) capital improvement project at a cost of \$1,395,829 to the 2016 Sedgwick County capital improvement program, and amend the 2016 budget resolution prepared by staff to reflect said action.

Commissioner Howell seconded the motion.

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Norton."

Commissioner Norton said, "Well, that was left over, but I'll yield to Commissioner Howell and maybe I'll come back later. That was just left over, sorry."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to let people know that we did not receive a briefing of this until the proposed budget was presented. We had earlier, before that proposed budget was presented, had discussions about a northeast EMS station being a priority, and it was one of those things, I think, that we were moving towards at some point, [20]16, [20]17, hopefully, as soon as we could, but we didn't know at that time, I think, where the money would come from, we had talked about the potential bonding or cash, I think those were different options on the table. Nevertheless, that was, I guess, pushed out in the CIP listing for the proposed budget. I was surprised when the news media reported on this topic, they included a southeast EMS station, which unfortunately, I had never even heard about. I am embarrassed to say that, but the reality is, I found out when the news reporter did. I had not known and staff had not briefed me. It is one of those things that has come to light since then.

"I think they reevaluated our emergency service needs through entire Sedgwick County and they discovered or analyzed or decided that the southeast EMS post was critical for public safety. The response times are too long; the growth has been so great that they needed to put a station there as soon as possible. They also identified a funding source for this post. There is no reason this can't go forward. I understand, this budget will actually be considered a loan from [20]16 and pay that loan back in [20]17. We are loaning money to ourselves, so to speak, to make this work. So I think getting that post built in 2016, as soon as possible, is a public safety concern. And we would like to respond to that.

"That is why this has come up, and I did receive a very thorough briefing from Director, Scott Hadley, our EMS Director, regarding this, and he presented some really good data to illustrate that point. So I think with that information and with more understanding and more conversations with staff, who had done some good analysis, I think this is an appropriate motion. I would certainly support that. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be supportive of the motion in light of the discussion with our Director, Scott Hadley, who has established priority and established the funding source. I would like to be on record saying that having that take a priority over the EMS station in District 1 is not exactly something I am real happy about, but I think circumstances probably require that. We do have the property secured, I think, for the EMS post in District 1, and I hope that will take a

priority, in our future capital planning. This is partly the result of I think some good, creative financing on behalf of our Public Safety Department, but also it is brought about by the decision not to use bond funding for some of these projects. I think we should still keep that on the table as the needs of our citizens become more acute, but right now, Mr. Hadley assured me that he can provide the coverage for the people in northeast part of Sedgwick County, so I will be supportive of the motion as it is. That's all I have."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Thank you. I am in the same position as Commissioner Howell, finding out after the fact, but I am convinced by staff and the staff briefing I received that this is the appropriate way to proceed, and we will be able to work it out internally in a way that this can move forward. I would be remiss not to mention that, you know, western part of the county continues to have a significant call volume, and that's a concern for a lot of the folks in my district. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Norton."

Commissioner Norton said, "Well, first of all, I am a little surprised that we have people that are surprised, since in the budget presentation it said tradeoff is two EMS stations. From the very beginning, two of the tradeoffs were moving EMS stations down the road in the capital improvement budget. So it surprised me. I knew about it, and have been very supportive of new fire stations and new EMS stations, you know, this Commission has stated many, many times that public safety is one of our number one goals, and postponing and moving capital projects that make the public safer and give our first responders a better place to react out of is one of the core functions.

"So I am a little surprised that we didn't know that we had EMS stations that had moved down the road in the capital improvement budget, and now we can find the funds for it. I will probably support this today, but I am very encouraged by what Commissioner Howell just said; we found a funding source. We found a funding source. As we move forward today, we'll have conversations about finding funding sources. And some of the iterations of the budget, that is exactly what's happened. We found funding sources where we can do a lot of the things we need to do for the public that has spoken to us. I find that very encouraging. As Commissioner Howell has said, we went out and found a funding source. That's what it's all about today.

"I will be supportive. I wish we could do both of them, with a little bonding we could probably go ahead where we've already bought property and put in the northeast station also, and continue down the road of having the best facilities, probably in the state, for public service and public safety. So, I am going to be very supportive of this, but I would be just as supportive of the one in the far northeast, and even bonding it to get there. But I am encouraged that we are starting to find funding sources, thank you, Mr. Chair."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would be remiss if I didn't point out that, you know, the county has put together a tremendous list of new facilities, and I wish, you know, if we really had the planning process worked out, EMS would be in conjunction with also the Fire District. We have a relatively new station; it is not the newest station. The newest EMS station and fire station in our county, and that's out in Goddard, but since I became a Commissioner, there are new fire stations out at Lake Afton, one in Goddard, the second newest is down in

southeast on South Clifton, which if we put the EMS station in at that time, but we moved away from cash funding for fire stations which we had and we moved into bonding. Of course, our newest fire station in the Fire District, down in Haysville, and I think the fire station capabilities that we have in terms of the age of our facilities, I mean, we have one of the newest physical plants of any Fire District in the entire country from everything I can find out. So I think it is important that we keep things in a broader perspective in terms of what commitments we've made in the past, and my understanding is from staff, because of some other changes that have nothing to do with the county, that's changing likely need for the EMS facility and reprioritization, so I do plan to be supportive of this restructuring that we are talking about this morning, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to respond to Commissioner Norton's comments. I want to be clear, there were no discussion in my office or in a conference room, or anyplace else, regarding the southeast EMS station prior to that Power Point that was presented in a day. As you know, it was a very detailed Power Point presentation, presented by our CFO (Chief Financial Officer), Chris Chronis.

"There are a lot of details in there. If you saw that, it is hard to pick up on every single detail within that, but nevertheless, that Power Point was followed with news reports, within a very short time. Whether it was the Power Point or the news media, I don't remember, but I remember, the point I am making is; I had no prior conversations with anybody regarding the need for a southeast EMS station.

"That was the first, that day, that I had heard about this. And may have been the Power Point, may have been the news media. The point I am reflecting on is the fact that I did not know about it before it was in the projected budget. In that form.

"No prior discussions. And that's I think the fault of staff not bringing that to our attention. I wish we didn't find out about things when they were already in print. That's unfortunate. Also, the fund source that was identified for this is one that was already under the EMS umbrella. A fund that is, I think, designed to fund EMS stations. Scott Hadley showed us that this is money in his own budget, if you will, a contingency for his own budget. He wants to use his money for this EMS station. I think that's the money we are talking about. He's making a choice for his own budget to move money from his contingency, his savings, into a building that he thinks is absolutely necessary. I agree with him. So we are not moving money from roads to funds an EMS station, let's be clear. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Chris, correct me if I am wrong, I think on the CIP, both of them scored I think 20 points. So they were on the same level, so to speak and Marvin, I don't know if you can speak to this. The reason this has become more of a priority is that somebody is going to create an urgent care facility, down there, next year. Wesley is going to create an urgent care facility, down south, so they are going to anticipate a lot of transfers up to Wesley. They would like to have this online about the same time, given the historical things that have happened in other parts of the county. So they have elected to move that and make that a high priority and get that done.

"The troubling thing for me in this whole deal, back when the former Manager gave us his plan for the budget, we had plans for three different EMS projects to be bonded, because that was the only option. Now a few months later, staff comes to us and says we have money for EMS set aside for this thing, we can, in fact, pay cash for

this. I am very disappointed that wasn't offered as a solution from the very beginning. Nevertheless, we will proceed. I did this one first, because I thought this was going to be the easy one. Commissioner Norton."

Commissioner Norton said, "Chris, is the money in 2016 coming from the EMS budget?"

Mr. Chronis said, "No, sir. The budget has been set at a maximum amount that was published, and we would not be able to fund this additional post within that limit, unless we made corresponding reductions of spending elsewhere in the budget. This proposal is to add the project to the CIP, pay for it with a loan of cash from the general fund to the EMS fund, and then in the 2017 budget for the repayment of that loan to the general fund from EMS. So that's the point at which the EMS cash would be available to use."

Commissioner Norton said, "So, if the EMS cash is not available to put back the loan, what happens? In 2017."

Mr. Chronis said, "The general fund stays short of cash by that amount of money."

Commissioner Norton said, "So we are borrowing the money to fund this project."

Mr. Chronis said, "Yes."

Commissioner Norton said, "Okay. That's all I have, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Chris, does this have...I think I know the answer to this. I think it would be good to have it on the record. If we approve this item, this is considered, I think, a transfer, or cash, and has no impact on the mill levy directly."

Mr. Chronis said, "It has no impact on either the mill levy or the budget that Ron has. This is a capital budget item."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Chris, isn't it true we are asking to do this loan because we are too far in the process. If we had had this option earlier we could have put that in and taken the money directly out of EMS in 2016, if we had made that decision earlier?"

Mr. Chronis said, "That's always an option, yes."

Chairman Ranzau said, "And the other option would be to wait until 2017 and take it directly out, otherwise we are really left with no other option, but to loan this and then pay it back, basically, obviously at no interest, because we are so far in the process, and this was not offered as a solution early enough. Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "Just to be clear, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to be clear, this motion is for spending approximately \$1.4 million for this EMS station. Can you tell us about what the balance in that fund will be used to repay the loan? What is the balance in that fund right now?"

Mr. Chronis said, "The EMS fund balance is \$3.4 million."

Commissioner Howell said, "So, \$3.4 million in the fund, currently, and it is going to be used to repay \$1.4 million loan. Is there anything I don't know right now that would cause me concern about that money not being available in 2017 to repay this loan? Anything that you can think of?"

Mr. Chronis said, "No,"

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Seeing no other questions, Madam Clerk, call the vote."

VOTE

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

Chairman Ranzau said, "Okay. So that amends the budget and adds that in. Now, we can proceed with any other discussion questions or suggestions from Commissioners on the operational budget in general. Don't be shy."

Mr. Chronis said, "Commissioner, if I might, we had given you a briefing about what is on screen, but the people in the audience and anybody watching on TV might wonder what they are looking at. This is a tool that was developed some years ago by budget staff and we've used frequently since then, and on the top of the screen, what you see is, in the column called proposed budget, the amount that was included in the recommended budget, that was originally delivered to you last month; \$394,143,119. That budget was proposed to be funded with a property tax levy of \$129,580,173, and based on the current estimate of assessed valuation, a property tax rate, a mill levy of 29.359 would be necessary to produce that revenue. And that budget and that property tax revenue, we anticipate would generate a deficit at the end of the year, and our tax funds of \$1,140,000. That was budget. You are about to propose some changes to that recommended budget. And as you do that, Lindsay will enter those changes on the bottom part of this screen, and for each change, what we will ask you to do is identify the character of the change, the nature of the change. What it is you want to do, how much money is attached to that change, what fund type is associated with the change, that is, is it tax funds, or non-tax funds, and we will identify the funding source, and for this purpose, the funding source might be an increase in property tax revenue, it might be an increase in other revenues than property taxes. It might be a transfer from some existing, proposed spending. A transfer of budget authority, in which case there is no impact on the total budget, and there may be an impact on the deficit, depending on where the transfer is coming from.

"You will be able to see those changes, on the fly, in the yellow box at the top of the page. So you will see, in the yellow box, where the budget stands, having taken into account all the changes that the Commission has adopted. The far right column, change from proposed, identifies the net change that you have made to the recommended budget. As you make those proposals, Lindsay will add them to this screen and we will be able to show you what the impact is. But if you do not take a vote on the action, there is a check box on each row that where we will flip the switch, and that change, even though it may still appear on the screen, will not be included in the county top of the page. So it will only be the items that are checked that are included in the adjusted budget. The Board of County Commissioners deliberations

budget.

"And so with that kind of an overview of what you are looking at, and what the audience is looking at, I think it would be appropriate now for you to entertain whatever proposals and discuss whatever proposals for change to the recommended budget you might make."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Thank you, Chris. Commissioners, what is the will of the Board? I know there's been some Commissioners with a plan. Commissioner Unruh, would you like to share, with us, your plan? Plan C I heard all about?"

Commissioner Unruh said, "There is a lot of controversy about that, Mr. Chairman. I think probably Commissioner Norton will do that. I wanted to follow protocol, I was told Commissioner Howell wanted to present first. My staff, actually, Mr. Chairman, you said that he requested that. So, I don't want to get in Commissioner Howell's way."

Commissioner Howell said, "Mr. Chairman, I spoke to Commissioner Unruh this morning and informed him that was no longer my wish. I would like to see Plan C, before I make any motions to change anything else. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Okay, well. Does anybody want to say anything? Commissioner Norton."

Commissioner Norton said, "Certainly I am not going to let us come to impasse this quickly in the process. Lindsay, I know you have got Plan C loaded in. I am going to advocate for that; you know, Commissioner and I worked, after we heard all the public input, and I want to make it very clear that as the process went along, over the years I have always thought that it's best to listen first, to understand and speak second to be understood. And now maybe it's time to speak. We listened to what the public had to say, not only in these chambers, but over the internet, on the public forum, through phone calls, and other contacts, and it was pretty clear to me that there were many, many people in the community that advocated for us to try to restore either all or most of the funding to many of the critical services that have been cut in the original proposed budget. And trying to take a very simple approach, Commissioner Unruh and I found that if you took the little bit of mill levy from keeping the mill flat, a little bit of money which comes out to \$480,000, not the true \$520,000, because there are some technical adjustments there that lower it, and if you took the road cold mix project, which is a super slurry seal project line item, which is \$1,250,000, added those together, we could just about clean up and restore all the cuts to all those important agencies, programs, and services that we provide and have provided for many, many years. It doesn't increase taxes any. It does not change any budgetary requirements, and it finds a funding source.

"I heard that earlier. Find the funding source. We found one. All it requires is for each Commissioner to give up one mile of taking a gravel road, out in the county, and unincorporated areas, and putting it in a slurry seal mix. We have had other years we have had to postpone or move around that program, like many other programs, and this would be one of those years. What we do in [20]17 is a different thing. We could revitalize that program or make it a second year. You know, we have had a conversation about that program over a lot of years of my term, because every time you take one of those gravel road and put it into a paved road, now you have to maintain in a different manner. It comes out of the township system where it's taken care of by township officials, duly elected, and puts it into the county road system and we have to maintain it. Over the years our own Public Works Director, Dave Spears, has cautioned that every mile you add in comes a mile that in three to

seven years you may have to do more work on. You have to rejuvenate them, you have to reseal them. You may even have to tear them out and redo them. We are setting ourselves up for more expense later, and trying to do some other things. So postponing it for one year, taking a breath, being sure we get all of our partners plenty of time to know that maybe next year we are going to have to cut, and we can have great negotiations, and not just do it right at the budget season, I think makes sense to me. I am going to propose that. At some point after we have had discussion, I would be glad to make a motion."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to tag along with what Commissioner Norton said, I don't know if I was listening close enough, but we have added back two people to the Election Commissioner's Office, in addition to the two that had been planned in the recommended budget. From our presentation the other day, that increases that by that \$114,626. And that's part of the reason why we, in this presentation, we add to the deficit by \$133,000."

"This does for detail, for folks that have a hard time seeing that, I just might, some of the big items that restores funding for the Health Department; most all their programs, Project Access, for Foster Grandparents, for GWEDC (Greater Wichita Development Coalition), for SCKEDD (South Central Kansas Economic Development District), WATC (Wichita Area Technical College), the [Sedgwick County] Zoo, Exploration Place and our relationship with Wichita on the Metropolitan Area Planning Department (MAPD). Those are all in that \$1.863 we are adding, and that leads to the additional deficit of \$133,000. But this is, as the Commissioner said, and I agree, I think this is an easy approach to listening to constituents, listening to the citizens of Sedgwick County and, at the same time, keeping our word in some of these agreements. That's a big focus for me. That's all I have right now, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Should I treat that as a second, Commissioner Unruh?"

Chairman Ranzau said, "I don't think that a motion has been made yet."

Commissioner Unruh said, "If you would like to, I would be happy to second."

MOTION

Commissioner Norton moved to accept the changes, in Plan C, as presented."

Commissioner Unruh seconded the motion.

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Thank you. Just for clarification, for the record, when you presented this plan yesterday, it didn't include the positions that would basically be mandated for the two slots in the Election Commissioner's office. How are those being funded, Commissioner Unruh?"

Commissioner Unruh said, "Those extra two positions are in this proposal. Another slight modification we took out was senior citizen amount, so the actual net change is about \$119,000. We are funding this through the one mile road project in each Commission district. Each Commissioner would have to yield or defer one mile of

road in each district, which comes up with \$1.25 million."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Actually, I think it is a little bit turned around. I appreciate the clarification, that there is no intent to impact senior centers, and I am glad that's removed from this."

"It looks to me, I can't see it from here, but it looks like you are funding that, by pulling the funds out contingency, which doesn't impact it, which is my question."

Chairman Ranzau said, "It's reserves. It increases the deficit."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Oh, increases the deficit. I will turn this over to our CFO, Mr. Chronis."

