

Sedgwick County

525 North Main Street 3rd Floor
Wichita, KS 67203



*Sedgwick County...
working for you*

Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, March 16, 2016

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 March 16, 2016 in the County Commission Meeting Room in the Courthouse in Wichita, Kansas, by Chairman James M. Howell, with the following present: Chair Pro-Tem Commissioner Richard Ranzau; Commissioner David Unruh; Commissioner Tim Norton; Commissioner Karl Peterjohn; Mr. Ron Holt, Acting County Manager; Mr. Eric Yost, County Counselor; Mr. Jim Weber, Bureau of Public Works; Mr. Tom Stolz, Metropolitan Area Building and Construction Department; Mr. Joe Thomas, Director, Purchasing Department; Mr. Dan Wegner, Sedgwick County Fire District No. 1; Mr. Jon VonAchen, Assistant County Counselor; Ms. Kate Flavin, Communications; and Ms. Erika Rice, Deputy County Clerk.

Guests:

*Ms. Joy Barnes, Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority
Mr. Bud Lett, Metropolitan Area Building and Construction Department*

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

FLAG SALUTE

ROLL CALL

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

PROCLAMATIONS

- A** [16-147](#) PROCLAMATION WELCOMING THE ALPHA KAPPA ALPHA SORORITY 86TH MID-WESTERN REGION CONFERENCE.
Read by: Chairman Jim Howell.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Adopt the proclamation.

Chairman Howell said, "I have the following Proclamation to read into the record.

PROCLAMATION

"WHEREAS, members of the Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Incorporated® and the Mid-Western Region, which includes the local Beta Kappa Omega and Epsilon Alpha Chapters of Wichita, are hosting the 86th Mid-Western Regional Conference on March 17-20, 2016; and

"WHEREAS, the Regional Conference convenes several hundred members of the Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority from the states Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Iowa, Oklahoma, Colorado, Montana and Wyoming; the conference is an opportunity to showcase how members of the Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority use leadership skills

through service to improve the quality of life for all mankind; and

"WHEREAS, the Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority is an international service organization founded in 1908 on the campus of Howard University in Washington, D.C.; it is the oldest Greek-letter organization established by African-American, college educated women; and

"WHEREAS, Alpha Kappa Alpha's mission is to cultivate and encourage high scholastic and ethical standards, to study and help alleviate issues negatively impacting local communities and to be of service to all mankind; and

"WHEREAS, Sedgwick County is honored to have the Mid-Western Regional Conference in our community this year, and we thank the members of Alpha Kappa Alpha and the Mid-Western Region for their commitment to service and to the advancement of girls and women.

"NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that I, Jim Howell, Chairman of the Board of Sedgwick County Commissioners, do hereby welcome members of the Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority to Sedgwick County for their 86th Mid-Western Regional Conference.

"In Sedgwick County and I call this observance to the attention of all our citizens. Commissioners, what's the will of the Board?"

MOTION

Commissioner Unruh moved to adopt the Proclamation.

Commissioner Peterjohn seconded the motion.

There was no further discussion and the vote was called.

VOTE

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

Chairman Howell said, "Ms. Barnes is here to receive that. Would you like to say something real quickly?"

Ms. Joy Barnes, Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I just wanted to thank the Commissioners for giving us this Proclamation. The conference actually kicks off tomorrow. So the streets will be painted with pink and green with over 600 women within the Midwestern region, and we're just happy to have it. Thank you."

Chairman Howell said, "Thank you for being here today, and we look forward to having those visitors to our community and hopefully they spend a lot of money here."

Ms. Barnes said, "Absolutely. We like to shop. Thank you."

Chairman Howell said, "Madam Clerk, next item please."

Adopted

NEW BUSINESS

B [16-150](#)

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE, PUBLISHED BY THE INTERNATIONAL CODE COUNCIL, INC., 2012 EDITION.

Presented By: Thomas Stolz, Director, Metropolitan Area Building and Construction Department.

Recommend Action: Approve the resolution and authorize the Chairman to sign.

Mr. Tom Stolz, Director, Metropolitan Area Building and Construction Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I am here today to discuss the adoption of the new commercial building codes for Wichita Sedgwick County jurisdiction. As you recall, last month I was here for a public meeting to discuss the [International Building] Code adoption for this Commercial Building Code. We have historically, within the last year or so, adopted new trade and residential building codes, and we are now similarly looking to adopt 2012 International Building Codes (IBC) here today. Over the last year and a half, staff members and members of the Wichita Area Builders' Association along with commercial builders and design professionals have been reviewing the local commercial building code together so that a reasonable and best practice code can be adopted. These discussions were shared at four public meetings attended by builders, architects, engineers and developers, and the code adoption with amendments was passed by the Building Codes and Standards Advisory Board by an 8 to 0 vote in our January meeting. Finally this code was presented to the Commission last month at a public meeting.

"Like other government jurisdictions around the country, Sedgwick County has historically adopted local building codes from recognized national and international organizations. Members of these organizations are industry experts in the fields of residential and commercial building construction and the code guidelines that they produce every three years generally are viewed as best practice for the construction industry nationwide. As I previously mentioned, there are several reasons to adopt new code in this jurisdiction.

"First and foremost, it represents a way to enhance public safety for our citizens through best practice application regarding designs and construction of homes and commercial buildings, and it also helps to keep building insurance rates at the lowest possible level. Secondly, it helps to insure basic consistency of building practices between jurisdictional lines in consideration to building professionals who operate in and around the Wichita and Sedgwick County area. And finally, it serves to achieve consistent and fair operational protocol for building professionals who are licensed and operating in Sedgwick County.

"There are two parts to the code adoption process. First, we have to do an extensive review of the incumbent code and compare it to what is being proposed by the new code, and secondly, we then have to discuss amendments, which are local in nature, and differ from the base code. These amendments serve to provide several benefits.