Mr. Chronis said, "The proposal that is before you right now, increases the amount of property tax in the budget, by \$480,000. So, that in combination with the \$1.25 million that is moved from the capital program to the operating program are the funding sources that are being added to pay for the items on this list. The net effect of all those items is to provide an increase of the anticipated deficit of \$133,131. And just to get it on record, because it is a little bit difficult, I know, for the Clerk to refer to something that appears on screen, we will provide the Clerk with a printout of what you are seeing on the screen so that it can be attached to the record, the changes that are included in Plan C, are pretty extensive, and involves some positions that would be added back to the budget that have been cut in the recommended budget. We want to make sure that gets on the record correctly."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Mr. Chronis, if I can continue my questions. You just threw out a number that was a little bit, I think, unexpected, because when we talked about the difference between 29.359, which was the last Commission vote to set a mill levy, and the actual levy that was in place at the beginning of this year, 29.477, that was I think \$512,000, and you mentioned a figure now that the difference there only generates about \$480,000. Would you kind of explain what happened to the rest of that money?"

Mr. Chronis said, "\$512,000, or whatever the number is, I believe it's \$523,00, actually. That is the amount of the property tax levy that would be added. From that levy, we expect some taxes will not be paid. There will be delinquencies, and additional taxes that are levied, by Sedgwick County, will be diverted to city tax increment financing districts, and so the net result of those impacts on the amount of taxes you levy is that we expect you will actually receive \$480,000 that you can spend on county services."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "So long-term consequence of TIF (Tax Increment Financing) districts are partially on display here, having an impact on county revenues. One of the problems I have with this proposal, and I find it ironic, because I know how a number of business groups have been strongly supportive of roads and road construction, and here they are saying let's remove \$1,250,000 from this, and I thought it was ironic, in light of the fact that this year and last year we are spending \$3.3 million on two road projects to do only two miles in District 1, and we could have done those, we could have done the same type of amounts, put super seal roads in for a tiny fraction of that amount, \$500,000, and we would be out of this problem. The challenge of this budget, if we want to go down that road."

"I am very disappointed, because when you have got 150 miles of cold mix road, average lifespan, roughly five years, from what I have been told, and of course it varies depending on the volume of traffic and the weight of the traffic, this plan to pull

\$1,250,000, but in light of the fact that we had \$3 million, 3.4 million to do two miles of road on 45th Street and 53rd Street in the northeast part of the county by an industrial park, you sit there and go wait a minute.

"As a Commissioner who has half the road miles in this county; well, I share them with Commissioners in District 2 and District 4 and over half the bridges, I find this disingenuous. But that doesn't upset me as much as the fact that, well, looks like we are going to let the property tax levy move from .359 to .477. That's not a big amount. It does generate close to half a million dollars. But as a Commissioner who promised not to raise the mill levy, and who has been trying to stand by that promise, I will live at .359, I will die with .359. I think we need to make some adjustments to this budget. I am going to try and share my opinions as we go forward. But this plan, and I could go through in details, we cannot add additional positions which this proposal would do. We cannot let certain departments grow seven percent, year over year, which this proposal would do.

"So I could go through it item by item. I am not going to go through it at this point. But beyond these specific areas that I have concerns at the moment, but I want to be clear, this is an amendment, I commend Commissioners Unruh and Norton for their hard work in terms of bringing this forward, and also in terms of commending people, I want to commend our finance staff who have done an outstanding job, having to work with us, and also everyone in the public, I see some faces out here who I know were at the public hearing, and testified. It is so very important, I am glad we have had this extended public discussion, extended public input. I would say my recent emails have been 50/50, between those who are saying restore the spending, doesn't matter what happens, where you get the money for it, and people saying, no, no, no, high and tight, in terms of taxes and spending. So I wanted to get that on the record as part of this. This is a proposal I can't support, although I do appreciate both Commissioner Norton and Commissioner Unruh's work and their passion in putting it together. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to say part of my motivation or a big part of my motivation is the strong outpouring of public support, just in one measurement of what the community wants, our online public forum has a little over 400 entries on it, and there are about 20 of those who say that they support our current recommended budget. The rest of those folks are urging us to change what we are doing. I think the term that is being used, is quit the cuts. Beyond that, I would say that, talking about a road that's in the ground and being used and promoting economic growth in our county, and is done, I guess we can talk about decisions made a couple years ago, which I think had unanimous support when we voted on that from this Board, so I don't know if that's part of the conversation. I am just responding to the comment that I think as we consider what we can do, going forward, the solution that's presented right now is simple, straightforward, and we have, at previous times, suspended that, when it was necessary, to keep our budget whole. And I think we should listen to our citizens and we should keep our word on some of these commitments. That's all I have right now, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Quick question for Commissioner Unruh. These two roads I mentioned, which municipality are they in?"

Commissioner Unruh said, "Those are in the Bel Aire Industrial Park."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Are those in city limits of Bel Aire?"

Commissioner Unruh said, "In the big land purchased several years ago, yes, they are."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Bel Air is a city of the second class, right?"

Commissioner Unruh said, "That is correct."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "So they are not part of the county system."

Commissioner Unruh said, "That is also correct."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "We really didn't have the responsibility for doing those projects, did we?"

Commissioner Unruh said, "That is also correct. However, Mr. Chairman, may I continue?"

Chairman Ranzau said, "You may."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you. It was the unanimous wisdom of this board that in a, that that was a significant contribution to the Economic Development potential of Sedgwick County, and it has proven to be very successful in these last couple years."

"We have, I think it is, a UPS trucking facility out there. We have got, Mr. Perez has the basketball academy out there. We have a couple other businesses I don't remember, and a concrete transfer station out there. So it has been a real stimulation for Economic Development in Sedgwick County, and I will continue to say that the Commission was wise to participate in that way. That's all I have."

Chairman Ranzau said, "I don't want to get involved too much into this, but I would hesitate to say that it was unanimous vote. I could be wrong. I think it was 3-2. But I could be wrong."

Commissioner Unruh said, "I think it wasn't. Maybe one of the interns could check that. So the public knows. If I am wrong, I will say I am sorry for saying it. But I think I am right."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Just a small detail. Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do have a couple questions. I would like to ask Commissioner Norton, what do you plan to do next year should this budget be tough like this year. Do you plan on taking another \$1.25 million out of the cold mix road program next year?"

Commissioner Norton said, "It's always hard to speculate what's going to happen the next year. I would anticipate that maybe we wouldn't have to do that. We will find other sources, you know, things change as we move along. I am hopeful that there will be changes in our revenue projections, things that we have done, we are moving towards a different dynamic on debt and capital projects anyway, so I think this gives us a chance to breathe a little bit. Understand, and truthfully, I am very willing to give up my mile of road down in my district."

"I don't have as much rural space as Commissioner Peterjohn, but I have got a lot of rural, south of Haysville and west towards Clearwater in my district, you know, I could

probably find a road that I wanted to do, but I will postpone that to make sure that many of our partners, programs, services; truthfully, that I have advocated for a lot of years.

"Many of these didn't come around just this year. Some of these go back for many years. Project Access, I was involved in that when I was Mayor of Haysville, I sat on United Way board as we brought partners to the table to create Project Access. So I am very loyal to that. I think it does good work. I have been intimately involved with the board, with John Roselle and Ann Nelson for years and years, and I am not ready to diminish their funding, to that out of our communities. That's just one of them. I can go to WATC, Exploration Place, on and on, the things that I have tried to restore.

"Not to mention the Health Department. I have been intimately involved with the Health Department for many years. In fact, helped bring the negotiations together that brought the Health Department under the auspices of Sedgwick County, instead of being a dual Wichita-Sedgwick County Health Department. Since then we have done some, I think, really good health promotion work in our community. We have moved towards accreditation, streamlined a lot of our services, we've tied in with a lot of great partners and done really good work as a Health Department, and it was a very fractured system. I could go down the litany of items there, but I am pretty loyal to, had my fingers in, and am not ready to diminish their return on investment in our community."

Commissioner Howell said, "So, right now, you would say then, that is potentially a place you would find money next year. Based on what you just said."

Commissioner Norton said, "No."

Commissioner Howell said, "No, you are not willing to do it next year?"

Commissioner Norton said, "I would be willing, if I had to. I am not proposing that we go for two years in a row. Our budget is one year at a time. If we move towards a two-year budget, or a five-year budget or whatever, then I would say maybe we would have to consider that. No, I am not ready to say we have to do that next year. But I would do it. I would give it up in a heartbeat."

Commissioner Howell said, "I do have further comments, but I do see that Commissioner Unruh's light is on, so I will yield to him for a little while, thank you."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you. I think we are moving towards a conclusion of this discussion. I just want to say, or share with you all a quote that I saw the other day that said that a budget is not just a collection of numbers. No disrespect to our budget department. But a budget is not just a collection of numbers, but it is an expression of the values and aspirations of our community. That's what this Sedgwick County budget is. And I think that the values and aspirations of our community are best supported and described in this compromise than one that cuts and eliminates so much of that funding. I think, once again, we need to listen to the people, and keep our promises. That's all I have."

Commissioner Howell said, "May I continue, Mr. Chairman?"

Chairman Ranzau said, "Yes, you may."

Commissioner Howell said, "I guess I do have another question, and that is to Commissioner Norton, or Commissioner Unruh. I would like to know why in 2012, and 2013, and 2015 especially, I will name some of the things that were cut in those

years; in 2012, they did cut \$360,000 the Zoo, \$158,000 to Exploration Place, other community programs, \$48,000, they eliminated at least 62 positions. It is hard to understand all of this. They did across the board cuts with public safety and non-public safety, 6.6 percent, and 3.3 percent respectively. In 2013, they did cut the Zoo, \$256,000. Exploration Place another \$112,000, WATC another \$47,000. Last year they cut WATC \$150,000. My question to you gentlemen, why in those years did you not take money from this program at that time, if you were willing to cut those projects instead?"

Commissioner Unruh said, "I don't know what the record says. I don't remember all those details from three years ago. I remember what I had for dinner last night. But I would just say that with the help of staff, and the concurrence of the Commissioners, we found a solution, and we carried on services to the citizens of Sedgwick County. Exactly the detail of that, Commissioner, I don't remember."

Commissioner Howell said, "Let me make some comments, if you don't mind. For the record, I think since yesterday, I am going to guess about 100 emails encouraging me to support the proposed budget. And it is interesting that they came in that late, but I have had a number of emails over the last three, four weeks that said, essentially, the same thing. Yesterday I got inundated with a very large number of emails that encouraged me to stay with what we have."

"I will tell you that I have been working very hard to talk to our agency leaders, and our community partners to find the things, I think, that are critical, they have critical funding needs. I would say I have had hundreds of conversations, trying to seek a balance, and a budget that is very difficult. Let me remind everyone, this is the 8th year, in a row, that we have had budgets that required cuts. In 2012, they had to cut 16.3 million dollars. In 2013, they had to cut \$9.3 [million]. We started off this budget session trying to cut \$10.3 million. There's been a lot of discussion about bonding."

"I would like to explain, because I think the public misunderstood my ideology, if you will, to bond out something that is routine in nature, something that's small in value, I think is unwise. That's what this road maintenance program is. If you don't mind, I would like to ask you to think about your personal budgets. If you want to buy things on your credit card and make the minimum payments, things such as food or gasoline, or other things, such as that, make the minimum payments, and you are pulling money out of your savings account to pay your bills, then something has to happen. Either change your behavior, or get a second source of income; raise your revenue, if you will, or you will be destined for financial ruin. I think that's exactly what is going on here."

"We have eight years, in a row, of budgets with significant cuts. And this year is no different. In fact, I would tell you I believe what we have right now as a new normal. We have been juggling, trying to find ways to keep our operations budget supported with all kinds of interesting financial ideas. The fundamental problem is the operation budget is too big. I know when times are good, in the 1990, middle 1990, especially middle 2000s, back in those days, the budgets were growing; the revenue sources were going each year. I think in those days you could sit back and say we are going to fund everything that we funded last year and you would have a pile of money left over, what would you like to do?"

"They could return the money back to the taxpayer. That's not what happened generally. Most of the times they find things in the community that are worthy, do good things, they partner with them. Those partnerships were created in good times. But those partnerships were not promises forever. I think you do those things when you have the time and also when up the opportunity. It is not something that you can do necessarily forever. It is not an obligation that you are willing to, necessarily, say

we are going to do this all the time. In fact, I would like to argue that when we tax someone, especially with property taxes, it is with the understanding that we are doing something absolutely necessary and critical, that we are doing something that can't be done in the private sector. Let me say that again, it cannot be done in the private sector.

"Things like building roads, things like an emergency management system, 911 system, or a jail system, or court system, or sheriff's office, or sheriff's public safety system, EMS services, Health Departments, mental health, or a variety of other things; we could go on and on and on, but these are things the individual citizens don't have much of an ability to provide for themselves. We, as government, take their tax dollars, and we do these things for the common good. But then we turn around, we do things that are artist, charitable, and, sometimes they are helpful, yes.

"But, these are things that the community could support on their own if they wanted to make that choice. For example, someone wanted to give their money to United Way, to support Project Access, they could definitely do that, if they wanted to. There are times people actually lose their homes because they can't pay property tax bills. I find that to be a curious reality, because the Constitution talks about property rights. We, as leaders of this community, ought to be standing up to the Constitution and right to own property. Property taxes are one of those things we do out of necessity, not because we want to be generous to people in the private sector, with things they could do on their own. So I have trouble with the idea of higher tax rates, and taking people's homes away, to support some of the things that are in this proposed budget.

"I would let the public know, I would let you know, I do have a plan. Should this plan not be adopted, that would restore some of the funding to things like Project Access, and others. I will explain that when my time comes up. Go back to the issue of bonding. I do have a home mortgage, but what makes that different is, it is a very large purchase, and I get to enjoy living in that while I am paying for it. It is extraordinary, because it is a large purchase, and trying to save money for a house is nearly impossible. Some people might be able to do that, but it's pretty unlikely. Even Dave Ramsey supports the idea of a home mortgage and he is, obviously, a financial expert on personal finance. Having said that, if I have a savings account, if I have good financial practices, if my refrigerator breaks, I can go and pay cash for that, because it's not an especially large purchase. I certainly wouldn't be using debt for things like food and gasoline. So, there is a variety of different things we purchase, that you can approach with a different methodology, if you will. Applying that to county government. Do I support something that is routine and small in nature with bonding, I don't think that's wise. If you use bonding for something that's large, for example, City of Wichita about to purchase \$35 million library. Should that be the will of that body? I think in that case, bonding might make sense. We purchased an arena. We did the National Center for Aviation Training. We have used bonding for many things, in Sedgwick County, they were fairly large in nature and needed, at the time that they were done and were paid for, for a very long period of time. And, you get to enjoy those much like you enjoy your home. So, in those cases, bonding makes sense. I would support that type of bonding, on those conditions.

"But again, to bond out things that are routine in nature, things that are small purchases, overall, I think that is not wise. In 2015, we are going to need to bond out \$4 million in roads, for previous decisions, of another Commission. Last year, they actually made the choice to bond out \$4 million in 2015. We have not acted on that, yet, we still have to do that this year and we also purchased an IRS (Internal Revenue Service) building, the 271 building, where we put out \$5 million out of that we will, arguably, do bonding on that, so that's \$9 million in 2015, that I think the Commission generally supports. I would expect that sometime between now and the end of the year, we will approve those bonds.

"So, the idea that we're not going to bond, I think, is misunderstood. But you know what; we have been bonding roads for a long time. Let me explain that we have different sources of income. Some of the income comes from sales taxes, and that money is primarily used for road preservation. There's other money from bonds and also from grants, from the federal government, we've used for a very long time. I've found in discussion that we received federal dollars for our county road program for 33 years. I actually have a little graphic I'd like to show you. If you could see this, this is the top, you can't read it very closely, because print, but it shows 3 years, 2014, [20]15, and [20]16. In 2014, we spent \$22.153 million on a county road and bridge program. Some of that money was used for preservation, some of that money was used for CIP. The sources of funding, again, were sales taxes, federal grants and bonding. In 2015, we went from \$22.15 down to \$20.311. This year, the proposed budget is \$18.326. What Commissioner Unruh and Norton are proposing is reducing that down to \$17.076. So if you think about a two-year change going from \$22.15 down to \$17.06, it looks like this. I don't know if you can see that or not. But it's a downward trend, and I don't know where that goes. I would tell you that the decisions that made this happen are going to last through 2018.

"I'd like to read a little something I wrote, and I would like to just inform the folks listening that several years ago, Commissioner Unruh, Commissioner Norton and my predecessor voted to fund the Kellogg and I-235 interchange project, with federal funds. I think that's a great project. I'm glad that they found ways to make that go forward. However, they made this agreement with the City of Wichita this would be solely funded through county effort and not through any other sources. They do receive federal funds. Let me go on just a little bit farther. They decided to fund this with federal funds that would normally have helped the county roads, CIP, capital improvement program, which makes more significant repairs to roads and bridges throughout the county. The county had made a deal with the city where Sedgwick County alone would provide the total match funds for this \$116 million project. This is the 33rd year Sedgwick County has received federal funding, that we have become dependent upon, to help fund the county road and bridge CIP program. Without that funding, there are not enough other funds available to be able to run the program ahead of the needs. Let me step away from my notes here for a moment. We have 150 miles of cold mix roads, a plan to replace those roads, but that plan is 17 years in length. One of my fellow Commissioners mentioned these roads last between 3, 5, maybe 6 to 9 years, but they're not going to last 17 years. Our plan to replace these roads is a 17 year plan.

"The decision that these three make diverts \$3.2 million in 2016 plus another \$867,000 transfer from the sales tax revenue that would normally have been used to county road and maintenance CIP money. Similar transfer planned for 2017 and 2018. That project pulls a total of \$11.6 million out of the county road CIP program over three years. We also are cutting roads another \$710,000 in our proposed budget.

"So rather than doing \$4 million of road projects, we're doing \$710,000 less. The proposed budget has that in there. Our Public Works Director, David Spears, accepted that challenge. The Plan C cuts roads another \$1.25 million. Now, you say this is just for unnecessary projects in our district. Let me tell you that one of the projects identified in my district, which I would love to see this something we address, but you're asking me to give up on a vision of my district. I would call that the death of a vision. Southeast High School is nearing completion. It will be open in about a year from now. On that project, they plan to pave from the parking lot, north to Pawnee. That's about a half mile. Going so from Southeast High School to 31st Street is planned to be a gravel road. Now, I don't think that's a good idea. This is an area that I think you're going to see high school kids go from pavement on to dirt at

high rates of speed, and they're going to lose control of their cars, and it's going to be a safety issue. The township Clerk has already contacted me. They have great concerns about maintenance and safety on this road. I've talked to our Director, David Spears, as well, and he also has concerns about this road. It comes with high recommendations that this is a road that needs to be taken care of. And I planned to take care of that, with this with this project, that's being proposed to eliminate.

"Anyway, taking money from road projects is exactly what the legislature does. They move money from the needy road budget, also known as the bank KDOT (Kansas Department of Transportation), to fund road operations and the people across the state they land bass legislators every year for doing that. This plan would restore all of the cuts, which I'm not willing to do. That plan is unsustainable and kicks the can down the road, making next year's budget even more bleak. I would also like to let everyone know, not only is this the eighth year with tough budgets in a row, I've been here since January, and I've already received 3 financial quarterly reports, all three of them were clearly negative. The forecast is not positive, and for Commissioners to sit up here and to believe that next year is going to be better, I think is wishful thinking. I think I'd rather be grounded in reality. We have a new normal and I think our operations budget is too large.

"I guess I will not be supporting this budget. I would like to talk about the items in their proposal I do support. There are a number of items; in the newspaper this morning, if you read it. I hope my colleagues read it. I can explain that now or later, whichever is appropriate. My approach is based on hundreds of discussions I've had with community partners and agency leaders. It provides a very balanced approach that reduces operations and yet takes care of the most critical things in our county.

"A couple of things in the Health Department, including Project Access, the Health Care Navigator, which is coordination of healthcare to our citizens. They helped 2,500 people last year. It does fund the Zoo, appropriately to take care of 100 percent of their salaries for 2016, restores some money to Exploration Place. I'll explain the rest of this later. But, I guess my point is this, that a balanced approach, when we have dyer and bleak forecasts, eight years in a row of significant cuts, I think to fund everything 100 percent and kick that can down the road by gutting roads is a precedent that we can't afford. I did ask one of the Commissioners about the idea of next year, about whether we would gut roads or not, and the answer at that time was pretty quickly; well, if we need to, I guess we can do. That I guess my point is, this is a precedent.

"We've got a core function taking care of roads and bridges as far as Economic Development, people don't say I'm going to move to a place where roads are great. But there are places in this country where you don't want to live because roads are bad.

"This is a form of Economic Development, if you will. We have fantastic roads and bridges, in Sedgwick County because we have done a good job, over the years, taking care of them. This is a turning point. Talk about transitional budgets. What we're doing right now is transitioning into neglecting our roads and bridges that need that money to be taken care of.

"I can't support that plan. I could talk a lot longer if you wanted me to, but I've said too much already. So, Mr. Chairman, that's my comments. Thank you."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Thank you. Just a clarification and one point, because

while the I-235 and Kellogg project is absolutely a necessity and the local match is entirely county funded, because of its location, I don't think Sedgwick County should have been the only one funding it. We had some discussions about 3-2 votes or not. I very distinctly remember that we had a 3-2 vote on that item, because I thought that Sedgwick County shouldn't be the only one funding it and that roughly between \$11 million and \$12 million is going to be entailed with that project for the local match or about 10 percent of the first phase of that project should have fallen entirely on Sedgwick County, because it's had a big impact in our Public Works Department and will for 2016, 2017, 2018. I'm glad that intersection is being done, but I wish Sedgwick County wasn't the lone ranger on that. It's a good example, Commissioner Howell, in terms of how, even though we may say that one Commission can't tie the hands of a future Commission, Mr. Howell, I think your hands are a little bit tied."

Commissioner Howell said, "They are."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Norton."

Commissioner Norton said, "I just wanted to clarify a little bit on the Kellogg and I-235. I was Chairman of WAMPO (Wichita Area Metropolitan Planning Organization) when Deb Miller, then Mike King and Jerry Youngers came to me, to talk about the exchange, and it became apparent that if the number one bad intersection, on that system, in the state, was going to move forward with federal and state funding, that a local match had to be part of it. And then we talked about the whole Kellogg Expressway, and they were going to do Webb Road, an interchange there, and a Greenwich Road Interchange. All of that together helped me draw a conclusion, and I talked to a lot of people, that maybe the county should not be nickel and dimed on a lot of different little projects that needed to be done with state funding and federal funding, that we would pick one. As I came to the conclusion with my colleagues at WAMPO, with other Commissioners, it seemed to me, the best choice would be to take the number one project in our region, the number one safety issue in our community, and take that on as a county. Even though it falls in the City of Wichita, I try to remember that about 75 percent of my electorate comes from and lives in the City of Wichita and that much of the population travels through that interchange, either on the north-south track or going to the airport or east and west. So, I don't think it was bad use of county money. We serve populations that live in small towns, unincorporated areas and our metro area, and that is the number one interchange that needed help, and we parlayed our money into one pool, one place and didn't have to look at 20 projects up and down that corridor but the one major project, and that's how that came.

"I mean, it went through a lot of vetting to get to that one final conclusion, and I don't remember how it passed through the Commission, but it did, and I'm proud that it did, because we're going to get that fixed in our community. I can't tell you how many people over the years have told me that is dangerous. I don't even drive through the, I hate it, when are you going to fix it. And I'd go, well, it's not particularly a county project, but we'll try to be partners on it, and we were. So thank you, Mr. Chair."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a couple of quick things. One, in Commissioner Howell's conversation a few minutes ago, in his talking about projects that we had bonded, he named the [Intrust Bank] Arena in there and he probably didn't mean to, but that's paid for with cash."

Commissioner Howell said, "I understand, thank you."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Second thing is, I will just remind everyone that we still have a budget, even if we follow this Plan C of \$17.1 million that we're spending on Sedgwick County projects, not including the I-235 and Kellogg Interchange. And then the last thing I'd say is that this plan is consistent and supports the Commission goals as stated in the recommended budget, which was reduce the debt; we aren't hurting that, reduce property tax; that's the one that is off of the table in this, set aside cash for future projects; we're doing that, improve core services; we're doing that, and eliminate deficits; we're doing that.

"So, four out of five of the stated goals when we rolled out our proposed budget, we're still supporting. This also has the aspect of supporting our community partners, listening to our people, keeping our promises and doing it with a simple, one-year sacrifice on the amount of Commissioners for one mile of road. That's all I have, Mr. Chair."

Chairman Ranzau said, "I'd like to say a few things. I will talk about some important factors that I'll use in making my decision on how I'll vote on a variety of things that have come up today. This certainly is not an inclusive list, but these are some important things. First of all, I agree with Commissioner Peterjohn. I believe we need to maintain the mill levy. This is important to struggling families. I know some people may not care about it, but I've heard from a lot of people who have taxes raising from a lot of different entities, and they say they hate the property taxes going up, the mill levy going up, do anything you can to live within your means. I think that's very important and we can reach an agreement, while doing that.

"Next, I think we need to minimize the use of reserves except for planned CIP operations, because using reserves for operations is not an operable solution and not something we can continue over the long haul. Next, I think we need to protect our investments in infrastructure. That includes roads and bridges. As previously stated, we're reducing by \$4.7 million this year. Additionally with certain roads and bridges, we're at the point that our repeated borrowing causes us to spend \$5.7 million a year, but get a net benefit of \$2.4 million in road and bridge projects. Beyond that, we also have a need of 150 miles of cold mix to be replaced, and Public Works has come up with a plan here that's going to cost \$47 million, over 17 years to do this. You've got to have the vision to get this done, and you've got to have a plan to get that done. "And we need to protect this program and our roads and bridges, not let them deteriorate. We have cut roads and bridges. I've spoken extensively to our Public Works Director, and he has told me that any additional cuts are not advisable.

"Next, we, of course, need to decrease our use of debt, which we talked about. I don't have a mortgage payment. I used to. And without that mortgage payment, that empowers me to provide for my family much more easily, gives us a lot more options, and that's why if we can move in that right direction, it empowers us to provide better services in the long run for our community.

"Next, I think the budget needs to have a vision and a plan to address the future. We just can't kick the can down the road and hope that we'll have increased growth, because the fact of the matter is we're having slower than expected growth. The leading indicators are declining, and we need to face that reality. You just can't be focused on just one part of the budget.

"You have to see all parts of the budget, and we need to avoid tunnel vision, which is

difficult to do sometimes, because everyone has their own issue that they think is important, but as Commissioners, we've got to see the whole thing. Lastly, I think we need to move towards empowering all citizens to decide what the money is spent on with respect to nonprofit agencies. You know, there are a lot of nonprofit agencies out there. The vast majority of them do not get funding from the taxpayers. And I've heard from some of them, as well as some for-profit businesses that compete with nonprofits that get taxpayer support, and they don't like that, and they don't think it's right. Beyond that, there are a lot of people who want to have the power or the right to decide for themselves what nonprofits they support. So right now we have a situation in which a relatively small minority of nonprofits do get taxpayer funding, but there is a large segment of our population that don't want their taxes going to those organizations. They want to be able to make that decision. They want the right to choose, and they have no voice in this. They've been completely disenfranchised. There is another group of people who say, yes, I want to support that. Let's use the government to support those entities. I understand that, because those are all good things, but so are all the others that don't get support.

"So how do we allow every citizen to have a voice in that? By decreasing taxpayer support, that empowers the entire community. That empowers those people who want to make a decision themselves and maybe not give to a particular organization at all or maybe give to another and they can make that choice. The other group of people who are happy with the way it is, they can continue, on their own, to support organizations in a variety of ways. I also think it empowers the organizations themselves to free themselves from dependence upon the government, and I've said this throughout the last four years that any individual or entity that is dependent upon the government in these times, it's at their own peril. They really need to empower themselves and seek funding and assistance from the private sector. That's really better for our community in the long run. Now, we're not going to be able to eliminate all of that or anything, but I think we need to move towards that direction and empower everyone to have a voice in this situation.

"So, these are the sorts of things that I'm looking at as we look at budgets as we move forward. This particular one being prepared I think fails on five out of six of those things, so I won't be supportive. I reiterate all of these as we move forward, which I'm sure you're thankful for, but these are things I will keep in mind as we consider other things in the future. Madam Clerk, we do have a motion and a second."

Ms. Lovelace said, "Yes."

Chairman Ranzau said, "I see no more lights, so let's call the vote."

VOTE

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

Chairman Ranzau said, "So that motion fails 2 to 3. Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to present, I guess, another alternative to the budget, and I'd like to just add the hundreds of conversations I've had includes one-on-one discussions with all of my colleagues. I've spent a couple of hours talking to Commissioner Unruh, in his office. I spent more

than an hour talking to Commissioner Norton about a compromise. I've asked them to make suggestions to me that I would be able to have dialogue with them, to add some of their ideas into this budget, and they did not provide any input. They had their own plan, but as far as making suggestions to my budget, making suggestions to the budget I'm proposing right now, they did not give specific things that they wanted to change or add to the budget I'm presenting. This budget does a couple of things. It seeks to leave the mill levy exactly as it is at 2015, at 29.478 mills. To do that would require a little bit of cash. It takes about \$200,000. That's an estimate. It is not intended to return it back to 2010 levels, not intended to give \$1.37 tax cut.

"It is required, because unfortunately, every single year, we're not allowed to set a mill levy. We have to set a budget. And that mill levy is calculated. So, in an attempt to keep it that, at 29.478, we have to put something in the budget to counteract that technical adjustment. Based on the last ten years of technical adjustments, with a tool that Mr. Chronis and Lindsay have put together; I appreciate your hard work on that, by the way, and looking at that tool, for a long time, I believe that level of money would be enough to counteract a technical adjustment, leaving the mill levy exactly as it is in 2015. Without that attempt, then the mill levy is likely to creep up, as it has the last five years. Just to remind the audience, the mill levy has crept up .119 mills over the last five years, not because the County Commission voted for it, but because of technical adjustments. So this is an effort to counteract that. Now, I do think legislation is needed to allow us some other options to do this, but in the meantime, this is the only thing we can do. Either that or accept the fact that it's going to creep up.

"In this plan, spending \$200,000 for that effort to counteract the technical adjustment, with other spending, it has a total of \$750,000 of restoration to organizations and agencies that have demonstrated, I think, a critical need. The things I intend not to refund or restore, there are reasons for that. I will gladly explain any one of them, to a colleague that asks the question, but I don't want to go through that unless someone has a question. Let me list what I am planning to do. This fully funds Economic Development at \$110,000. If you want to break it down and understand that, that would be; we funded Economic Development to \$250,000. This would restore that plus money for SCKEDD. A total would be \$360,000 this year.

"For WATC, restore \$50,000. To Exploration Place, it would restore \$40,000. To the Health Department, it would restore \$175,000 of Project Access and \$20,000 to the Department of Aging to restore the funding for the Foster Grandparent Program. It restores money for the Health Navigator Program at \$91,099. It restores two positions to the Commissioner's office, a total of \$114,626, and it restores \$150,000 to the Sedgwick County Zoo. This is a package that's \$750,000 worth of spending, based on hundreds of conversations.

"The things it does not restore, the things that are left cut, I would be very happy to explain the reasons why they're not in this proposal. I believe this is a proposal that funds things that are necessary. It invests in Economic Development. It insures that the salaries for the Sedgwick County Zoo would be paid for by Sedgwick County, and it takes care of people. There are 8 different things that fall under the health category umbrella. Two of them stand out to me that touch people. And that's the Navigator Program. I'm going to use the word Coordinator. And Project Access. So this is being careful and trying not to hurt people in our community. The other aspects of the healthcare budget are more bureaucratic in nature, and there are some things that can be done in the private sector without any harm to any person in Sedgwick County. It does continue to provide immunizations. Let's be clear. The screenings will still happen as they do now, perhaps in different places. But the screenings will still happen. So this is a budget now, a balanced budget, I think, that provides for the most important things that I have heard about, and this is in response to the literally

hundreds of comments and people talking to us at the public forums and the e-mails I've received and the conversations I've had. I don't know if it would be appropriate for me to actually read the motion at this time. I would be glad to read it whenever it's appropriate. It's a very long motion, but I'll leave it at that right now.

"Based on the previous budget, I would like to make a motion we would adopt this budget, and I would be glad to read the details of that into the record when it's the appropriate time. Would that be okay?"

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner, might I suggest that you make an easy motion to amend the budget. You can call it the Howell Plan, you don't have to go through everything."

MOTION

Commissioner Howell moved to amend the proposed budget with what was described as the Howell Plan."

Commissioner Ranzau seconded the motion.

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I have to take exception with the Commissioner saying that we didn't offer any compromise in our discussions. Monday afternoon, I think it was, I was in your office and said I can cut out of my Budget C approximately \$750,000 or \$700,000, which left you and I, approximately, at that time, somewhere around \$300,000 apart. And we couldn't close that gap, which I acknowledged, but it's not fair to characterize that we didn't try to make some changes and some accommodation. I hated it. I didn't like it, but that's what I said I could get to. Heck, there was another thing I was going to say."

Chairman Ranzau said, "We can come back to you if you want to."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was going to provide a second for discussion purposes. There are certain factors here that I think is much, much better and moving in the direction I'm comfortable with. However, my heartburn is the mill levy should not be where the Commission elected to place it. Some people view this as a cut. I believe it's just the Commission trying to keep our word, and I realize that if someone went out and looked at all the local units out there, they can see these numbers. The mill levy jumps around, and we do need to get that law changed. My understanding, for instance, this proposal eliminates the one additional position out at the Zoo. Grant you, it's a maintenance position. The Zoo is in a position this year that they've had at least five positions added in their table. It allows them to provide forward and frankly, I'm much more comfortable with this. I've discussed it with Zoo Board members. Most of whom would like to have the \$380,000 full restoration, of that spending, but when our tax base is growing at one and a half percent, it's really hard to do a seven percent increase. But having said that, my vote today is I'm struggling with the mill levy aspect of this, but this is certainly, I think, a better proposal than the first amendment that we voted on. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would encourage my

colleague, Commissioner Peterjohn, if he feels strongly about that, I would certainly entertain a substitute motion to add a provision of the property tax roll-back that he wants, into this budget. If he's not willing to do that, I would be glad to amend my own budget to add that in, if that would please him, or I feel like I might be able to get a little more support. So I would encourage him to either do that. If he is not willing, I would be glad to make that motion as well."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you. I just need a couple points of clarification. The Commissioner indicated this would be a balanced budget, but this does increase our deficit slightly, right?"

Commissioner Howell said, "Yes, sir, it sure does."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Second thing is, allocation for Economic Development. My question is, is that for GWEDC (Greater Wichita Economic Development Coalition)?"