"First of all, they can give relief from regulation of the national code, which we decided doesn't make sense for this local jurisdiction. Secondly, they cover the adoption of local trade codes, such as Uniform Plumbing Code or the National Electric Code that we choose to adopt here locally. They reference ADA standards,

which are enforced in the state of Kansas, and they connect the local fire code related matters directly involving the State Kansas Fire Marshal's Office, the Wichita Fire Department, and Sedgwick County Fire District No. 1. In any of the amendments being removed today are carryovers from previous code cycles, however there are some we discussed in detail at the public meeting held last month.

"Specifically, Section 10 of the Resolution today, which deals with when permits are required in this jurisdiction. The [International Building] Code calls for a building permit to be pulled when a structure reaches 120 square feet or greater. For several cycles in Wichita and Sedgwick County jurisdictions, this number was amended to say 200 square feet. During the public hearing we discussed the possibility of increasing that number even more. After discussion with staff, we have increased this number to 400 square feet before requiring a permit in an unincorporated county. We will still keep it at 200 square feet in the City of Wichita. We also corrected Section 10 to reflect that no location permit is required in county jurisdiction but is still required in City of Wichita jurisdiction and we also removed the anchoring requirements for structures built in an unincorporated county.

"Section 32 of the Resolution, which deals with fire sprinkler requirements for A-2 classified structures was discussed. A-2 assembly buildings are commonly built structures for restaurants and nightclubs or food service industry. The new code calls for sprinkler systems to be installed in all new construction of this time when the fire area exceeds 5,000 square feet or when the occupancy will rise above 100 people. Historically the City of Wichita Code Department allowed for an exception to this code, which allowed an occupancy of 300 people. When the code departments merged in 2013, this exception was carried over to the unified code. The proposed amendment today continues to allow the 300 occupancy number but requires the builder to add a third exit or fire alarm system to the building. This the new amendment proposed today is less restrictive than the 2012 Code but more restrictive than the previous amendment. This proposal was a compromise between fire officials and local builders and developers, and after further discussion with staff and Commission after the public meeting, we kept this amendment the same for today's Resolutions.

"Sections 27 and 35, similar, these amendments were developed in partnership between builders and Wichita Fire Code officials. Both of these amendments address large scale storage facilities, most notably pertain to aircraft hangars. The 2012 Code calls for a sprinkler or fire suppression system when the building reaches 12,000 square feet in size. Historically, the City of Wichita Code Department allows an exception for aircraft storage buildings to reach as much as 26,000 square feet before requiring a sprinkler system. When the code departments merged in 2013, this exception was carried over to the unified code. The new amendment today is a compromise between the old amendment and new code, allowing storage areas of this nature to be built at 18,000 square feet before a sprinkler system is required. After consultation with Sedgwick County Fire District No. 1, these current amendments were to be specific to the City of Wichita jurisdiction only. The county fire jurisdiction wished to continue to adopt the 2012 Building Code as its standard. After public meeting, it was clear that a majority of the Commission expressed an interest in last month's public meeting, it was clear that a majority of the Commission expressed an interest in keeping this amendment language consistent between county and city jurisdiction, and today's Resolution will reflect that. So the Resolution today states 18,000 square feet.

"Section 37 of the Resolution was brought up by Commissioners during the public hearing. Essentially this proposed amendment requires that emergency egress openings have to be 48 inches high, in addition to the 40 square inches required by

code. This is an amendment that has been in a previous code and is supported by Wichita Fire District 1 officials. Since the discussion of the public meeting last week, I began to talk with fire officials from both city and county jurisdictions. The amendment was originally adopted after fire officials proved through simulation that the 48-inch height is needed for the safe extraction of people from a building or the safe entrance into that building by a fire officers wearing breathing apparatus. The City of Derby has adopted the same amendment into their local code ordinances. We have left the amendment in place for today's consideration and further discussion.

"At this point, I know there will be other questions. I want to conclude my comments and stand for any questions you may have. The County Fire Marshal is here with me today and Mr. Lett, the Assistant Director of MABCD is also here to answer any technical questions. Thank you."

Chairman Howell said, "Mr. Stolz, thank you for the presentation. On the slide that's on the screen right this minute, the last statement, Section 37, I believe according to the paperwork here, it should be Section 36 for the opening. Is that correct? I'm seeing in any backup material it looks like Section 36."

Mr. Stolz said, "Let me double-check that, Chairman. Correct, sir. That is Section 36."

Chairman Howell said, "Commissioner Ranzau."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Tom, I just want to clarify a couple things. First, on this hanger, right now the code in the county says 26,000 square feet."

Mr. Stolz said, "The unified code says 26,000 square feet."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "And that's been in effect for how long?"

Mr. Stolz said, "Since the unification of the code departments, 2012."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "2012. So the last four years it's been 26,000 [square feet], and now we want to lower that to 18,000 square feet?"

Mr. Stolz said, "That's correct. I might qualify that. The 26,000 has always been an amendment in the City of Wichita jurisdiction. It hasn't been in the Sedgwick County. When we amended or when we unified the departments in 2012-2013, that amendment got brought over."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "So it has been in the county since 2012, the 26,000 [square feet], and we want to lower it?"

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

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Back on Section 32, could you clarify for me, fire sprinkler requirements, what's required now? Go back and say again, it's more restrictive, less restrictive than what."

Mr. Stolz said, "First of all, this deals with assembly to occupancy. So these are buildings which are, by code definition, restaurants, nightclubs or food establishments, generally speaking. The code calls for a fire sprinkler system to be added when the fire area reaches over 5,000 square feet or when you decide you want to have, as a business owner, more than 100 people in an establishment. That triggers the need for a fire sprinkler. Historically in the City of Wichita, the amendment

existed which would allow that number to go from 100 to 300 occupancy.

"So you have 5,000 square feet of fire area and up to 300 people. The 2012 Code wants that number to be 100. So the Fire Marshal in the city met with a lot of business owners and they were averse to that restriction, so they worked out the compromise that if they put in the third exit or fire alarm system, they could continue to have their occupancy at 300 people. So this amendment historically has existed in the City of Wichita, did not exist in Sedgwick County until the unification of the code departments in 2012. So what we're proposing today or what the fire marshals are proposing is that we have this compromise exist so that we can get people out of the building if it starts on fire. That's the need for the third exit or the early warning alarm system to let people know an incident has happened which will get people out of the building faster in lieu of the fire sprinkler system."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Okay. But for years, we've allowed up to 300 in the city?"