Commissioner Howell said, "The intent of that is it is going to transfer the \$250,000 from GWEDC into a new category called Economic Development, which will be available to them or others which make proposals trying to access those funds. SCKEDD (South Central Kansas Economic Development District) would be part of that. There may be other organizations that would like to make proposals for those funds. But the reason those numbers are in there, I guess my thought would be \$60,000 for SCKEDD and \$50,000 for GWEDC. But as a general category of \$360,000 total, we can have those conversations about what they do exactly and we'll have opportunities to understand that better before we, I guess, send the money to them."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Okay. Thank you for that clarification. Commissioner, I won't get into what our obligations are and the agreements we've had with GWEDC, and this significantly changes our relationship with GWEDC. I will not be able to support your motion."

Commissioner Howell said, "Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest that my colleague, Commissioner Unruh, feels strongly about that, I would certainly be able to entertain a substitute motion. I would be glad to make this myself, if necessary, in the spirit of compromise, to restore the terminology back to GWEDC and SCKEDD, so that it's clear we're funding them at the full \$300,000. To me, that should not be a reason not to support a balanced compromise. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Norton."

Commissioner Norton said, "Certainly this doesn't go near far enough, for me. There are some places I would, obviously, compromise and have thought about it. I would tell all of the Commissioners and the public, one reason that I don't offer a lot of solutions other than in the public purview is that we have rules and regulations about serial meetings and running up and down the hall negotiating outside the purview of the public. So I've been very sensitive to that. I've done a lot of listening. I have talked to a couple of colleagues that had information. I did partner with Commissioner Unruh, but that was two of us, and we presented our plan. So for me, it's about trying to think through too much conversation, serial meetings up and down the hall is really against the open meetings law, and I didn't want to get too compromised into all of that. So, I've got ideas about where we can compromise, but trying to sell them

before we came to a public meeting is not in my toolbox. So I hope that's an explanation that satisfies Commissioner Howell to why I didn't give you a lot of feedback."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "I'd like to provide some feedback on your comments. I've also been very, very careful not to ever tell one Commissioner what another Commissioner thinks. That's the spirit of KOMA (Kansas Open Meetings Act), as explained to me by our Legal Council. I can talk to one Commissioner about anything, but I can't tell another Commissioner what another Commissioner thinks, and I have not done that. So this is a proposal that comes from hundreds of conversations and meetings, with my colleagues, one-on-one, not disclosing to other colleagues what they think. So, I have abided by KOMA as described to me by my legal counsel. I would just throw that out there, if we're close to getting support and there's something that specifically bothers one of my colleagues, that this doesn't quite do something that I would like, I would sure like to entertain the idea that I'm willing, again, in the spirit of compromise, to hear that if they would make an argument for some other changes to this budget. This is a starting point, as I've described.

"This is something that could change, right now, if there is something that's specific, to them, that they feel strongly about. I'd love to have the conversation. This is a sausage making, a combination of different viewpoints from the far left and the far right. This is a very carefully constructed budget, based on what I believe is the most important spending, but this is mostly my opinion, and again, I've taken some input from others to tweak some things that I've heard about, but if there is something on this list that's causing one of my colleagues not to support it, I'd sure like to encourage them to make substitute motions to tweak it, if necessary. Thank you."

Chairman Ranzau said, "County Counselor, just to clarify, we have a motion by Commissioner Howell to approve this. There is no need for an additional motion; is that correct?"

Mr. Pepoon said, "That's correct, unless somebody is intending to make a substitute motion, which I haven't heard, at this point."

Chairman Ranzau said, "I'll say this budget certainly is an improvement, as well, in my mind. However, it does continue to include a mill levy increase. Three of the last four years, the targeted mill levy was 28.359 and 29.359 the last year. The majority increased that a little bit, but it's always been my intent to maintain that commitment to that more targeted mill levy, as we have in the past. I also think it spends a little bit more in reserves than what I think is necessary and overall, there is a little bit more spending. I think we're pretty close, but there are some issues there that I'm not quite ready to proceed with this particular one."

Commissioner Howell said, "Based on conversations that have happened at the bench so far, I would like to make a motion to amend this proposal by splitting up the Economic Development dollars into two separate funds, GWEDC would be \$50,000 and SCKEDD would be \$60,000 for a total of \$110,000, so it's the same dollar amount, and I would also make an amendment to include the rollback that Commissioner Peterjohn spoke about. It would substantially change the dollar figure, so we may need to allow some time for Lindsay to catch the numbers up to get those numbers on the screen. But I would be willing to include the rollback that Commissioner Peterjohn has spoke of that he believes is important to him, especially. That would increase the deficit another \$282,000 above what you see on the screen. The difference between his proposal and my proposal is \$282,000. That would, in

fact, it would return the mill levy back to a target of 29.359. It's not something that's important to me right now, but it's important to my colleagues, and therefore I would add that to this budget, in the spirit of compromise. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you, Mr. Chair. I need some more clarification on the amendment to the motion. And so maybe Lindsay will get there and I won't have to ask."

AMMENDED MOTION

Commissioner Howell moved to make the recommended changes.

Commissioner Peterjohn seconded the motion.

Ms. Rousseau said, "Commissioner, can I confirm with you that this is accurate, the changes you wanted to make? The property tax adjustment has been removed. Reduce allocation of GWEDC and shift budget to Economic Development has been removed?"

Commissioner Howell said, "That's correct."

Ms. Rousseau said, "The increased allocation to Economic Development and that wording has been removed and instead has been replaced with increased allocation to GWEDC to \$50,000 and restore to SCKEDD \$60,000."

Commissioner Howell said, "That's correct, thank you."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "I think we've got a process, Mr. Chairman. If I can ask a procedural question, I think we've still got the increased allocation to Economic Development for \$110,000. Above that, we've added the two below."

Chairman Ranzau said, "That's not included."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "It's checked off. Okay. Thank you."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh said, "What was characterized as the rollback? Are we not doing the mill levy rollback? I didn't understand."

Commissioner Howell said, "It was the difference between your proposal and the current proposal, as I've amended, would be that yours would capture \$482,000 and use them for spending. This one would not capture those dollars. It would be an agreement with the proposed budget, rather than your proposal allowing the mill levy to stay up at 29.478. This one would drive it back towards 29.359."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you. That's what I thought you said, and I guess I didn't catch up to the chart. But that means that we are then deficit spending \$1.89 million. Is that the number Lindsay? We're deficit spending \$1.89 million then?"

Ms. Rousseau said, "Yes, sir."

Commissioner Howell said, "That started out as \$1.4 negative. Was that correct?"

Ms. Rousseau said, "I believe so."

Commissioner Howell said, "The difference between \$1.4 million and \$1.89 million, that's the difference in these two budgets?"

Ms. Rousseau said, "Yes, sir. Your action to do the property tax levy had increased revenue by \$282,000. So that's the difference that we're seeing reflected here."

Commissioner Howell said, "Mr. Chairman, I would also like to make a further comment before we vote, so I will let you continue to run the meeting, please do that. But before we vote, I would like to make a final comment. Thank you."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Go ahead."

Commissioner Howell said, "I would just tell my colleagues that I believe that this is the best option on the table, and should this not pass, it's going to go to a more conservative budget, because we have to have three votes, and I've been doing my very best to compromise and trying to find the middle point, and I would encourage my colleagues to recognize this as a valid, balanced budget approach and to support this budget. If they do not do that, then the budget has one direction left in my mind, and that's going to more conservative and less spending. So, this is about as spendy as it can get and I would encourage my colleagues, that may not want to support this, to please support this balanced approach.

"If you have any questions about any specific items or want to change any specific items, I'm still open to that discussion. Thank you."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you, Mr. Chair. You know, before I get to talking, I think I want to make a substitute motion. Is that legal to make that now, or do we have to do something else first?"

Mr. Pepoon said, "You can make a substitute motion."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Let me explain a motion I would like to make as a substitute, because we're not yet at an either or place. There is another iteration that we might consider. Lindsay, could you go back to budget Plan C? And I suggest that most of those reinstatements or all of those reinstatements remain, but in this Plan D, I would add funding, and I think it's already in there, the two persons for the election Commission, and I would add, also, enough money to fund that full-time equivalent for what we call a fiscal associate, someone to concentrate on collecting the EMS bills that I think was going to focus on that but be housed in COMCARE, and I can remember that Commissioner Howell would make a pretty strong pitch that we should collect those past due accounts and have someone on the front side of it getting that money coming in would be a good thing. So, I think what was originally proposed, I think. Is that what we call it, Lindsay, a fiscal associate?"

Ms. Rousseau said, "It's a patient billing representative. We know what you mean."

Commissioner Unruh said, "I think we had budgeted 59.5 for that. I think we should add that. I also think that and what I am going to add in and then try to find funding for is that we eliminated \$1,200 for employee recognition, and I think that's a small amount of money, but I think we ought to plan to do those things that show appreciation for employees. Now, how we pay for this, I'm still going to suggest in the motion that we use the mill levy recapture, which is significantly different from Commissioner Howell's motion here, that two Commissioners forgo their mile of

super slurry cold mix. I think that Commissioner Norton will agree. I will agree that the two of us will forgo that for \$500,000 and that we also use the proceeds from the Furley Land sale, which just happened, of \$1.3 million.

"Now, I've said to lots of people that I don't like using proceeds from a capital sale in operating costs. I think extreme times call for extreme measures, and so I'd say this is perhaps a little bit extreme, but we can use that revenue, this year, give our community time to continue the conversation about what's a priority, what should we fund, how should we spend their tax dollars and if they have to prepare for cuts in 2017, then that can be part of the conversation, but it buys us some time, and in the meantime, responds to the clear citizen input that we've had and keeps our word to our partner organizations. I think that, if I did my math right, this Plan D has us spending in \$1.933831 million in restorations and we have then captured \$2.280 million in funding between the mill levy, two miles of road and Furley Land sale.

"So, that would give us \$346,000 to go back into reserve so we're not draining down our reserves, we continue to support the Board of County Commissioners priorities, that we had before of more focused government, no bonding, and we can support our community partners this way. So for shorthand for right now, I would like to make a substitute motion that we support budget Plan D."

SUBSTITUTE MOTION

Commissioner Unruh moved to support budget Plan D, with the changes recommended.

Commissioner Norton seconded the motion.

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you. I don't know if I was very clear in what I was saying, but I hope so. The Chairman is looking at me like I'm crazy."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Plan D is based on Plan C."

Commissioner Unruh said, "That's correct."

Chairman Ranzau said, "It adds some more spending in, basically and changes some of the revenue sources."

Commissioner Unruh said, "That's correct. It adds \$70,000 for someone to collect our bills and employee recognition, but it's funded by that mill levy, but Commissioner Norton's road and my road and the Furley Land sale, as a solution."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Norton."

Commissioner Norton said, "I seconded it. I agree with it. I would go along with it. It restores what I advocated for. It changes the funding mechanism and does not include any deficit spending. You know, the alternate plan that had just come to us, was a lot of deficit spending. We reduced the deficit spending in this manner, it still has a little bit, but for the most part, it gets us going the other way, from the original proposed budget even. I am willing to forgo my miles and we had a little found money that came in this year that will offset that, keep our partners whole, make sure the Health Department stays whole and doesn't require putting the burden on Commissioner Howell's project that he's still passionate for, which is his road project, and moves us forward."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Mr. Chronis, based on what we've been told, I think that

proposal would actually increase deficit spending, but please clarify."

Mr. Chronis said, "I guess we need some clarification. What we have entered up here are the changes, Commissioner Unruh, that you just identified and we have not included what is commonly called Plan C. I understand your intention is that these be added to Plan C; is that correct?"

Commissioner Unruh said, "Yes, sir, that is correct."

Mr. Chronis said, "So before Lindsay does that, I would ask you to take a look at what has been entered here and make sure that we've captured those changes the way you intended."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Yes, that is correct, and I understand that you folks in finance and budget have to..."

Mr. Chronis said, "What I would propose to do is have Lindsay copy this information over on to Plan C now, so that we can see what the net effect is of the entire package as you've amended it."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Plan C is gone, so that would be fine."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Mr. Chairman, if I may make a suggestion. We've been at it almost two and a half hours. Let's give Chris and Lindsay a five or ten minute break and let them work numbers, and then we can come back."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Do you understand what the intent is, so you can work?"

Ms. Rousseau said, "Absolutely."

Chairman Ranzau said, "We'll stand in recess for 10 minutes."

The Board of County Commissioners were adjourned to recess at 11:21 a.m. and returned at 11:32 a.m.

Chairman Ranzau said, "We're back from recess. I'll call the meeting back to order. Mr. Chronis."

Mr. Chronis said, "Commissioner Unruh, we have now added the information that you just discussed before the break to what was originally identified as Plan C, and that's what you see before you. What I'd like to have Lindsay do very quickly is just run through all of this as it now stands to make sure that we have exactly what your intentions are."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Okay, thank you."

Ms. Rousseau said, "Alright, Commissioners, we start up near the top. We've left Plan C mostly intact at the beginning. This row two, which had reduced overall roads and bridges, has been removed. You'll see that everything else still remains checked from your original Plan C until we get past elections, when you'll see that we've added 1.0 FTE (Full Time Equivalent) EMS patient billing representative, to the COMCARE staffing table. We restored employee recognition funding to the HR (Human Resources) budget for \$11,200. We have included the idea that we'll forgo two miles of cold mix for \$500,000 of savings, and then we'll receive the revenue from the Furley Land sale this year. That does mean that we would still plan to run a

deficit, in that amount, for 2016, but it would be a planned use of fund balance, of that specific revenue."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Okay. I understand what you're saying. That's what my proposal is, and I realize that the red ink cancels itself out."

Mr. Chronis said, "And so the net effect of all of these changes is that we end up with a budget that has spending of \$394,623,119, which is a \$480,000 increase, over the original recommended budget. We have property tax levy to fund this budget of \$130,101,812, which requires an estimated property tax rate of 29.477 mills, and this budget, at the end of the year, we project, would have a deficit of \$2,093,724, of which approximately a \$1.3 million, I think, would be the revenue from the Furley Land."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Okay. And so, from the sale of the Furley Land, it leaves us with a net of approximately \$793,000 as compared to what had been proposed of a deficit of \$1.1 million?"

Mr. Chronis said, "Yes, that's correct."

Commissioner Unruh said, "I think that's a great plan."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So if I understand correctly, this does not do the rollback; that two of my colleagues have asked for, it does not do the rollback?"

Commissioner Unruh said, "Correct, it does not."

Commissioner Howell said, "That is the most important thing to my two colleagues on the right, that have clearly stated there. Furthermore, if I look at the numbers here, it spends \$953,000 of deficit spending. Is that correct, Chris?"

Mr. Chronis said, "No, sir. The \$953,000 is an increase of deficit from the original recommended budget, and so the actual projected deficit would be \$2,093,724, of which we have the Furley Land providing the (inaudible)."

Commissioner Howell said, "You said that better than I did. That's \$953,000, plus what's not shown here is another 1.13 million for the Furley Land sale. By my math, it's \$2.253 million of spending that he just recommended. I don't think this is compromise, folks. He's not moving, he's actually gone the other direction, spending more than he did in his original plan."

"This is not the compromise I'm asking for. I have a plan on the table. I'm asking my colleagues, what is it that they value that's not presented in my budget. Let's have a discussion about those things specifically. I'm willing to tweak here and there, but substantially spending more money is not solving the problem. We can't spend more money than his proposal in the first place. His proposal in the first place was too much already. I went on the long speech earlier talking about how our operations are too high. We've got to substantially change the problem, which has created upside down budgets for eight years in a row. We need to move the budget to spend less, and in this proposal, he doesn't seem to have a will to spend less anywhere. They resource funding everywhere and he even spends more than the original budget, he proposed. This is not something I can support. I'm willing to compromise, but this is

not a compromise. This is digging in, in my opinion. Thank you."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Unruh."

Mr. Chronis said, "Just a point of clarification. The increase in spending in this budget is from \$394,143,119 to \$394,623,119, an increase of spending of \$480,000."

Commissioner Howell said, "Plus \$1.3 that's not shown here."

Mr. Chronis said, "No, sir. That's included in this."

Commissioner Howell said, "So the Furley Land sale is shown here?"

Mr. Chronis said, "Yes. The Furley Land sale would be a funding source that we would use to draw down, and it's a part of that \$2 million deficit. The Furley Land sale produces revenue in 2015, that will become a part of the fund balance. In 2016, Commissioner Unruh's proposal is to use that fund balance to the tune of a total of \$2 million."

Commissioner Howell said, "Right. And that's a bigger number than he started with a few minutes ago. Is it not?"

Mr. Chronis said, "Which is a bigger number?"

Commissioner Howell said, "His original Plan C had a smaller number than that, did it not?"

Mr. Chronis said, "I believe the total spending was smaller than that, yes."

Commissioner Howell said, "Yes, my point exactly. Thank you, very much."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh said, "By \$70,000. The difference between those, on spending, is someone that will collect our EMS delinquencies, get that money coming in, which actually was a public statement by Commissioner Howell that he thought those were big and we needed to do something about it, and the \$11,000 for employee recognition. So those are the only increases in spending from the Plan C, and the sources of revenue to help cover that are substantial different, still the mill levy and giving two miles of roads from two Commissioners and the Furley Land sale, is the way that we'll fund that."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "The question I have to understand, we're talking about a substitute for a substitute motion, and in that light, I wanted to find out if both Commissioners Unruh and Commissioner Norton, if their willingness to forgo their one mile of coal mix road was strictly limited to this substitute for a substitute, or if this was going to be with us for the rest of our budget discussions on whatever motion goes forward."

Chairman Ranzau said, "I think it's just for this motion."

Commissioner Unruh said, "That's what I think."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "I mean, I would just like to know."

Commissioner Norton said, "I think if we get to some impasse on some of the things that I care about, I'll throw my \$250,000 in to restore some things. That's not a big deal for me. I'm dedicated to that as part of the funding stream if we need to. There are still things that even in Commissioner Howell's proposal that I don't think go far enough and that I would like to restore, and I'm willing to put my \$250,000. I say mine. It's the taxpayer's. It would go to some gravel road in my district, and I think these other things are more important to me than restoring that gravel road right now. I'm committed to doing it.

"I'd have to see what the next iteration might be as to where I might want to apply it, and truthfully, if I'm kicking in, then I would like to apply it. I don't know that I'm ready for other people to take a whack at the money that I'm donating out of my district."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Well, Mr. Chairman, if I may continue, you know, my point was to just get a better understanding of what was or wasn't on the table and if it's all tied to this substitute for a substitute at this point, because if we do vote on this, this does look like it's a, we've taken the original plan that Commissioners Norton and Unruh brought forth, and we've expanded it in a number of ways, and of course, I still have the problem with the mill levy being moved up. So this substitute for substitute, I'd have some problems with. Thank you."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "Mr. Chairman, I'd like to point out, I actually have two problems with the original Plan C. One problem is they gut roads to get there, and that revenue is a bad precedent for Sedgwick County. We don't need to be going down that road of taking money out of our road system, and frankly, it simply creates an appetite for more spending next year. We're not substantially solving the problem. That's the second problem I have with the plan, is that we're not substantially reducing operations in any way. We're essentially creating an appetite for spending that we'll have to deal with at some point down the road. We've not dealt with this adequately in previous years, which is why we've been handed a problem this year.

"Our expenditures are too high. Our revenue is not high enough, and that creates a deficit that's gone on for eight years. This plan does not substantially solve that problem. The plan I presented actually is trimming operations and that makes every year in the future more fundable, if you will. It creates a solution that lasts into the future. Rather than finding some money one time, this year, to fund operations that are too high, it doesn't fundamentally fix the problem. It basically puts a band-aid on the problem. That's why I can't support Plan C or this plan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just for procedure, we have a substitute motion on the table, and then before that, we had an amendment, not a substitute; is that right?"

Chairman Ranzau said, "That's correct."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Different terminology, I guess. Well, I appreciate the Commissioner's comments. I would just say that this still upholds the originally stated Board of County Commissioners goals, at our original budget presentation. Beyond that, what this particular plan does is that it takes into account the citizens' response to our online forum to our open meetings, all the mail I've got, and it keeps our promises to our community partners. So I support it."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Norton."

Commissioner Norton said, "Well, I guess the place I'd go to is if we stay similar to this but get back to the original mill levy proposal, does that warm up a couple of Commissioners?"

Chairman Ranzau said, "No. Not at all."

Commissioner Norton said, "So it's not about the mill levy then? I thought I'd heard that that's a real talking point."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Go ahead and finish and I'll say what I've got."

Commissioner Norton said, "Well, I've heard over and over and over that we want to roll back the mill levy to the 29.359. Given all of that, if we roll back to that and still had a proposal similar to this, would you warm up to it? Because, I've got a substitute motion that I can put on the table over the substitute motion if need be."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Anything else?"

Commissioner Norton said, "No."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Well, since we're still on the substitute for the Howell amendment, I did want to answer Commissioner Norton's question, because it's warmer but it doesn't get me warm enough, especially with the increase with the spending that we're looking at overall here. But having said that, you know, I will vote on the substitute to the Howell amendment and then see if we've got more substitutes for the Howell amendment or substitute for the substitute for the Howell amendment."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Commissioner Unruh has two points I'd like to address. I continue to hear the word promises. The promises we have made to our community partners. I don't know where these promises are. The fact that we have funded things in the past is not a promise. You can fund those things to the extent that you have money to do those things, but there is no promise, and we have a responsibility to lead this county in a responsible fashion, and if we don't have the money, we've only got a couple of choices.

"Either cut spending or raise taxes. I think taxes are high enough. People are being punched everywhere in this economy. I have not heard of very many people advocate for raising taxes, and those that do frankly pay little or no taxes at all. For people to stand up and advocate for more spending is understandable, but they don't understand the totality of this entire budget and the balance that we have to maintain.

"I don't fault them for standing up and asking for spending. I understand that. I would do the same if I were in their shoes. But we have a responsibility to be adults here, and we have to trim the budget in a responsible fashion. We don't have the money to fund everything as we have in the past. And these funding agreements; we have one with GWEDC which was cancelled because of an action Wichita did, which they had done, but nevertheless they did what they have done and we had to take the appropriate action. We do have funding agreement with the Zoo and Exploration

Place, which, unfortunately with the Zoo, it has a 45 percent increase over a five-year period. That would be wonderful. If the economy could support that, I would be delighted to do that. We don't have the money. That's too much. This year a seven percent increase, next year is six percent and eight percent in 2018. The economy is growing by around one percent.

"(Inaudible) Unless you raise taxes, we can't fund those increases that way. It doesn't make sense. So to fund everything fully as these men have suggested I think is a fundamental flaw with their proposal. I am trying to be judicious and careful with my proposal. It does trim spending as much as we can this year.

"It does deficit spend a few hundred thousands, which I don't like. But it's a balance that, unfortunately, is the reality of what we have before us. We can't do everything in one big step. Some people would like that. I would rather do it a little bit slower. I do think down the road, though, there will be further cuts, but because again this economy is continuing to be stagnant and this is the eighth year in a row and next year is going to be just like this.

"If we do not substantially reduce our operations this year, we're kicking that can down the road, and it's going to be much worse next year. There are also things we have no control over. The legislature continues to do things that might change some revenue streams, and I understand the City of Wichita has some ideas that might change our relationship with them, with respect to revenue that we share with them. So there's a lot of risk on the horizon. Our current outlook in our budget proposal, if you look at that, is bleak at best. We have negative forecasts in eight years of underperforming budgets with cuts. This is not a responsible proposal. It doesn't do anything to cut spending, which we have to do, unless we're willing to raise taxes. Unfortunately, I'm not willing to do that.

"I can't support this proposal. I'm sorry that we can't find a better compromise, but this is not even close to where we need to go. We need to start at the Howell budget and tweak up from there if necessary on some minor things, but to go to this extent is not going to pass, at least not in my opinion. I'm not going to vote for it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Thank you. I'll say quickly yeah, I think this goes in the wrong direction, increases spending, increases the use of reserves for operations. I do agree with Commissioner Unruh, that the proceeds from the sale of the CIP project shouldn't be used for operations. Instead of taking money out of roads and bridges, we've taken money out of other CIP projects. For example, that money could be used for the Tag Office that we're going to be doing. It could be used for the Law Enforcement Training Center. It could be used for building the EMS station in this district. So, I don't think that this is a prudent direction to go. That being said, we do have a motion and a second, correct?"

Mr. Holt, said "Yes."

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

VOTE

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

Chairman Ranzau said, "So the substitute motion fails 2 to 3. Now we're back to the Howell amendment, which we have a motion and a second, as well."

Ms. Lovelace said, "Yes."

Chairman Ranzau said, "And we can vote on that, correct?"

Ms. Lovelace said, "Just for clarification, that motion that I have was to amend the proposed budget with the Howell amendment and then it was further amended to split up the Economic Development and include the rollback?"

Commissioner Howell said, "That's correct."

Ms. Lovelace said, "Thank you."

Commissioner Howell said, "Mr. Chairman, again, before we move this budget, I would allow other Commissioners to make exchanges or make comments, but I would like a final comment before we vote. I ask you for that. Thank you."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Okay."

Commissioner Howell said, "Again, in the spirit of compromise, I'm asking my colleagues to understand that this is probably as spendy as this is going to get, and if they don't support this budget, then I want them to understand that the next option will be less than this. I'm asking my colleagues to support this. I think this is as good as we can get this year. It meets all of the goals of the County Commission. It doesn't cut the roads. It doesn't bond. It is responsible. It is careful to take care of people and organizations in a very careful manner. It's based on hundreds of conversations, and I have done my very best to be very judicious in where we put is money, and every bit of this is based on a lot of thought, a lot of very careful thought. I would ask my colleagues to support this budget. That's all I have Mr. Chairman. Thank you."

Chairman Ranzau said, "I'll say...Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you, Mr. Chair. What we're voting on is just the amendment right now; is that correct?"

Chairman Ranzau said, "Yes."

Ms. Lovelace said, "Just to clarify, it was to amend the proposed budget, yes."

Chairman Ranzau said, "It's the Howell amendment to the existing budget."

Commissioner Unruh said, "It's an amendment to his budget?"

Commissioner Howell said, "That's correct."

Commissioner Unruh said, "We had a motion and then he said I will amend it to..."

Chairman Ranzau said, "He did make that amendment, but we've not had a second."

Commissioner Unruh said, "I'm sorry. I didn't know that. I'm sorry."

Ms. Lovelace said, "Mr. Chairman, then I'm confused, because I have that a motion

was made to amend the proposal budget and then a substitute motion was made over that motion which would amend the proposed budget with the Howell Plan, but also change that Howell Plan to split up the Economic Development and include the rollback. Am I incorrect?"

Chairman Ranzau said, "He made the motion for the Howell amendment, which I seconded, and then we had some discussion, and he said I want to do an amendment to mine that would split those up and do Economic Development. I don't believe there was a second to that."

Ms. Lovelace said, "I had Commissioner Peterjohn seconding that, for discussion purposes."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Did you second his amendment to his amendment?"

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "I think I did for discussion purposes."

Chairman Ranzau said, "So we're actually voting on splitting this up and giving \$300,000 to GWEDC."

Ms. Rousseau said, "Would it be helpful for me to review the list that we have? What we currently have..."

Chairman Ranzau said, "But we're not voting on the whole list right now."

Ms. Rousseau said, "Just the property tax rollback and..."

Chairman Ranzau said, "We're just voting on..."

Commissioner Howell said, "Two changes; the rollback, and the splitting up of the Economic Development money. That's it."

Ms. Rousseau said, "So these two, you'll see that this is not included any longer, that rollback? He just said two things, the rollback and splitting them. The rollback is included as a part of this motion?"

Commissioner Howell said, "Yes, it is."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Well, my understanding, and I'll stand for correction if I'm wrong on this. The rollback was part of the original motion, plus it was a two-part change instead of having a general allocation for Economic Development. Commissioner Howell broke it into two parts, which was to restore, I think, \$50,000 for GWEDC and \$60,000 for SCKEDD is my recollection. If I'm correct on that or incorrect on that, please someone correct me. And that's the amendment to the Howell amendment."

Commissioner Howell said, "That's what we're going to vote on next, yes."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Might I offer a suggestion?"

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "If I can continue, Mr. Chairman, I was more comfortable with having the GWEDC and SCKEDD confined in one group because we've been through a number of changes and I think, frankly, having some flexibility on the allocation for Economic Development on where we can get the biggest bang

for the buck should be our priority as opposed to trying to fit it in exactly now."

Chairman Ranzau said, "I would agree with that statement. Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh said, "I don't think I have anything right now."

Chairman Ranzau said, "I will not vote for the amendment to the Howell amendment. Madam Clerk, do you have it clear?"

Ms. Lovelace said, "Mr. Chairman, no, I do not. Can you please clarify, is it your intent that this vote would amend the proposed budget, entirely, or only amend the Howell budget, which would then have to be adopted to amend the proposed budget?"

Commissioner Howell said, "That's correct, what you said last. So we're going to amend the Howell proposal."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Might I make a suggestion that you withdraw your amendment and then restate it? Would that be helpful?"

Commissioner Unruh said, "Or, Mr. Chairman, if I may, he could withdraw both of them and just restate the thing the way he wants it. Withdraw them both and just make a new motion that includes your amendment."

Commissioner Howell said, "If that makes my colleagues happy, I will withdraw my motion to amend."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "I'll withdraw the second."

Commissioner Howell said, "Okay. Are we back on the budget or do we need to vote on that?"

Chairman Ranzau said, "Now withdrawing your initial Howell amendment motion, or just amend the..."

Commissioner Howell said, "What I just did a second ago was withdrew all the changes to the Howell proposal. Now we're back on the base Howell proposal."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Right."

Commissioner Howell said, "Okay. From that point, I would make a motion to rename what is shown on my budget there as Economic Development, to split that up into two categories, \$50,000 for GWEDC and \$60,000 for SCKEDD, and additionally, remove the part that was \$200,000 to roll back the, to try to target the 29.459 going to the proposed budget, which is trying to target 29.35, or 29.478 versus 29.359, if you understand what I'm trying to say? That's the entire amendment to my proposal."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Is there a second? Motion fails for lack of second."

Commissioner Howell said, "Okay. Let's do this again. I would make a motion that we split up Economic Development into two categories, one \$50,000 for GWEDC and \$60,000 for SCKEDD. I'll deal with the second part of the earlier motion, after this one is voted upon. This is an amendment to the Howell proposal to change the name from Economic Development back to GWEDC and SCKEDD."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "I can't support this. I think we should focus on the efforts are being made in this community to improve our competitiveness at all levels. I think we would be better off to have some flexibility, and I like the idea of having a general allocation that the county can go forward with this so we can get the biggest bang for the buck. Thank you."

Commissioner Howell said, "Let me add, Mr. Chairman, this proposal is not something I feel strongly about. This is an effort to find compromise with my colleague, Commissioner Unruh, about the earlier comments he made. I'm trying to find middle ground, and based on his comments, I believe this is something he would desire. That's all, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Unruh, are you interested in seconding the motion?"

Commissioner Unruh said, "No, thank you."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Motion fails for lack of a second. We are back to the original Howell amendment."

Commissioner Howell said, "Okay. I would make a motion that we not amend the mill levy adjustment and go back to the proposed budget on the property tax rollback, trying to target 29.359, which would be an addition of \$282,000 to this budget, and this is in an effort to satisfy a couple of colleagues that have stated this is important to them, so trying to get their exceptions to the proposal. That's the intent of this motion."

Chairman Ranzau said, "I appreciate the effort. I do have, I would like to, at some point, offer a modification of your plan. However, I think it would be easier to do it all at once as opposed to one at a time, so that's why I'm not going to second this. There are a number of issues, and it would just be cleaner, I think, to offer an amendment that does a variety of things, all at once, as a slate. I appreciate the effort there, but I'm not going to really support this, because I think there are other things that need to be done, and I think we need to deal with it in a cleaner fashion, I guess. So I see that that motion fails for lack of a second. And now we're back to the original Howell amendment."

Commissioner Howell said, "With no further changes, I don't see any lights on the panel, I believe this is as good as we're going to get this year, and I would move this for consideration. I would move that we adopt this budget as amended by the Howell proposal."

Chairman Ranzau said, "I think we already have a motion and a second. You motioned it and I seconded it."

Commissioner Howell said, "I gave a nice speech earlier, so I don't need to do that again. I guess it's time to vote."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Are we ready to vote? Madam Clerk, call the vote."

VOTE

Commissioner Unruh No

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

Chairman Ranzau said, "Motion fails one to four. I'd like to propose a modification to Commissioner Howell in the spirit of compromise, as a slate, on a variety of things."

Ms. Rousseau said, "Would you like me to go to your tab?"

Chairman Ranzau said, "Yes. I will make a motion that we modify the budget, using the slate of items, under the tab Ranzau."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "I want to see the list here."

MOTION

Chairman Ranzau moved to amend the proposed budget in accordance with the list of items on the Ranzau tab of the visual presentation.

Commissioner Peterjohn seconded the motion.

Chairman Ranzau said, "What this does, is it puts a variety of things back in. Not all of them, personally, I even want to do, but in discussion with some of my colleagues, there are things in there important to different Commissioners. It does so without maintaining the mill levy at 29.359. At this point it does not increase the use of reserves beyond what was proposed in the original budget. It includes funding for the election officials, the Zoo, Project Access, Exploration Place, Economic Development, WATC and the Navigator Program.

"That being said, I am open to a friendly amendment, to this, that might change these numbers or add some spending, as long as it's not, I think is this adds in about \$550,000 of spending. Commissioner Howell's added in back \$750,000. If we could work out a compromise, I think we could probably do that. So, this is why I did it as a slate, because it makes multiple changes. Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, your proposal, and the proposal we just lost 4-1, are \$200,000 apart. In the spirit of compromise, I would like to meet you in the middle. I would like to make a substitute motion that we amend your proposal by adding \$75,000 to Project Access, \$10,000 to Economic Development, and \$15,000 to Exploration Place. That's a total of \$100,000 addition."

Ms. Rousseau said, "Commissioner, can you please repeat that, I apologize."

Commissioner Howell said, " Yes. It would be \$10,000 to Economic Development, and \$15,000 to Exploration Place. That restores two of the items back to the point that I had proposed earlier, and it gives up a number of items that I was trying to pass."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "I will second that, for discussion purposes."

MOTION

Commissioner Howell moved to amend the Ranzau proposal to include \$75,000 to Project Access, \$10,000 to Economic Development, and \$15,000 to Exploration Place.

Commissioner Peterjohn seconded the motion.

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Norton."

Commissioner Norton said, "If we are going to play around with this, I would like to add in my \$250,000 for roads."