Mr. Stolz said, "For at least 10 years."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Now we're going to make it more restrictive?"

Mr. Stolz said, "Correct, yes, sir."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Same with the other. Okay. That's all I have. Thank you."

Mr. Stolz said, "Thank you."

Chairman Howell said, "Mr. Stolz, on Section 39, I don't think you talked about this during the slide presentation."

Mr. Stolz said, "I did not."

Chairman Howell said, "On Section 39, on standpipe, I was reading the backup materials and it sounds like standpipe systems are required if the floor level of the highest story is 20 feet above the lowest level of the fire department vehicle. In other words, when the fire truck pulls up, where the tires are sitting, that's where it's measured from, I assume."

Mr. Stolz said, "I think that's correct. I might have the Fire Marshal come up and hit the standpipe topic."

Chairman Howell said, "If you don't mind, I'd like a better explanation of this."

Mr. Dan Wegner, Sedgwick County Fire District No. 1, greeted the Commissioners and said, "How can I help you?"

Chairman Howell said, "Well, on the standpipe regulation that's being proposed here, I'm trying to understand what it says. It's talking about the lowest level of the fire department vehicle access. I don't know what that means. Does that talk about the building entrance?"

Mr. Wegner said, "That would be the roadway where we have our vehicles."

Chairman Howell said, "The roadway."

Mr. Wegner said, "Yes. The ground level of the building, so wherever that is."

Chairman Howell said, "Measures from the floor level to the highest story, if it's more than 20 feet, then a standpipe system must be installed. That's what this is saying?"

Mr. Wegner said, "Yes, sir."

Chairman Howell said, "So I was misunderstanding you earlier read about access to standpipe system. This is whether the standpipe system is needed or not needed. This would trigger the need for a standpipe system."

Mr. Wegner said, "Yes, sir."

Chairman Howell said, "Of course in the city it's 30 feet, in the county it's 20 feet being proposed. Can you explain why we need something 10 feet shorter than the city?"

Mr. Wegner said, "Operationally, we operate on the floor below the fire floor, so far we're in a three story building, we don't have a standpipe system in this building. This code would get us a standpipe and water on that second floor where we can establish our water supply, give us a place of safe refuge and conduct our fire attacks on the third floor of that building."

"In Sedgwick County, we have fewer resources and a longer distance to these buildings. So if we've got an apartment complex that's three stories tall and we've got a fire on the third floor, this allows our crews to be able to operate safely, quicker, and get water to the scene in a better means."

Chairman Howell said, "What you just said a minute ago is basically response times are longer because we've got a very large jurisdiction."

Mr. Wegner said, "Right. The distance between our fire stations is larger than the city, and takes us longer to get resources to that scene. When we've got to pull hose from the trucks to the third floor, it takes time, manpower, and this allows us to do this quicker, more effectively, and safer."

Chairman Howell said, "I think I understand that one now. I'm going to continue thinking about this. Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Thank you. If I can jump back, I want to make sure. Fire Marshal Wegner, if you or Tom can help me out, in terms of I want to make sure I understand. This square footage provision, if we're at 18,000 square feet, will that be different than the City of Wichita which will remain at 26,000 [square feet], Section 27 and 35?"

Mr. Wegner said, "18,000 [square feet] across the board, sir, city and county jurisdiction."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "18,000 [square feet] for both city and county. So it would be a level, it would be the same for both?"

Mr. Wegner said, "Correct."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "That's what I wanted to know. Thank you."

Chairman Howell said, "Commissioner Ranzau."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "I have some more questions about the standpipe height. What does the code say now?"

Mr. Wegner said, "30 feet."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "30 feet. And it's been that way for how long?"

Mr. Wegner said, "Since the [20]12 adoption. We amended it to 20 feet when we adopted the 2012 Fire Code. So when we adopted the 2012, we lowered it from 30 to 20 feet. So we've been in effect since 2013."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Before that, it was 30 feet?"

Mr. Wegner said, "Yes, sir."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "And the city can do it at 30 feet?"

Mr. Wegner said, "Yes, sir."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Okay. Thank you, and clarify, back on the hangar thing, we're going to go to 18,000 [square feet], but that means the city is actually lowering from 26,000 [square feet] down to 18,000 [square feet]?"

Mr. Wegner said, "Correct, sir."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Thank you."

Chairman Howell said, "Can you, can we go through this list real quickly and talk about, we talked yesterday about what are the Sections being proposed that are more restrictive of the code that's a change this year. Can you highlight those items as we go through this list?"

Mr. Stolz said, "Sure. We have 70 amendments here. Within that, there are a small number of restrictions that are deemed more restrictive than the code that's being proposed."

"Section 25, which deals with door width required. Sedgwick County, Wichita, and the State of Kansas have adopted the ADA Code as the standard. The building code often refers to the ANSI Standard, which is the American National Standard Institute, and sometimes the number for accessibility are slightly different. So for example, in Section 25, the 28-inch standard, which is listed encode is an ANSI standard, ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) Code requires door widths to be 32 inches wide to accommodate wheelchair access, to more accommodate wheelchair access. And so just the fact that we have adopted ADA in Sedgwick County, we're straight across ADA and City of Wichita, we have ADA plus, which we discussed about a year ago. Any time we see reference encode which is ANSI standard, we automatically go in and grab the ADA numbers. That's the case in Section 25."

"While on I'm on that topic, that's the case in Section 47, same issue, size of doors in I-3 occupancies, which are generally jails or custodial-type facilities. That number went from 28 [inches] to 32 inches, same way, ADA. Landings and doors, Section 49, more restrictive. The ANSI standards are 44 inches, a landing outside of a doorway, and the ADA standards are 48 inches."

"Another more restrictive amendment being proposed that we haven't talked about"

yet is Section 43, which is the requirement of fire horns and strobes at the connecting point for the Fire Departments, outside of buildings. The code requires that be clearly marked. I might ask the [Fire] Marshal to come up if there's further question on this. The horns and strobe are required in this jurisdiction to make it more visible. So if there are trees or other natural devices in the way that the fire department can clearly see, when they're rolling in, where to hook in and connect their equipment. So in this jurisdiction, that's an additional requirement."