Mr. Chronis said, "The CIP, in this proposal, stands as it was recommended, and that includes the \$1,250,000 for the cold mix and gravel road replacement program of which \$250,000 is designated for your district. So that's already in the budget."

Commissioner Norton said, "Okay. Well, I would like to reallocate it, whatever we were doing earlier. I can add that in as a reallocation, can't I."

Chairman Ranzau said, "You would have to make the motion. You can, but to make things easier, might I suggest that we vote on Commissioner Howell's amendment first, then you can add another amendment to that, if you so desire."

Commissioner Norton said, "Okay."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you, Mr. Chair. So I understand Commissioner Norton, you were wanting to offer that road to this, or you wanted to make sure you got the road?"

Commissioner Norton said, "No. I am ready to offer my amount of the road into this process, put it on the list as we move forward. Try to work out a compromise budget."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Okay. I understand that."

Mr. Chronis said, "I believe what Commissioner Norton is proposing to do, after we get through with this motion, is offer an additional action that would reallocate the \$250,000 that is designated for roads in his district to some other use that isn't on this list right now."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Okay, Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Chirman, you prefer that we did not do that right now?"

Chairman Ranzau said, "Let's vote on Commissioner Howell's amendment, then Commissioner Norton can make, anyone can make any further amendments."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Okay."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Otherwise, we have substitutions for substitutions, you know, and we run into the same dilemma we just had, here recently."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Right now, do we have a motion?"

Chairman Ranzau said, "Yes. To add \$100,000 of spending as you see there, Project

Access, Economic Development, Exploration Place."

Commissioner Unruh said, "I mean did we have a motion to approve this Ranzau budget?"

Chairman Ranzau said, "We did, we had a motion and second. Now we have a substitute or amendment to that by Commissioner Howell which has been motioned and seconded, correct?"

Commissioner Unruh said, "While I am asking some questions, Mr. Chair, does this mean, how much funding, then, does Project Access receive in this?"

Chairman Ranzau said, "\$175,000."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Economic Development then receives a total of how much?"

Chairman Ranzau said, "\$60,000 additional. Beyond \$250,000, which is already in the budget."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Okay."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Remember, these are additions."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Then Exploration [Place] would receive a total of..."

Chairman Ranzau said, "An additional \$40,000 off the base budget."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Okay."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Voting for this does not mean that you vote for the underlying Ranzau amendment."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Right. And the Zoo would be added back \$150,000 out of the \$388,000 that had been?"

Chairman Ranzau said, "Right now it is \$150,000 earmarked, in BoCC contingency. We are not voting on that right now."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Right. Just voting on the amendment."

Chairman Ranzau said, "That's right."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Okay, thank you."

Chairman Ranzau said, "I'll support this amendment. It puts more money in some things that I prefer not to, but wouldn't be exactly how I do it, in the spirit of compromise, I will support it. This amendment. Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Well, this is getting, we are getting closer to where I feel comfortable, and I will be supporting this amendment."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Seeing no other lights on, we have a motion and second."

This will amend the Ranzau amendment, basically, or whatever you want to call it, all right? By adding \$100,000 in spending. Please call the vote."

VOTE

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

Chairman Ranzau said, "Write that one down, Madam Clerk! That's 5-0. Now, Commissioner Norton, or anybody else."

Commissioner Norton said, "Mr. Chairman, I would like to move my \$250,000 for roads over here. And my amendment would be add \$25,000 to Project Access, which gets it up to full funding. Add \$48,000 for the Health Assessment. Add \$128,000 for the immunization processes."

Mr. Chronis said, "Commissioner, each of those items have positions associated with them. I am assuming you want to restore those?"

Commissioner Norton said, "I was just trying to round it off to make my math easier."

Mr. Chronis said, "So, what we will put in the amount column is the amount that's attached to those two positions."

Commissioner Norton said, "Okay. And then finally, whatever remainder of the, what is WATC at right now?"

Ms. Rousseau said, "Commissioner, the recommended budget reduced the overall allocation by \$100,000, which gave them \$693,000."

Commissioner Norton said, "So, we reduced by a hundred. Have we added any back in?"

Ms. Rousseau said, "Not yet."

Commissioner Howell said, "\$25,000 is on this budget."

Commissioner Norton said, "\$25,000 you added back in. Is that correct?"

Mr. Chronis said, "Yes."

Commissioner Norton said, "I would add my remainder back. That's \$49,000. For WATC. That may not be totally \$49,000 exactly based on the way I rounded the other things. That's my recommended amendment. I would make the motion to add those, what you have got on the screen."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Can I add on to his amendment or do I need to second his amendment and make my own?"

Chairman Ranzau said, "You have to second his amendment, first."

Commissioner Unruh said, "I want to enlarge and expand it. You know what I mean? Should I second it, or..."

Chairman Ranzau said, "I would prefer you second the motion and make a substitute motion for his and please help us keep track of where we are at."

Commissioner Unruh said, "I will second Commissioner Norton's motion."

AMENDED MOTION

Commissioner Norton moved to move \$250,000 from roads in District 2, add \$25,000 to Project Access, \$48,000 for the Health Assessment and an additional \$128,000 for the immunization processes.

Commissioner Unruh seconded the motion.

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would also offer one mile."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Hold on. Commissioner Norton, is that okay with you?"

Commissioner Norton said, "It is certainly okay with me to make the process move along."

Chairman Ranzau said, "We could vote on yours, alone, if you prefer."

Commissioner Norton said, "No, I think we can put it all together."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Okay, thank you."

Commissioner Unruh said, "This is an amendment, or inclusion or addition to Commissioner Norton's. I would also yield up my mile of road. Chairman Ranzau, you don't have any amounts from the Health Department restored."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Project Access and the Navigator, now, are in. And with Commissioner Norton, both of those would be fully, Project Access would be at \$200,000, and the Navigator will be fully restored."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Then, for my mile road, I would move that we add the Health Promotion position. I don't know if that's a full-time equivalent or what that is. And trying to do this math in my head here. And I think add that remaining balance to support the Sedgwick County Zoo. For simplicity, Mr. Chair, if you would do Mr. Norton and my amendment together or how we do that?"

AMENDED MOTION

Commissioner Unruh moved to move \$250,000 from roads in District 1, restore 2.0 FTEs in Health Promotion and an additional \$93,749 for the Sedgwick County Zoo.

Commissioner Norton seconded the motion.

Chairman Ranzau said, "I think first we have to vote on this, and then yours. First, do we have a second for Commissioner Unruh's?"

Commissioner Norton said, "I seconded."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Are you done, Commissioner Unruh?"

Commissioner Unruh said, "Pretty much."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "A question for Commissioner Unruh. I want to understand, are you also restoring the added position at the Zoo, as part of your motion?"

Commissioner Unruh said, "I am intending to increase funding for what is suggested here."

Chairman Ranzau said, "\$150,000."

Commissioner Unruh said, "I want to increase it and they can spend it as they see fit."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "So, \$243,000 restored to the Zoo."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Correct."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "So your amendment, okay, would add almost \$94,000. Thank you."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Can you slow down a little bit so we can see, or maybe that is all."

Ms. Rousseau said, "That is all, Commissioner."

Chairman Ranzau said, "That's all Commissioner Unruh's amendment. I will say in the past when Commissioners have not used all their cold mix road, it's happened to me, it's happened to Commissioner Howell, we've not then said that the money belongs to the Commissioner to spend on anything else wants to spend it on, so this would be setting a precedent that, I think, goes down a road we don't want to. "Additionally, many of these additions that the money is going to be used for, I would not support. I would suggest to the Commissioners, if they want to not use those roads, which are CIP projects, then we would still make a decision, as a Commission, to reallocate that for the northeast EMS station in Commissioner Unruh's district. That would be a better use. If we are going to eliminate capital funds, let's transfer it to another capital project as opposed to operations. I would suggest that would be a better alternative. I will put that out there. I will not be supporting these particular amendments. Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was interested, because one of the reasons we have an immunization program, actually three, the effort was to consolidate it to one. Most of the immunizations are occurring on the private side, and I was just curious from the proponent, which in this case would be Commissioner Norton, his desire to restore that almost \$128,000. But if there is any additional information on those, on the specifics, I would sure like to get some more details as part of our discussion this morning."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Point of clarification, I think there has been some misinformation out there. We are not eliminating immunizations, we're eliminating a couple positions, because we have three immunization programs, we want to change our delivery model, so they can be more cost-effective, hopefully be able to support itself financially. So that's the deal. We will still give immunizations. That's not going

to go away. It's just that the efficiency and cost savings. Seeing nothing else, Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to understand the rationale of Commissioner Unruh by putting Health Promotion back in, and I would like to understand the rationale of Commissioner Norton for putting the Assessment back in. If they would be willing to explain that to me, I would appreciate that. Thank you."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Certainly. They can respond, but they don't have to. I will wait a moment. Okay. Seeing no other comment, I would like to first vote on Commissioner Unruh's amendment to Commissioner Norton's amendment, correct?"

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

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

VOTE

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

Chairman Ranzau said, "So, that amendment fails 2-3. That takes us back to the Norton amendment, which we can vote on now, or if there are alternatives, changes to Commissioner Norton's amendment. Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "I also have the concern, in terms of in the past we have, because of financial problems, we have sometimes walked away from having any sort of cold mix program when we had that, and that's been a challenge. "If new schools get built, that happened in my district, having a road near the new Eisenhower School Complex at Goddard was imperative. To have it heating up the way it can, it really hasn't even lasted five years, and with the high volume of traffic, a lot more people using Colwich Road, also known as the 167th Street, west, that is an important part. So, you know, this is an interesting offer from Commissioners Norton and Unruh, but a little bit of surprise to me, so I am uncomfortable proceeding at this point, and so I am not going to be supporting the Norton amendment this morning, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What this actually does, we have a deficit in all of the budgets that have been presented have deficit spending. We are taking money from what otherwise would be important to the community in terms of roads. If it's not something this important, we don't have to spend the money on road, we can say there is no need in my district, and allow that money to simply help the budget move along. But to take money out of something that would otherwise fix roads to do operations, again, sets us up for problems next year."

"I don't have anybody giving me rationale as to why we would support immunizations program, which really is a move towards efficiency. That's almost half the money that Commissioner Norton has proposed, almost half the money for an efficiency move. Doesn't actually disservice anybody. Anybody who wants to get immunizations in Sedgwick County can do so with the program in the projected, in the proposed

budget. So I don't support his idea of restoring immunizations. Project Access, I have very clearly argued and defended Project Access, up to \$175,000, you know, I think everybody knows that I was the one that restored the extra \$25,000 late, just of recent, because we had a perceived, enough in the budget to do that. Through negotiations with the City of Wichita and with the administrators of the program I was able to come up with \$25,000, and I thought was reasonable.

"I don't know if we want to do that at this point. I do want them to have an incentive to look for other funds. A lot of these organizations are overly dependent on Sedgwick County government for a major source of their funding. I appreciate what they do, but they need to be diversifying their income stream from other sources, so this haircut, if you want to call it that, \$175,000 that I promoted, which was where we are at right now before this amendment, I think gives that incentive. We can also, you know, visit this during the year if we need to, to find other funds, if the budget is performing positively. But I don't support this at this time to restore \$25,000. Then for the assessment; again, I am looking for the rationale, this is primarily bureaucratic in nature. We are simply asking lots of questions from lots of people and coming up with, the final outcome is a document that we, theoretically, use to come up with health strategies. As I read the last version of this document, it was almost common sense. There was nothing in there I thought was worth \$150,000 of three years worth of effort to create that document. It just felt bureaucratic in nature. I appreciate that we want to measure our health across the county, but I don't know that that's the best way to do that. Really, the conclusion of having health strategies that are basically common sense. I am not sure that's worth that investment. I guess at this point I am not supportive on most of Commissioner Norton's proposal. I think that, and I think this is precedent-setting.

"Again, if he doesn't want to identify a road that needs a mile, let's not spend more money because of that. Let's let that let the budget perform. We have an upside-down budget. Every budget that has been proposed today is upside-down so to speak. Every one of them has deficit spending. Just to spend more money for the sake of spending money. I am interested in the rationale behind the spending. Tell me why. What is important to spend, why would we spend money on these things? I am interested in that discussion, without the rationale, I can't support it. I think, I need the rational, I gave the rationale of what I supported in my Howell budget. I was glad to engage anybody as to why I said those numbers and those categories. I don't have that from this proposal. So just to spend money to spend money sets us up for failure next year.

"We have an upside-down budget, we can't spend money for the purpose of spending money. It doesn't substantially solve the problem for next year. Again, I can't support the amendment. Apologize for belaboring our long discussion here, but I just wanted to, I want them to understand exactly why I am voting no. Thanks, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "I appreciate Commissioner Howell's statements. And I will say in general, I know there's been a lot of changes in the budget, and if you lump the sum together, sometimes people say you are cutting the Health Department \$800,000 or \$900,000, that may sound bad. You need to understand, we are still spending over \$11 million in the Health Department. When you look at the individual decisions that are made throughout the whole budget, there is a rationale and reasoning behind it. As Commissioner Howell said, it is hard to get all the rationales and decisions out in the facts out in the public, as to why we made those decisions, or why they are in there, and so that leads to, you know, lack of information, some

misinformation. I can assure you, there is a rationale behind every decision.

"You may not agree with it. In fact, my colleagues and I, at least Commissioner Howell and I don't agree on some of the rationale or some of the decisions for different reasons, but we do have a rationale behind our viewpoints. So, with that being said, at this point I think we can vote on Commissioner Norton's motion, unless there is any other discussion. Seeing none, please call the vote."

VOTE

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

Chairman Ranzau said, "So, that amendment fails 2-3. We still have the original proposal, which was amended by the health proposal. Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Mr. Chairman, since we are back on the original proposal, I would like to obviously, except for the restoration for Project Access and the \$91,000 for the Navigators, the rest of the reductions in the Health Department stands. I think it's important for public discussion, for the folks who wanted to restore this, and I think I have got two colleagues who are pushing in that direction to come out and provide their rationale in terms of why these programs are important, and have a discussion on it. I mean, we have voted on the amendments that were offered, but we haven't had the debate.

"I think the public discussion, public deserves that, and they ought to have an understanding, unless we just want to have it treated as kind of a consent item. I don't think there is consent here. I think we have got some significant, profound differences. But if we don't have a discussion on it in terms of why we've got the proposal in front of us as it is, which is going to slide forward, and I really do think, from a health point of view, to have that discussion before we vote on the final budget, I would like to make some health-related comments, because, and I would like and expect to hear some comments in terms of why we are moving in the direction we are moving. So I throw that out, at this stage of the discussion, since we are back, as I understand it, and please correct me if I am wrong, on the amended Ranzau amendment. Ranzau amendment as modified."

Chairman Ranzau said, "As modified. So are you asking others to comment?"

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Giving them another opportunity to."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Do you have anything else to say?"

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Nope."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Okay. Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to make a substitute motion."

Chairman Ranzau said, "I am not surprised. Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh said, "I don't know if you call it substitute motion E. There's 26

letters in the alphabet. We won't go through all of them today, but one more time. And this is kind of in deference to Commissioner Peterjohn's strong position on the mill levy, and trying to accommodate that, and trying to accommodate what, for me, was the reference of our community partners and citizens with regards to Economic Development and the Health Department and culture and recreation issues. My motion would be that we don't use the mill levy throw back. Lindsay, you can make this in relation to the Norton-Unruh plan."

Ms. Rousseau said, "Okay."

Chairman Ranzau said, "So this is not a modification of the current plan."

Commissioner Unruh said, "This is a substitute motion."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Based upon C or D?"

Commissioner Unruh said, "C, which was the Norton-Unruh, whatever you call it. Is that still there?"

Ms. Rousseau said, "Yes, it is. That's what you are seeing now. Sorry, it took me a moment."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Okay. I would just recommend that we, I would move that we fund that proposal for the budget with the exception of the sales tax addition recapture, take that out, I want to compromise with Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Sales tax?"

Commissioner Unruh said, "Not sales tax, I'm sorry. The mill levy, the property tax, thank you. So take that mill levy addition back out of it, and if we take out the Fiscal Associate that I think is still in there, the Billing Clerk, that's still in there."

Ms. Rousseau said, "I had removed that because we went back to Plan C. I will add that back in."

Commissioner Unruh said, "We can take that out, and since it appears there's no one really supporting the Metropolitan Area Planning Department suggestions, let's take those out. That's about \$155,000. And that can be, those additions to our budget, and with not taking the mill levy recapture, they can be funded with two miles of cold mix, which would be \$500,000. So that's Commissioner Norton's road and mine, and once again suggesting we use the revenue from the Furley Land sale, and that should cover all those additions, keep our promises to this institute of people and not recapture the mill levy."

Ms. Rousseau said, "Commissioner, may I clarify with you that you were wanting to start with Plan C or D as your starting point?"

Commissioner Unruh said, "Plan C."

Ms. Rousseau said, "Okay, would you like to add the employee recognition?"

Commissioner Unruh said, "At the original Plan C, we had those items, and we added the election personnel, Election Commissioners personnel, so let's do that, and then take from that the Metropolitan Area Planning Department section of that, which is \$155,483, for historic preservation, environmental review, bicycle and pedestrian and comprehensive plan. Take those out. And then I would say fund those additions with

the two miles of road, and proceeds from the sale of the Furley property. I think that should leave us with a small positive balance which would reduce our deficit. We have already talk about using capital money for operating, I don't know how much time we have to spend talking about that again. I think in this special circumstance, and not recapturing mill levy, or keeping it level with what we had last year, make that modification that Commissioner Peterjohn wants to do."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Are you okay calling that Plan E?"

Commissioner Unruh said, "Sure, we can call that Plan E."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Can we do that? We have a motion."

SUBSTITUTE MOTION

Commissioner Unruh moved to adopt Plan E.

Commissioner Norton seconded the motion.

Chairman Ranzau said, "We will pause for a moment until Lindsay gets up to speed. Do you think that reflects everything that he's recommending?"

Ms. Rousseau said, "I believe so. Would you like me to run through it quickly?"

Chairman Ranzau said, "Sure."

Ms. Rousseau said, "Okay. What this does is remove the property tax adjustment that had been initially included in Plan C. It reduces the allocation for cold mix roads by \$500,000. Everything else from Plan C remains in place. The MAPD restoration, that had been included initially, is now removed, and we have added the proceeds of the Furley Land sale. That revenue would be received in 2015, so this would be a deliberate use of that in 2016, about \$1.3 million."

Commissioner Unruh said, "And the two election positions."

Ms. Rousseau said, "Yes, and the two election positions."

Commissioner Unruh said, "So, on the chart, the way that the Furley Land sale, \$1.3 million is up there, that would actually mean that we've got a deficit of about \$1 million, compared to the original \$1.1 million."

Ms. Rousseau said, "Yes, sir."

Commissioner Unruh said, "That's my motion."

Chairman Ranzau said, "It would reflect a deficit of 2.3, would it not? In next year's budget."

Ms. Rousseau said, "It would. Right."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "Just for summary, thank you, Mr. Chairman, for summary, we are talking about not funding the MAPD items, total of that is \$156,000? Is that correct? So that's \$156,000 cut in Plan C. But you are adding another \$482,000 expenditure by doing the roll back. So, in terms of cuts, we are only talking

about \$156,000 in cuts total, versus the original Plan C. Based on the spending of individual items, reduced that by \$156,000, and also the rollback. That's in summary what we've done here."

Ms. Rousseau said, "And there is a reduction of roads and bridges spending of \$500,000 included up here at the top."

Commissioner Howell said, "Okay. Well, I guess my comment, again, I hate to keep coming back to the same point. This isn't substantially change our behavior. This, again, is using a one-time solution that hope we can attain next year, and essentially creates another problem, so I guess I am not going to be able to support this one, either. It's kind of along the same lines as the previous comments. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is very similar to Plan C, and I am still waiting to hear some discussion."

"I was hoping to hear in terms of defensive, why we should increase, under this amendment, the funding for a whole bunch of items that really haven't been discussed much. So my vote is going to be the same as it was on Plan C. Thank you."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Seeing no other comments, I believe we have a motion and second. Commissioner Unruh's second proposed amendment, or substitute motion. Please call the vote."

VOTE

<i>Commissioner Unruh</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Norton</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Howell</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Commissioner Peterjohn</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Chairman Ranzau</i>	<i>No</i>

Chairman Ranzau said, "The Plan E fails 2-3. Continue to move back to the first amendment, Ranzau amendment, amended by Howell. Correct? Just trying to keep track of where we are at. Okay. Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you. I just want to explain my vote on this. I won't be able to support it. I did not think it reflects being good partners with our community partners to keep the level of funding that we were in previously contractual agreements, that we changed. I don't think it reflects the will of the citizens in terms of their desires about culture and recreation, and the Health Department. It goes part of the way, and that's a good move, but because of that, I won't be supporting it."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "So I am clear, I understand exactly where we are, the motion in front of us at this point is the amended Ranzau amendment, and adding it to the base budget, correct?"

Chairman Ranzau said, "As amended by Howell."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Commissioner Howell. Okay. Just wanted to make

sure I understood that. I am going to be supportive of this motion. Thank you."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "Again, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, the issue of promises needs to be discussed. When that agreement was signed in 2013, it was after we cut hundreds of thousands of dollars, and it was with the hope that the economy would be better than it was. And in those funding agreements, there is an exit clause that says that any party can terminate this for any reason. I think not having the money to fund that is a pretty good reason. We are under an agreement with the Zoo, to fund salaries. I asked, specifically, the Zoo, what does it take to fund 100 percent of your salaries for 2016, and the answer came back \$176,000 and that includes one new FTE of \$26,000. Which I don't think we need to fund, I believe they can, it is a maintenance person, frankly. But this proposed budget of \$150,000 funds 100 percent of the salaries for the Zoo, for 2016. Which is what the operating agreement says we have to fund.

"So, our community partners that are clamoring for spending, I think what they are interested in is making sure the Zoo opens the elephant exhibit on time with what they need, and this will do that. With respect to Exploration Place, they have had modest increases in the last couple years, not very much, but modest increases. This is not taking back to 2013. Actually leaves them slightly above what they would have been. Having said that, they do have plans for \$100,000 expansion in December, which they should do. They plan to do, if they have the money, and I have had discussions with them. I hope they can find the money to make that happen. But it is a choice they are making. To spend \$100,000. This is above and beyond salaries. This is a choice to improve their financial position, if you will, and give them more opportunities to increase revenue. I appreciate that. But, this is a choice they would make to spend \$100,000 to improve their financial forecast. I would suggest, we are cutting our CIP, that would otherwise improve our financial forecast. The reality is, they have money, if they wanted to spend on salaries, they could do so. And I am sorry that they are going to see a small reduction in my proposal, or in this proposal here, but having said that, we don't have money we used to have.

"We have a \$10.3 million shortfall. We have got to somehow, substantially, reduce expenditures, and that should be shared amongst our community partners. Our partners obviously with us, we appreciate what Sedgwick County provides. Let's be clear. We have been providing about \$3.3 million to Exploration Place, we subsidize, principle and interest, subsidizing each visitor more than \$17 per visitor, on average. We are a partner with them. And this is a modest cut.

"And I wish we had more money. We don't have it. So our partners need to partner with us and our shortfall. We are doing the best we can, but to the extent that we have promises in place, they are not promises. Those are commitments based on revenue that we don't have. And I know that we are going to deal with those funding agreements in the next item on the agenda. I want to push those funding agreements back to December so we have time to renegotiate those, because they contain increases in the spending that I think are way above what we could possibly support with these budgets.

"So, again, I think the idea of using the word promises is not true. That's a misnomer. There are no promises. Those are commitments based on revenue we don't have. And to the other partners in the community that they will see reductions in their funding, just because you got it last year does not mean you get it next year. You are overly dependent on Sedgwick County for a major source of your revenue, you are vulnerable, you're at risk. We only do things if we have the money. We don't have it.

We have got to substantially change our behavior, and be adults, and let's get this budget back where it needs to go. We have got to substantially reduce expenditures on the operation side, which many of the proposals, Plan C and otherwise don't do that. As we finish up here, I would make one final comment. That is, had my colleagues supported my proposal, we would be spending \$100,000 more on the things they care about. But I couldn't get their support. It failed 4-1. I did my best. And feel like, at this point, I have got to support this motion on this budget, which I guess I will do, because there is no other option on the table. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to make a comment before we get to the vote on this, that as our Chief Financial Officer described when he first went through that process, he said this is a transformational budget. "And the reason he said that is because we are doing things way different than we used to do. We have become a AAA rated institution, with strong reserves, with a very reasonable, workable debt level. We have achieved that level of excellence and service to our citizens by using bond funding judiciously. A big driver in this, if we were going to fund \$4 million worth of roads this year, we wouldn't be having all these budget gymnastics that we are going through right now. So it is clear that the majority of the Commission does not want to bond any more. But I think that we need to understand that this is driven by a new policy on how we fund county activities. It is a transformational budget. It was my term at the meeting, I call it experimental, but I just want to say that all we are going through right now is, in some degree, self-imposed by a new financing strategy. That's all I have. Thank you."

Chairman Ranzau said, "I think Commissioner Howell is next."

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have explained earlier my reasoning as to why leaning on bonding for routine things, small expenditures, is not smart. I think that needs to be remembered. We got ourselves into a bad habit, in Sedgwick County. This proposal of this budget is not a step, this says we are going to pay \$4 million in cash. This proposed budget spend \$2.29 million in cash, and deficit spend a million dollars, we have saved up for transportation contingency, transferred into that budget to make that a little less painful for our Director of Public Works. It is transformational, but we need to move away from bad habits, and continuing to do insanity, by borrowing everything you possibly can, borrowing out of your savings accounts when you have negative forecast, we have three quarterly reports that are negative. We have got eight budgets in a row that are deemed negative that required cuts to make them work. This needs to be transformational. We need to start better habits. I think this is the best we can do. Again, I wish my colleagues would have supported my position, but nevertheless, it's time to move forward. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With the discussion shifting into bonding, I want to remind folks, a bond is a government term that we are using here, basically a mortgage. Like a mortgage on your home. And we to have to do some mortgaging, or bonding, later on regardless of the outcome of this discussion. We got a commitment to, unless we want to draw down reserves significantly, when this Commission spent between \$11 million and \$12 million in the fourth quarter of last year. It was not part of a proposed and adopted 2015 budget. Biggest item was \$5.3 million for the elephant barn, because we had a fundraiser that failed. County Commission stepped into the gap, majority voted to provide \$5.3 million."

"In addition, the 3rd Street building was purchased for \$5 million. Those are the two biggest ticket items. And that's put us in a position, with the changes that are needed within that building, we are probably looking at a bond issue later on this year. So the comment that we won't be bonding in the future, I think, is misleading, because I think within the next few months, there is going to be a proposal to come back here to bond, and I don't see a good option except for, if we try and keep the criteria for our AAA rating, which I do agree is important. We are missing one of the five criteria, but the other four are in place. But some of the changes occur, and reserves get drawn down, or they don't get replenished by other sources, we are looking at a challenge.

"So when the comment came up that, you know, we won't be doing any bonding going forward, I did want to put that into place, because there will be, and I think it will be within the next, within, certainly within the next year, thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Thank you, Commissioner. I will say a few comments. First of all, I will add in, with respect to Exploration Place, I think it's important to remember, as Commissioner Howell said, taxpayers do subsidize to the tune of \$3.3 million. \$1.1 million being the bond and interest, \$2.2 million for operational costs. However, when Exploration Place was originally sold to the community, it was with the understanding there would be no operational subsidy from the government. And then after a few years, there was supposed to be a temporary modest subsidy.

"We have gone from a program supposed to require zero taxpayer subsidies for operations to one that is subsidized to the tune of \$2.2 million. Now there is a sense of entitlement and permanency to this, to the point that a modest reduction of \$75,000, the response I got from some of the Board members was disappointing considering the amount of money that the taxpayers put into that. Now, even that's been reduced by I think \$40,000. So I think it's important to keep in mind that when people are complaining about the reduced subsidy, it is a reduction of a \$2.2 million operational subsidy, which was supposed to be zero. I still think they are doing pretty well.

"That being said, bonding, I will say some things, to my Commissioners, we won't eliminate bonding, but we will reduce our bonding. We have relied on bonding too much in the past. We could get away with it in the past. Now, the reality of the situation prevents us from doing this. As I said earlier, some of our road projects, we have been habitually borrowing, to the point that we are paying \$5.7 million in principle and interest, getting \$2.7 million worth of roads and bridges. I think everybody can see how that's not something we can or should sustain. The other example is from the plan given to us by our previous manager before he left, recommended bonding for three EMS stations. No cash, he said that's what we have to do. But a few months later we realized we actually do have cash, earmarked for EMS stations. We can pay for one right now with cash. Additionally, one of the EMS stations, and these are details you don't hear, was in my district, it exists right now. 53rd Street. And it has some issues that need to be fixed. So the proposal by staff and the previous Manager was to replace an existing EMS station for about \$1.4 million. What I ask, we could repair it for \$200,000. So we were going to bond \$1.4 million for an EMS station to replace it, when you could have paid \$200,000 in cash just to fix it.

"Now, all of the people that are supporting this and everything, I mean, does anyone realize what was going on? That doesn't make sense. So we are going to move forward with less bonding, not zero bonding. And we are going to be more judicious, because we have dug ourselves in a hole, and we have made some decisions that

you can get away with when revenues are growing 4 to 5 percent a year like they used to. That's great. As I said before, revenue growth is slowing, and the leading factors put out, by WSU, are declining. We have to face reality. We can't keep kicking the can down the road.

"That being said, I am going to be supportive of this as well. I said there's spending in here, spending levels and items that I don't agree with, actually, but you can't get everything that you want. You do have to compromise. We have addressed some of the biggest things we have heard about, as far as the Zoo, Project Access, Exploration Place, Economic Development, WATC, I don't know what else, there was a variety of things in there, I think Project Access.

"If I didn't already say it, it maintains our commitment to the mill levy we have made in the past. There is some deficit spending, but it is not increased as much from the base budget as what it could have with other previous plans. Even though we all don't get what we want, we have added in \$650,000 of spending and moved it towards that direction.

"Once again, I go back to how do you reconcile the very strong, but different opinions of some people who say keep all the cuts, others who say don't keep any of the cuts, and others who say keep some and not the others, and it is very tough, and we have made some sausage, here, for a while. I think if we are going to vote on this, this vote will be to amend the budget, but it is not actually accepting the budget. If this or anything else passes, you need some time to do a few things; is that correct?"

Ms. Rousseau said, "Yes, please."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Okay. Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh said, "One point of clarification, on Economic Development budget, we had a vote earlier about making sure that that was earmarked for GWEDC, but that was on a different budget."

Chairman Ranzau said, "We had a motion which was not seconded."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Alright."

Chairman Ranzau said, "The intent is to put it under the title Economic Development."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Then it may or may not go to GWEDC."

Chairman Ranzau said, "That's correct. Madam Clerk, call the vote."

VOTE

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

Chairman Ranzau said, "That amendment passes 3-2. Are there any other amendments to be heard?"

Commissioner Unruh said, "Mr. Chairman? I got a whole list of them here I could go through. I am just certain they are not going to pass. Should I go through them or spare us? I would make a lot of motions to fully fund the Zoo, and Exploration Place,

WATC, and I will just be on record, that's my preference, and we won't go through the pain."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Okay."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Maybe I should read it."

Chairman Ranzau said, "You can read it into the record."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Okay. I would want the Zoo, fund Immunizations for Children, fully fund the Tech Training, Project Access, Exploration Place, and include funding for Foster Grandparents, which I am sorry that slipped under the radar. So those are things that I would like. I would indicate my strong support."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Since Commissioner Unruh was going to discuss each of the items, I wanted to get, you know, if he wanted to talk about in particular, you know, some of the individual items like, for example, the health area, I was interested in having that discussion, and I know that we have been at this a long time, but I am willing to continue here. I think it's important to have the public discussion, because these issues, regardless of how they come out, it's important, and spending public money deserves our full attention, and the best information every Commissioner can have when we are doing these votes. I am willing to stay here as long as necessary. And I am interested in hearing Commissioner Unruh's reasons for his support, although obviously, I mean, funding for a lot of these items were in Plan C and I think D. That we voted on earlier. But obviously, my comments on the Health Department side, I am very much interested in that area. Thank you."

Chairman Ranzau said, "At this point, I don't see any additional questions or comments. Lindsay and Chris need some time. I think what we want to do is pause this discussion for a moment, and we want to give you some time to work out the details. In the mean time, we do have need for Executive Session, correct, Mr. Manager?"

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

Chairman Ranzau said, "So we can be doing something while they do that, I believe we need a motion for Executive Session."

MOTION

Commissioner Peterjohn moved to recess into Executive Session for 20 minutes to consider consultation with legal counsel on matters privileged in the attorney-client relationship relating to legal advice and personnel matters of non-elected personnel, and the Board of County Commissioners return to this room from Executive Session, no sooner than 1:20 p.m.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Sedgwick County Board of County Commissioners recessed into Executive Session at 12:59 p.m. and returned at 1:28 p.m.

Chairman Ranzau said, "We're now back from Executive Session, and no binding action was taken. We'll now move back to our discussion, which was in progress, with respect to the budget. Lindsay, would you like to tell us what we need to do next?"

Ms. Rousseau said, "Absolutely. Commissioners, at your seats, you have a packet. It's a white packet as opposed to the blue packet you received this morning. At the top, it says 2016 budget option motions based on 2016 recommended budget.

"This has been updated to reflect the changes made today. Overall, your total budget expenditures did not change from the recommended budget, nor did your property tax levy. However, the action taken to add the EMS southeast post has adjusted the total CIP amount, and so your motion reflects that. The packet behind your motion includes an updated resolution to add that EMS southeast post to the list of Capital Improvement Projects included in the 2016 budget. At the back of your packet, also, is the certificate that is referenced in the resolution that shows the total amount that will be included in the adopted budget by fund for both expenditures and your property tax levy. That has not changed from what you saw with your original agenda item, because the changes you've made today just serve to reallocate budget authority within the general fund. So, with that, I believe we're prepared for you to make the motion if there is no other changes and formally adopt the budget.

Chairman Ranzau said, "Okay. Commissioner Peterjohn."

MOTION

Commissioner Peterjohn moved to adopt the resolution for the 2016 Sedgwick County budget that includes an operating budget of \$394,143,119 in the 2016 capital improvement program of \$63,290,571. Total operating budget is partially funded with a property tax levy of \$129,580,173, which is approximately equivalent to 29.359 mills based on the estimated assessed valuation subject to review and technical adjustments.

Chairman 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 have a question. So with this budget, that truth in taxation resolution, would that apply or not?"