Chairman Howell said, "When you say the word connecting, what do you mean by that word? Connected to what, fire hydrant?"

Mr. Wegner said, "To the actual building."

Chairman Howell said, "Oh, connect to the building itself."

Mr. Wegner said, "Yes. They've got a fire department connection of the building to augment the sprinkler system in there, so the strobe just gives us a visual cue to say, hey, right below here, this is where we hook up to it."

Chairman Howell said, "This is part of the fire alarm system that's in the building already?"

Mr. Wegner said, "Yes, sir. The horn strobe combination only activates if we have an activation of the alarm or sprinkler system."

Chairman Howell said, "Just for clarity, is this a new requirement in this adoption of the 2012 or something in place before now?"

Mr. Wegner said, "This has been in place before."

Chairman Howell said, "That really is my question on really all of these. What are these things we're talking about that are new this year? This is one of those things that's been around for at least a little while, it's not new."

Mr. Wegner said, "Yes, sir."

Chairman Howell said, "It's good to know that we are more restrictive. We've had some history with this."

Mr. Wegner said, "The sprinkler system, the code requires that they use a water gong. One of the problems is they get birds building nests in them and they don't always function, and they're expensive. Actually a horn strobe system, I don't know the exact numbers, but they're a little bit less expensive than the horn gong thing. So we have both a visual and audio cue that we've got an event going on in the building, and we know where the fire department connections are."

Chairman Howell said, "That does make sense. Okay. Thank you for that explanation."

Mr. Wegner said, "Yes, sir."

Chairman Howell said, "Commissioner Ranzau."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Let me clarify on the standpipe thing. Right now it's 20 [feet]. But what is the national standard recommend?"

Mr. Stolz said, "The code that we're adopting, 2012 IBC, is 30 feet."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "It's 30 feet. So we're being more restrictive than what the Code, the National Standard Code recommends?"

Mr. Stolz said, "Yes."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Okay. That's what I wanted. Thank you."

Mr. Stolz said, "I think that might be all. Section 69, prohibited doors. This has to do with elevator doors, and this is language which allows buildings with elevators to put fire rated doors on the outside of the elevators. Actually, I was talking to the Fire Marshal before the meeting. He would be okay exempting Sedgwick County from that if the Commission would be okay with that. We would keep that standard in the City of Wichita jurisdiction, but we could take that restriction away."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "What number is that?"

Mr. Stolz said, "Section 69, prohibited doors. When you build a building that requires, or you have elevators in it, there is a lobby required. In some buildings that is not feasible. So this is an alternative for buildings that cannot have a lobby through structural design, and it allows them to put fire rated doors in and automatically closing doors in the event of a fire. It's actually an additional option for those types of buildings, not necessarily a requirement. It is more restrictive, because you'd have to add the door if you don't have the lobby area, but if you have the elevator lobby area, then this does not apply. This is a little bit complex, but it is still a more restrictive requirement if you don't have a lobby."

Chairman Howell said, "And just for clarity, is this a new idea?"

Mr. Stolz said, "This is new."

Chairman Howell said, "So you're telling me, just again for clarity, our fire experts here are not necessarily opposed to the idea of us not making this change?"

Mr. Stolz said, "Our county fire experts. Our city fire experts are not here, and I think we'd like to probably keep this in the city jurisdiction."

Chairman Howell said, "I anticipate some interest in probably not adopting Section 69 change. So let's put that on our list of things to talk about here in just a moment. Commissioner Ranzau."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "That's an attempt to give another option, right?"

Mr. Stolz said, "Correct, sir."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Well, is there a way to give another option, I like options, is there a way to give an option that's not less restrictive?"

Mr. Stolz said, "Not that we discussed during our public meetings with the developers and not that the City Fire Marshal could come up with."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Okay."

Chairman Howell said, "Going through this list, I'm trying to figure out which things are more restrictive that are new this year, and again, I'm not exactly sure if I can."

Mr. Stolz said, "I think all of the more restrictive, half a dozen or so, amendments that we have listed that are more restrictive, there really is only one that's new, and that's Section 69. The rest of these are carry-overs. I think that when we have discussions, I know when they had public meetings and talked with fire staff, just because we carry something over doesn't mean we shouldn't scrutinize it if it's more restrictive, and we have been pretty vigilant in looking at that. The Marshals, city and county and the developers want to keep some of those more restrictive items, and we bring them forward to you then for discussion, but most of these, all of them except one that I can see are carry-over."

Chairman Howell said, "Back to the standpipe regulation, I understand the explanation that was given, but I'm wondering, when the Wichita fire department shows up to a building that's higher than 20 feet and they've got to pull hoses up to that higher level, it takes them a certain amount of time to do that. If the building is engulfed in flames, it's not safe to do that, and they're not going to make an attempt to put out that fire. They're going to attack that fire from someplace a little further away, or whatever. They're not going to put themselves in danger. So if we get to the building, and because it takes us longer to get there, our response time is a little bit longer because of the type of area that we have to cover, it seems to me that would still be the same thought when you get on scene if you get to the point where things are not safe to do so, you're going to have the same thought process that the WFD (Wichita Fire Department) has, and so I'm not sure I understand the reason as to why. I'm still struggling as to why ours would be different than the City's. They don't have any equipment that we don't have, do they?"

Mr. Wegner said, "No. The equipment is the same. It's just the logistics address. Of course, if the building is totally involved, we're not going to go in there, but if we've got a single room that's involved in fire and we can go in there and make an interior attack, this allows us to establish our water supply where we need to have it established."

Chairman Howell said, "I do understand that. I think that's correct. I accept your explanation. That does make sense to me, but why would WFD and Sedgwick County be different? Can you explain why, other than response time, but when you get on scene, your decision process is exactly the same, I would think."

Mr. Wegner said, "It is. It is."

Chairman Howell said, "So whether there is a standpipe or not a standpipe, I don't see why they would have a different standard than we have. If they're following the national standard and it's okay for the city and it's been this way in our county for the history, why would we want to make it more restrictive?"

Mr. Wegner said, "We just looked at it that with the development going around in Sedgwick County, we're having more hotels and taller buildings. Until recently, we really didn't have three and four story buildings to contend with. As they're building more of these, we're addressing the issues and from a logistics and tactics point from us, this makes sense for our department to make us more effective in how we do our jobs. So that's why the change."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "But if those are three and four story buildings, they're going to be over 30 feet."

Mr. Wegner said, "Yeah, and it's already in place. I'm talking about the three story buildings where we currently don't have a standpipe system."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "So you want the current buildings that don't have one to get one?"

Mr. Wegner said, "No. Any new construction, it comes into play. If the building is already in existence, we don't make people come back and put them in."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "But if they're a three story building, they're going to be bigger than 30 feet."

Mr. Wegner said, "Yes."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "If they're a two-story building, they're probably going to be bigger than 30 feet."

Mr. Wegner said, "Well, they're at the 20-foot mark, so it's the two-story buildings. If you're looking at 12-foot for a story, it comes into play when we add the third story into the building. So we're talking a three-story building, because currently at the 30-foot, it would be a 36-foot building, which doesn't necessarily require it either."

Chairman Howell said, "Let me interject. A two-story building, the floor of the second story is roughly 12, 13, or 14 feet above the ground."

Mr. Wegner said, "Yes, sir."

Chairman Howell said, "So, that is not going to be a problem on a two-story building a three story building, it would be, because it's probably going to be 25, 26, 27 feet off the ground, so that would trigger in our case to adopt this as proposed, that would trigger standpipe requirement in the county."

Mr. Wegner said, "Correct."

Chairman Howell said, "But in the city, we would go to the fourth story before it triggers this, because that would be something above 30 feet, something like 35, 36, 38 feet in elevation. So a four story building, regardless we always have this city or county. As proposed, the three story building, in the county would require this and would probably not require it in the city assuming that the feet per story is approximately 12 or 13 feet per story and that type of thing?"

Mr. Wegner said, "Correct."

Chairman Howell said, "I'm thinking about around the county. Do we have a lot of buildings out there that have this third story? I'm trying to think of..."

Mr. Wegner said, "There aren't a lot, but we've added a few apartment complexes and stuff. Apartments are seeming to be built more, and again, there's some sprinkler requirements that come into it. It's not going to be applied very often, but in the cases that it is going to be required, it would trigger it."

Chairman Howell said, "Is that considered a commercial building, if it is an apartment complex?"

Mr. Wegner said, "Yes. Multi-family."

Chairman Howell said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn thanked the Chairman and said, "I'd like to ask a broader question, just so I make sure. I know we're looking at this code strictly for the county for the unincorporated areas, but I do know our building inspection folks sometimes are contracted out to do inspections, particularly third class cities, and I was wondering if the codes that they would be inspecting to in this case probably follow the county code or something else?"

Mr. Stolz said, "Great question, Commissioner. There's actually three things going on here. There's our Building Department covers Wichita and Sedgwick County, and there are 9 class 2 and 3 cities that also have an MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) with MABCD (Metropolitan Area Building and Construction Department) that provides services for that city. So when we adopt things and we say, Sedgwick County jurisdiction only, that would incorporate the class 2 and 3 cities as well, and the City of Wichita would be separate and distinct by itself. Section 10 that we altered says unincorporated county regarding the 400 square feet before a building permit is required, no longer requiring the anchoring, unincorporated county only. So in our class 2 and 3 cities, unless I hear from those city officials, I will keep that at 200 square feet, which has been the history that we have been adopting cycle.

"That's a good question. Generally, by and large, you are correct. When we say Sedgwick County, we are bringing in the class 2 and 3 cities who have an MOU with our department. But there are specific times and the building permit requirement is a great example of that, which will only involve unincorporated Sedgwick County."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "We had a lot of discussion about the standpipe and how that would fit. Would they have their own provisions or would they fall under the county or city or would it vary by the jurisdictions?"

Mr. Stolz said, "Anybody that's covered by Sedgwick County Fire District No. 1 would have the 20-foot requirement. So if they're building a building in that jurisdiction, that Marshal Wagner's department covers, we would require the 20-foot."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Let me ask you, then, we've got a number of second and third class cities that are in the fire district. Are those primarily the ones that are covered? We've got 20 incorporated jurisdictions entirely or partially in Sedgwick County, and you say we've got 9 that fall under the second and third class. Are all of these second and third class, the 9 within the boundaries of the fire district or is it a mixture?"

Mr. Stolz said, "It's going to be a mixture. I know, for example, Colwich, we have an MOU with Colwich, but I know they have their own volunteer fire department, so that wouldn't be in District 1, but by and large, I think that is true. Most these class 2 and 3 cities are within [Sedgwick County] Fire District No. 1."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "My concern has been to try and have a level playing field within Sedgwick County so that if you're looking at developing a property, if someone is trying to grab their piece of the American dream and build a building, we've got a level playing field between jurisdictions as much as we can. And that's why I very much appreciate my colleagues' questions in terms of trying to understand how we can try and create that level playing field for all the participants and not put one jurisdiction or another at a competitive disadvantage or an unfair advantage. And that's why I'm raising the questions that I have today, and I appreciate the answers from both the fire department, yourself, Tom, and the other MAPCD folks who are here."

Chairman Howell said, "Not to wear you out, Mr. Stolz."

Mr. Stolz said, "That's all right. I've got all morning."

Chairman Howell said, "On Section 69 regarding the extra door option, as this is currently written, the extra doors near the elevator would be prohibited, and we're talking about if we took out these changes to 69 and they would be allowed, or do I have that backwards?"

Mr. Stolz said, "You might have it backwards. This amendment deals with elevator doors, and the differences here are elevator doors that want to have additional fire protected doors, which then spells out the automation that those doors need. The automatic closing device shall be limited to an approved magnetic hold open device, et cetera, et cetera. It begins to give specifics on how those are to be built. As Commissioner Ranzau brought up before, this is not required if you have an elevator lobby. Not required. You can put them in if you so desire, and this will give you specifications on how to do that legally."

"For those buildings that don't have a lobby, this would be required. These types of fire closure doors with all of this instruction on how to properly do it would be what our inspectors would look for when they go out to look at the building."

Chairman Howell said, "So if we do not adopt this change, it would give us other options?"

Mr. Stolz said, "We could look for other options. In our discussion this time around, during this cycle, during our meeting with developers and during our meeting specifically with Wichita fire officials, we could not, there was not any other options, but if you want county fire to be excluded from this, I think we can, and I think the Marshal and I could sit down and look for further options to hit what you guys want to hit, which is let's give people options to build these buildings to do it safely and within code."

Chairman Howell said, "Commissioner Ranzau."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Can you allow the same door with or without a lobby? To me, that's the easy way."

Mr. Stolz said, "If you don't have a lobby, it's incumbent on the building owner, building designer to put a fire suppression system in to where smoke won't go up the shaft, that the doors will open, that the elevator will come down when a fire event happens and that fire officials can get in the door. There's a lot of things that happen to elevators during a fire emergency event, and this particular piece of the code requires that door to be installed, that fire protection piece of that door to be installed if a lobby does not exist. The lobby gives protection, and if the lobby cannot be there, then this gives a bona fide option for people to put extra doors in to give the protection that will keep the building safe."

Chairman Howell said, "What constitutes a lobby? How do you know if it's a lobby or not a lobby? I go into a lot of buildings where you get into an area where you wait for the elevator or maybe it's just open to the rest of the spacing."

Mr. Bud Lett, Metropolitan Area Building and Construction Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, "The lobby requirement would be an enclosure around where the elevator, the actual doors to the elevator, open and shut to protect that area from smoke penetrating through there, getting in that shaft and going up. It's not necessarily tied to Commissioner Ranzau's question on the width of the doors. This is a protection, a way of protecting that shaft to keep the smoke out of there, which

would be accomplished with an elevator lobby.”

Chairman Howell said, “So the lobby is an enclosed space, in other words, a wall and a door that separates that from the rest of the building.”

Mr. Lett said, “That’s correct. And this lobby, the doors to this lobby are going to have these same requirements by the code. They’re going to have to have the smoke seals. They’re going to have to the automatic closing doors.”

Chairman Howell said, “I see. Okay. Thank you for that explanation. That helps a little bit. So a lot of buildings I go to that you just walk from the front door of the building right to the elevator, there is no lobby obviously in that case. If I have to walk through a doorway, inside the building, then that would constitute a lobby. Most buildings I visit, I’m sure, probably are considered buildings that don’t have lobbies.”

Mr. Stolz said, “Epic center, for example, has a lobby. The doors coming and going in separate the lobby from the rest of the first floor.”

Chairman Howell said, “Commissioners, do you have any other questions before we take action here? All right. Commissioners, what’s the will of the Board then?”

Commissioner Ranzau said, “Mr. Chairman, if I may, my concern is making the rules and regulations more restrictive than necessary, more restrictive than what the code says. There have been some good things done here. There are some things I still have issue with. I think I personally would like to see some changes, but I don’t know where the other Commissioners stand, and I don’t know if we would be able to do that today or would want to do this at a later date. I’m open to whatever the other Commissioners have to say. There are about four things that I’d like to take a closer look at.

“Section 69, I’ve oscillated back and forth on this. I think I’d like to keep it, because I think it is an attempt to give people more options. I could make an argument you could make it even more flexible, but from what I’m understanding, it is an attempt to give them another option to do it if they don’t have a lobby.”

Chairman Howell said, “Commissioner Ranzau, may I ask, Section 69, I actually have some concerns about that myself. Section 39, the standpipe heights, I have concerns about that, and so yes, I would entertain a motion that would adopt the rest of the code if there’s other sections you would like to pull out of this for our first motion, we. We can process these exceptions a number of ways. We can either handle them specifically as a separate item or we can even defer those for a week or two until we understand these a little bit better, which I think may not be a bad option. But I’d like to see if we can drop as much of this as possible.

“There are two sections, 69 and 39, that I would like to personally have them excepted from our initial option to adopt this code.”

Commissioner Ranzau said, “Well, I agree with 39, as well, and I have some questions about Section 32 and 35, as well. So those would be the four, four areas. That being said, I do want to say I’m appreciative of the work that the staff did with respect to Section 10. I know we got some input from the public, and they took a look at that and made some changes based on that. And I do appreciate the willingness to take a look at that, Tom. Thank you.”

Chairman Howell said, “Let me also express appreciation. This is a tough process to go through this, a lot of details to adopt a new code standard, and by the way, I’m not

sure if you said this or not, but if you didn't, let me just ask the question. What is our current standard? This is the 2012 code right now."

Mr. Stolz said, "We're in 2006 International Building Code."

Chairman Howell said, "Just curious, is there efforts being done today to develop the next iteration of the code book?"

Mr. Stolz said, "2015 has just been printed and we're already starting review of that. Probably a year or so out before we come back and look at adoption."

Chairman Howell said, "So again, we're actually jumping 6 years."

Mr. Stolz said, "We're jumping a cycle."

Chairman Howell said, "We are skipping a cycle. So, again, I just want to say thank you. I know this is a very difficult process to go through, all the complex descriptions of a lot of different topics in here, so I wanted to just say I appreciate you and your staff and others that had worked very hard to bring this very concise summary of things we really need to know about to do this, because we're not experts. We lean on you guys to really lead us on this. I just really appreciate the work that you all have done. Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn thanked the Chairman and said, "I think I've got a bit of a cold. I would agree with the comments of Commissioners Ranzau and Howell. Just a question for Commissioner Ranzau, you mentioned several sections. I want to make sure that I've got them, 32, 35, 39, and 69; is that correct?"

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Yes."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "I'd certainly be willing to adopt the section, bring it up and we could put these others, bring them up at a later date. I'm comfortable with that. Thank you."

Chairman Howell said, "Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh thanked the Chairman and said, "Tom, I also want to express appreciation for you and all the work that's gone on with all the partners and trades people and experts in this field that brought this recommendation to us. I'm inclined to, after hearing all the discussion, to be supportive of this agenda item as it stands and then amend it as we see necessary rather than hold out some pieces. I guess I'm just asking for your opinion. Would you and the folks who have to work with these prefer that we go ahead and ask this as you have presented it to us and then come back to you with amends, or would you rather us delete these things and leave it or does it make any difference?"

Mr. Stolz said, "I'm comfortable with whatever the will of the Commission is. If we want to drill down on some of these, it's easy to say we'll adopt everything as written and just take out those amendments for county jurisdiction. That's a simple fix. We could bring it back. We can get that done, bring it back even on Consent Agenda, you guys can approve it. I'm comfortable with that if that's what we're talking about today. Just taking out the amendments for the four sections that were mentioned. I'm comfortable if we want to adopt as is today and continue to drill down on these and come back at a future meeting and modify the amendments. I have no problem with that either, whatever the Commission desires."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Okay. So there's no critical argument one way or another?"

Chairman Howell said, "To our staff, let me ask, what is the latest that we can add something to the agenda for next week? Is it tomorrow or Friday? Manager, do you know?"

Mr. Holt said, "We publish the agenda, the final agenda Friday morning, which means it goes to the printers Thursday. We could delay that, so if we had something by 5:00 p.m. Thursday, we can get it on the agenda."

Mr. Stolz said, "Chairman, I might mention, I'm taking this same proposal to the city council on the 4th of April. So if you would like, we could come back that Wednesday. If you'd like, we could drill down and look at these further."

Chairman Howell said, "There is some advantage for us to deal with these before it's presented to the city. Ideally we would ask all of our questions and hopefully you can present to them where we are."

Mr. Stolz said, "That would be an advantage."

Chairman Howell said, "It would be better for us I think to have this done if possible before you present this to the city. We do only have one more meeting left this month before you present this to the city. That would be next week, the 23rd. And so I guess it would be my hope that we can work on this today and tomorrow. I would like to go ahead and ask staff to add this to the agenda for next week, and if we can't be ready for that, we can always take action to defer it further. But I guess I would like to try to give our Commissioners a chance for them to ask questions and develop an opinion between now and tomorrow."

"Well, I'm going to assume we can get this done next week, add this too the agenda for next week, these four items, and if we're not ready to take action, we can defer them further. I guess that will give us a chance to have this resolved entirely before this is presented to the city. I would prefer that if possible. Commissioner Ranzau."

MOTION

Commissioner Ranzau moved to defer Item B, in it's entirety, for one week.

Commissioner Peterjohn seconded the motion.

Chairman Howell said, "One thing I did not do and I wish I would have done earlier, but let me ask the public. Is there anybody out there that would like to speak to this item before we take any final action here? Our motion is to defer to next week. We have a motion and second. Seeing no further discussion, please call the vote."

VOTE

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

Chairman Howell said, "Thank you very much for the good discussion and we will hopefully get that completed next week. Madam Clerk, next item, please."

Deferred

C [16-165](#)

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS' REGULAR MEETING ON MARCH 10, 2016.

Presented by: Joe Thomas, Director, Purchasing Department.

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

Mr. Joe Thomas, Director, Purchasing Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, "The meeting of the Board of Bids and Contracts of March 10th resulted in four items we would like to present to you this morning:

1. RIVER SAND FOR PUBLIC WORKS

"Recommendation is to accept the low bid from Martin's Central Sand Co., Inc. and establish contract pricing for one year with two one year options to renew.

2. BRIDGE IMPROVEMENTS FOR PUBLIC WORKS (B460 45TH STREET NORTH)

"Recommendation is to accept the bid from Klaver Construction Company, Inc. in the amount of \$480,782.75.

3. 271 BUILDING RENOVATIONS FOR FACILITIES DEPARTMENT

"Recommendation is to accept the low bid including alternates from Commerce Construction Services, Inc. in the amount of \$743,400.

4. ON-CALL PLUMBING SERVICES FOR FACILITIES DEPARTMENT

"Recommendation is to accept the low bid from Commercial Trade Services, LLC and establish contract pricing for one year with two one year options to renew.

"I'll be happy to answer any questions you may have, and I recommend approval of the items."

Chairman Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Thomas, for the presentation. Commissioner Peterjohn."

MOTION

Commissioner Peterjohn moved to adopt the recommendations of the Board of Bids and Contracts.

Commissioner Ranzau seconded the motion.

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "I know there was a lot of work by county staff on the building renovations on the 271 Building. With a figure here of just under three quarters of a million dollars, I appreciate the hard work that has been put in to getting that, and the fact that this is a number that is going to be well below a lot of initial numbers that have been thrown out. So I'm very pleased and going to be supportive of this four items today. But I wanted to draw some attention to Item 3, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Howell said, "Thank you, Commissioner, for those comments. I'm going to

use round numbers. But my recollection, our first presentation of the remodeling of this building was roughly \$1 million per floor, close to \$6 million for the entire building. What we've got right now is a much more affordable option. I anticipate it's still going to be very nice. You're going to walk in and it's going to look like a nice building, and we'll be very proud of it. I'm thankful for the work that you have done and others to bring us a very competitive bid.

"I do have some questions on Item 2. I notice you only have a single bid there. How do we know that we have got a good offer, a good bid on this item? Can you talk about that just a little bit? This is 108 percent of the engineer's estimate. I see that. And we're allowed to let contracts up to 110 percent of the engineer's estimate."

Mr. Thomas said, "Yes, sir."

Chairman Howell said, "Are we confident we've got a good bid here? How do we know that?"

Mr. Thomas said, "We had discussion with Public Works the other day, and we also reached out to the vendors who didn't quote on this project. What we ascertained was that due a major project at Kellogg with the several bridges being worked on at this time, many of them said they just did not have the crews to work on any future projects, for the time being. And then after talking to Mr. Spears and Mr. Weber, we felt like this was a competitive bid. Would you agree to that?"

Mr. Jim Weber, Public Works, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Yes."

Chairman Howell said, "If I understand correctly, 16 companies were informed of this opportunity, and only one bid it. So I guess there's a lot of construction going on in Wichita, which if you have cranes and cones, I guess that means that's good stuff for the community at the end of the day. It's rough when you're trying to get around town, but after it's all completed, it's pretty nice. Commissioner Ranzau."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Just along that same line, isn't our expectation that for the next few years, there's numerous projects being done that are ongoing and going to be planned, that it may be that the bids that come in for some of these projects for a number of years may have been a little higher than normally. Is that our general expectation?"

Mr. Weber said, "We're going to struggle for a while. I was driving along Kellogg yesterday and counted 9 cable cranes and two hydraulics working. Every one of those cranes has a crew. KDOT (Kansas Department of Transportation) has left a series of the bridges upon K-96 that will fire up pretty soon and we also have projects out on East Kellogg.

"Contractors are telling us that they've got some spots, it looks like, this fall, going into winter. Things may get better because the bid lettings will be done and known. Actually bid letting that we should have had Tuesday, we stood that one out two weeks and changed the timing of that project to let construction begin in the fall because we actually have contractors telling us that if we could get out to September, October, they think it will be better, but it's a tough thing. We have to guess what the market is doing, and we have to guess what the pricing is, so these estimates are a little tricky, and we have to try to get them up high enough that we can cover it at 110 percent, but we don't control them. We don't really know what's going on.

"As we see bids coming up, if we don't think we have enough people, we're making phone calls. Did you see this one? Are you going to take a shot at it? A couple of

them are saying, we're not bidding anything the rest of the year. We're going to struggle through this year. I'm hoping next year is better."

Chairman Howell said, "Well, thank you for that explanation, and I think we are in a good position considering all that's going on. I understand how supply and demand works, and right now there are a lot of demands. So the supply is not what it would have been with all that's going on around the community, but that's actually a good thing. I think our community is seeing a lot of investment by a lot of different governing bodies, and construction is just amazing, what's going on around the community."

"It's really not just the county doing a lot of work. But the city is doing a lot of work. And KDOT has some very significant projects happening in our state, on the turnpike and our interstates around the city, so we've really got a lot going on. Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Well, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to just amplify on your remarks there, because there's a lot of talk about infrastructure and spending on it, and I think the 600 miles of county roads and the 593 bridges. Taken as a whole, are in excellent shape, and I think for the State of Kansas we're in good shape too. Where we do have some problems, they're being addressed and being worked. You mentioned a project out there on west Kellogg. That's 100 percent funded with county tax dollars, on the local match portion, it's 100 percent funded with county tax dollars. There is state and federal money involved, but the local portion is entirely Sedgwick County. So I think it's important for folks to know, whether they're looking at a county road or a county bridge or even in this case it's basically an interchange with an interstate highway and a major U.S. Highway. Sedgwick County is definitely spending significant resources in this area. I wanted to point that out this morning. Thank you."

Chairman Howell said, "Thank you, Commissioner. Let me go ahead and just make one final comment before we vote. Next week, the 23rd, we do have Kansas Department of Transportation Secretary Mike King will be here to present to us what is really going on around the community and really around the state. We'll have a chance to see, I guess, a presentation, and we'll have a chance to ask him questions, but there's going to be even a greater understanding, I think, of what's really going on around us and what the bigger plans are, so we're looking forward to having him visit us next week to have a much more in depth discussion and maybe a deeper understanding of what what's being done around our community. With that, Madam Clerk, we have a motion and a second. We're ready for a vote."

VOTE

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

Chairman Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Thomas. Madam Clerk, next item, please."
Approved

CONSENT

D [16-0098](#)

Housing First Renewal Agreement with the City of Wichita.

- E [16-0099](#) Addendum to the 2016 COMCARE participating Community Mental Health Center agreement with the Kansas Department of Aging and Disability Services.
- F [16-0118](#) Affiliation Agreement with Phoenix Home Care & Hospice.
- G [16-146](#) Sedgwick County Townships Annual Expense Report.
- H [16-0140](#) Investment Options Transaction-457(b) Deferred Compensation Plan.
- I [16-0141](#) Agreement with the Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT) regarding the treatment of noxious weeds growing on KDOT right of way in Sedgwick County. All Districts.
- J [16-144](#) Sedgwick County 457 Deferred Compensation Agreement with Putnam Fiduciary Trust Company to Serve as Fiduciary Trust Administrator of Stable Value Fund
- K [16-145](#) In-Plan Roth Rollover/Transfer Election.
- L [16-151](#) General Bill Check Register for March 9, 2016 - March 15, 2016.
- M **16-152** Payroll Check Register for the March 5, 2016 payroll certification.
- N [16-0142](#) Changes to District Attorney's staffing table.

Mr. Ron Holt, Assistant County Manager, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I recommend you approve the Consent Agenda Items D through N."

Chairman Howell said, "Commissioners, what's the will of the Board?"

MOTION

Commissioner Unruh moved to approve the Consent Agenda Items D through N.

Commissioner Peterjohn seconded the motion.

There was no further discussion and the vote was called.

VOTE

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

Chairman Howell said, "Great. Madam Clerk, next item, please."

Approved

LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

Chairman Howell said, "We have counselor Jon Von Achen."

Mr. Jon Von Achen, Assistant County Counselor, greeted the Commissioners and said, "A few items today. One of them is we found out this morning it's kind of gone away, but it warrants some discussion senate bill 451 would have merged Wichita State University (WSU) and Wichita Area Technical College (WATC) and created the Wichita State Technical College. There is an actual more technical name for it. A similar merger has occurred previously between Washburn and Washburn Tech. Senate Bill 451 was a very different merger than the Washburn-Washburn Tech one. The initial proposal would have had the WATC funds be completely within the general funds of the university whereas the Washburn-Washburn Tech one remained in the post secondary education fund."

"There was a substitute bill floated around that would have created an additional oversight over not only the technical colleges, but the community colleges as well. It would have worked in conjunction with the Board of Regents, and I think that in large part is what killed the bill, at this point, from what we've been told. The most important as suspect of this that was not taken into consideration, and we did address it through our lobbyist and