Ms. Rousseau said, "No, it does not apply."

Chairman Ranzau said, "We don't have to do that?"

Ms. Rousseau said, "No. There will be no notice of vote."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Do we need to take up this other resolution separately?"

Ms. Rousseau said, "No, sir. The resolution is actually what you're adopting here."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Okay. Thank you."

Chairman Ranzau said, "So, we have a motion and a second. Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "I'd like to make some just general comments, because I think the end is almost in sight, because we've had a long day. We've had a lot of discussion. We've kicked around a lot of ideas. We wish we'd had a bigger ability to go into some of the details, and I think that would be helpful and useful."

"This is a budget that I'm not completely comfortable with, but it's better than some of the, it's the least bad of all the options in front of me, so I do plan to be supportive of this today. It has some positives to it. It leads the Commission back where we, the commitment we made not to let the mill levy ratchet up through these automatic adjustments and technical procedures. I want to repeat again my appreciation for the public, everyone who commented for or against it. I really regret that there has been so much, I had somebody call about a road in my district saying, save the trees, and do away with this road project, and we can save the Zoo. I've got to get back with them since I got the message this morning and didn't get a chance to call them back. The frustration I had was, even with the original budget, that doesn't include the funding for the Zoo that's contained in this budget, there was no cut to the Zoo. The funding level was the same as this year on the operations side, and it doesn't reflect the extra funds, the fact that we came up with \$5.3 million, out of county reserves, to help complete the fundraising drive that was in trouble. To the degree that there's public focused on Sedgwick County, I want to try and get the right story out to people in terms of what we're doing, what we're trying to achieve. In the area on healthcare, I've only had one doctor visit, and that was a Dr. Jeffrey Willett from the Kansas Health Foundation, and he had concerns about some of the proposals. I hope this Commission's action and the budget in front of us here with Project Access getting additional funding, from what was proposed, I would urge, having looked at the Kansas Health Foundation and their subsidiary organization, the Kansas Health Institute, that they might want to look at if they think some of the programs that we've had here are really, really important for this state and their mission statement on the Health Foundation is to improve the health of all Kansans."

"I'd be interested in seeing some support. I understood the city got a \$100,000 grant. I asked staff to look at how much money Sedgwick County has received from them, and maybe we haven't asked, but my understanding is over five years it's been barely \$66,000 and a number of grants, and that's including both the Health Institute, which is a subsidiary organization of the Health Foundation, and I throw this out because the Kansas Health Foundation is an interesting group. They threw out a study, Friday, that I think raises more questions than it provides answers."

"But when looking at the Health Institute with a couple dozens employees, and in fact, having a news bureau of five people, which I didn't think health institutes were in the media business, but they had former reporters with Wichita and Topeka papers on their staff who I know. I just think that the discussion of the budget we have today is an ongoing project, and I would be very interested to visit with folks, whether they're with the Kansas Health Institute or Kansas Health Foundation or elsewhere in the public, in terms of how we can improve the health of the citizens in this community, but it's ultimately, when it comes down to it, the relationship is between the health provider and the health consumer. The decisions we made today and the directions we're taking I think goes back to it and moves away from the collectivist decision where we've been trending.

"I appreciate all my colleagues' comments here. I am very appreciative of staff's hard work. I want to repeat that. But trying to get accurate information out here, it was Winston Churchill that said, you know, misinformation or lies can get out. There were no cuts to senior centers that I saw, but I saw media reports indicating that there were. You know, we really all have a responsibility to try and get accurate information out here, and I'm going to continue to try and do that, Mr. Chairman. I do plan to be supportive of this budget this afternoon. Thank you."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to dovetail onto the comments of Commissioner Peterjohn. I don't know if you intended to say this or not. I don't think I heard you say that the Zoo actually has a \$150,000 increase, over last year's spending. That's not what they wanted, but it is an increase. In fact, it's about the only thing in the entire budget that has an actual increase. They're going to call it a cut because of the funding agreement that dictates the seven percent increase over 2015 spending, and to the extent that we're not going to do, that they're going to call it a cut. But let's be clear this is a \$150,000 increase, so this is enough to fund their salaries. So when people call up and say, we're sad you're closing the Zoo, let the record be known that we're not closing the Zoo. They're going to have enough money to do all of the salaries for 2016 and I stand by that. I think that's wonderful. They're going to have a record revenue, I believe, with the opening of the elephant exhibit in 2016 and 2017. I've been told roughly a 24-month honeymoon, they call it that, where gate revenue skyrockets because of this new exhibit. Some day down the road, they'll have a baby elephant and I expect it will happen again.

"So, in knowing that, I think that it's prudent that we do fund salaries per the operating agreement, and that's what this does. Commissioner Peterjohn once mentioned this study and it's interesting as I thought about their argument that they're correlating spending to deaths. I spoke with Mr. Willett, in my office, regarding the nature of these cuts. He wasn't really interested in that. There are eight different topics under the umbrella of health that we're touching in this budget. Three of those, I would argue have no effect, whatsoever, because you can still get immunizations in Sedgwick County. You can still get screenings exactly as you had before, and one thing we've not talked about today is Healthy Babies. But we made some discussion earlier in the year regarding the effectiveness of that program, which I believe the communication should be, I would like people to know that the way this program is structured, it's impossible for them to move the dial on infant mortality. I do support the project. We did approve a \$2 million grant, earlier in the year, which I voted for, but to the extent that the program is designed to lower infant mortality, it's possible the way the program is structured.

"I would encourage that program to restructure somewhat and broaden their ability to interface with many more women having babies, in this community. When they do that, I would come back and support them with the \$74,000 cut I think they have in

this budget. The other two parts of this, the Navigator, which I like to use the word coordinator, and the Project Access, Project Access being funding \$175,000 and the coordinator being fully funded in this proposed budget, I think that those indicate we're standing by the two programs which I believe touch people the most out of those eight.

"The remaining three programs are primarily bureaucratic in nature. They're going into the school system, and they're screening these kids, which I think is great. But you know what? We do have parents, and I don't know that the schools are unable to identify kids that have health needs, and they can deal with it. They've got nurses. They can call the coordinators, and they can coordinate health. They can contact parents, contact DCF (Department of Children and Families), if necessary. So the idea that we're not helping kids in school, I don't think that's true. They still have capabilities, but Sedgwick County government does not need to fund this where we interface virtually almost every kid in the school system. I think that these kids will have help from their parents and school system still in place. The Health Educator Program deals with workplace health strategies. If you Google that, you can find literally thousands of things out there that are workplace strategies. This is not something we have to hold the hands of businesses to help them do this, by Sedgwick County government. This is not a need that we need to do. They can develop those strategies without our help.

"And then the issue of the assessment. I talked about this previously. I know that it's well intentioned, but frankly, it's a lot of bureaucratic effort, and all that comes at the end of that is a document that basically presents what I consider to be common sense. So the nature of these cuts is not going to kill 65 people. I think that was irresponsible for them to make that suggestion. In fact, if you want to go there, I would suggest them sitting on \$500 million, killing 3,255 people by not spending that money on health, or perhaps we should say we should have spent another \$1 million last year and we would have saved 65 people last year, which we didn't do. We put the money on entertainment rather than people. I think the argument is ridiculous.

"Having said that, it's time to vote on this budget. I'll tell you, I haven't voted for a budget I like. I voted on three budgets in Topeka, and voted yes on three, the fourth voted against because of the process they followed. They never allowed legislators to impact that budget. I think I've done that today. I've had my thumb print on this budget to the extent that I'm able to do that this year. I'm pushing for a compromise. Unfortunately, I wasn't able to get a compromise that I like. And even my compromise includes a lot of stuff I don't care for. But this is the best we can get. It's time to vote a budget up, because it's a compromise between five people with different ideologies, and you work the best you can and you fight for what you believe is right, and I have done that, with hundreds of conversations.

"So I'm going to support this budget now, not because I like it. I think this budget does damage in some ways to some of the things we do care for, but we did have a budget shortfall, and this budget puts us in a direction to substantially change our behavior and get our fiscal house back in order. Next year, we will not have the same problem we have this year. Unfortunately, I don't think that's likely to happen, but this will certainly help. I will support the budget this time. I don't like it. I don't think anybody likes it, but it's the best we can do. Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to give my comments.

Chairman Ranzau said, "Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, we've had a great deal of discussion today. I really appreciate it. I appreciate the effort that all the

Commissioners have exerted in trying to come to compromises and establish their position, but I will not be able to support the budget. I think that it did not go far enough in restoring funds to the Health and Human Services, the Zoo, Exploration Place, WATC, Economic Development, all of those different categories.

"So I will not be supportive, but in response to one concession made by Commissioner Howell, I'd like to offer a motion that we designate the Economic Development money for GWEDC. I know that was in a discussion. Maybe Commissioner Howell doesn't want to support that, but I know it's now just designated Economic Development, and I would like to move that we designate the Economic Development for GWEDC."

MOTION

Commissioner Unruh moved to amend the Ranzau plan, to designate the money in the Economic Development fund to GWEDC, for the 2016 budget.

Commissioner Norton seconded the motion.

Commissioner Unruh said, "I don't think that changes any numbers or anything else."

Ms. Rousseau said, "No, sir."

Chairman Ranzau said, "We will treat that as an amendment to this first motion. Okay? So everything will stay the same except that. Okay?"

Commissioner Unruh said, "That's fine with me."

Chairman Ranzau said, "We have a motion and a second. Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "In the spirit of compromise, I was certainly willing to support that idea, earlier. There's no point in it now. I think at this point this gives us the most opportunity to understand what we're doing with this money and make sure that it actually accomplishes the best things we can for this community. We need that latitude. Right now, I can't tell you that we really understand exactly how this money is going to be utilized. So I'm not going to support this motion. I would have earlier. I tried that earlier, but it failed, lack of a second, and it didn't get a vote, so I'm sorry, but it's not time to do it now. I couldn't even get a vote earlier. I will oppose the motion at this time."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "I'm not going to be supportive of this motion at this time. My earlier comments stand. Thank you."

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

VOTE

<i>Commissioner Unruh</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Norton</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Howell</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Commissioner Peterjohn</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Chairman Ranzau</i>	<i>No</i>

Chairman Ranzau said, "So that motion to amend fails 2 to 3. Now we're back to the original budget motion. Any other questions or comments by Commissioners? Seeing none, Madam Clerk..."

Mr. Pepoon said, "Commissioner, I might add that the Clerk told me maybe Commissioner Peterjohn misspoke and \$129,000 instead of \$129 million as part of the motion."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Do you mean on the property tax?"

Mr. Pepoon said, "Yes."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "What I meant to say was \$129,580,173."

Mr. Pepoon said, "Just wanted to clarify that. I didn't hear it, but the Clerk did."

Chairman Ranzau said, "So that's your intent?"

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "That's my intent."

Chairman Ranzau said, "And that was my intent with the second. And we can give the Clerk a copy of the language. I'll just let you have mine. Madam Clerk, call the vote, please."

VOTE

<i>Commissioner Unruh</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Commissioner Norton</i>	<i>No</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, "So we're done with that particular item. Do you need anything else, Madam Clerk?"

Ms. Lovelace said, "No, sir."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Next item, please."

I [15-0548](#)

DISCUSSION OF OPTIONS FOR THE SEDGWICK COUNTY
ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY, INC. FUNDING AGREEMENT.
Presented by: Ron Holt, Acting County Manager.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Take action as deemed appropriate by
the Commission.

Mr. Holt, said "You will recall that prior to the funding agreement that was adopted back in 2013 for the Zoological Society had a termination clause in it that called for either party being able to terminate that agreement by giving written notice by June 1, [2015]. As we were moving into the budget process and we were not sure of how that was going to end up, we had an agreement with the Zoo to move that termination date, notice of termination, to September 1, and even though we've had a number of discussions, and even though you adopted a budget that includes an amount for the Zoo, we still have not had the final discussions with the Zoo, and so in discussions

about what might be the appropriate action to take today, I have a second amendment to the funding agreement between the Sedgwick County, Kansas and Sedgwick County Zoological Society, and the change here is that we would have a new Section 9 to the first amendment that we did in May, that just reads, either party may terminate this agreement by giving written notice to the other party by December 1, of any year, which termination shall be effective the following January. The idea here is that we would have several more months to have continued discussions with the Zoo about the funding agreement based on the budget that's been adopted today. I would recommend your approval."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Do you have copies of that for us?"

Mr. Holt, said "I'm sorry. I do have copies, but let me make sure I've got the right ones."

Chairman Ranzau said, "For the next item, as well."

Mr. Holt, said "Yes. Sorry."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Mr. Manager, you discussed this with the Zoo Board. There were a couple, two or three options, that were given, and this has been the best course of action they thought we should take."

Mr. Holt, said "That's correct. We do have the board chair from the Zoo, who has signed this amendment."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Okay. Are there any questions or discussion while we're waiting?"

Mr. Holt, said "I apologize."

Chairman Ranzau said, "If you want, we could pause this and approve the Consent Agenda."

Mr. Pepoon said, "We could do that, if that works for you. We'll pause this discussion and move to the consent agenda."

Action for Item I was taken with Item J.

CONSENT

- | | | |
|----------|--------------------------------|---|
| K | <u>15-0538</u> | 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 | <u>15-0539</u> | Consideration of a Grant Application increase from the Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT) in the amount of \$647,111.00 for the funding of the Coordinated Transit District #9 which includes the Sedgwick County Rural Transportation Program. |
| M | <u>15-0517</u> | Agreement to provide After Hours Mental Health Emergency Services for Compass Behavioral Health. |

N [15-0533](#) Consideration of an Agreement between HealthCore Clinic, Inc. and the Sedgwick County Health Department for the Health Department to serve as a backup to provide temporary vaccine storage in the event HealthCore experiences a power outage or similar incident.

O [15-0544](#) Plat

Approved by Public Works. The County Treasurer has certified that taxes in 2014 and all prior years have been paid for the following plat:

FARMERS OIL ADDITION

P [15-0542](#) General Bill Check Register for August 5, 2015 - August 11, 2015.

Mr. Holt, said "Commissioners, you have the Consent Agenda before you. I recommend your approval."

MOTION

Chairman Ranzau moved to approve the Consent Agenda.

Commissioner Howell 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, "We have no legislative issues, correct?"

Mr. Holt, said "We do not."

Chairman Ranzau said, "We could move to 'Other'. Is there anything the Commissioners have for other? Seeing none there, we've already done our Executive Session."

Mr. Holt, said "If you would like, Mr. Chairman, if the Clerk would call the next item, at least we could discuss it and then you can take two separate votes in dealing with those."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Alright. Let's call the next item."

NEW BUSINESS

**J [15-0549](#) DISCUSSION OF OPTIONS FOR THE EXPLORATION PLACE, INC.
FUNDING AGREEMENT.**

Presented by: Ron Holt, Acting County Manager.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Take action as deemed appropriate by the Commission.

Mr. Ron Holt, said "Similar to the discussion with the Zoological Society, the funding agreement in place earlier this year with Exploration Place had a section allowing for termination. That section called for termination by either party by June 1. As we mentioned earlier, because of discussions going on with the budget, it was pretty clear we were not going to come to any kind of agreement before June 1. Without that, it meant that the Commission would be looking at terminating the agreement. Rather than doing that, we did bring before you an amendment to that agreement in May, to change the termination date to September 1. Again, we've had a number of discussions with the Exploration Place representatives since that time, and although you have voted for a budget today, the final number they were not aware of what that number was going to be, so in that case, rather than, again, you giving them termination of notice by September 1, we have been in discussion with them and would recommend changing Section 9 of that agreement or having a second amendment which would change Section 9 of that agreement that would read, 'Either party may terminate this agreement by giving written notice to the other party by December 1 of any year, which the termination would be effective the following January 1.' So in both of these agreements, it moves the date of termination, notice of termination which has been given, to the December 1 date, which allows another two and a half, three months, for discussions about what the funding amounts are."

Chairman Ranzau said, "And you have a signed version of that from Exploration Place?"

Mr. Holt, said "I have a signed version, yes, sir."

Chairman Ranzau said, "Mr. Counsel, have you reviewed both of these?"

Mr. Pepoon said, "Yes, I have, Mr. Chairman. I drafted the second amendment to the agreement. It's in proper legal form."

Chairman Ranzau said, "And they maintain the county's options as we move forward?"

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "As to December 1."

Chairman Ranzau said, "So the first one, now that we have copies and we're still on Item J, let's go ahead and proceed. Are there any questions, comments, or what's the will of the Board with respect to Item J?"

MOTION

Chairman Ranzau moved to modify the agreement.

Commissioner Peterjohn 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, "That passes 5-0, so we'll return now to Item I, which is the Zoo. Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "I'll make the same motion for the Zoo that you just made for Exploration Place."

Chairman Ranzau said, "That being to take the recommended action?"

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Taking the recommended action as deemed appropriate and called out in this draft of the agreement."

MOTION

Commissioner Peterjohn moved to take the recommended action

Commissioner Howell 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, "That passes 5-0. Mr. Manager, Madam Clerk, I believe we have addressed all items on the agenda for today; is that correct?"

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

Chairman Ranzau said, "Is there anything else to come before the Board? Once again, I want to say thank you to staff. They put a lot of work into this and still a little bit more work to do, but it's greatly appreciated, as well as all the input that we received from the citizens. With that, we are adjourned."

ADJOURNMENT

There being no other business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 1:55 p.m.

*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: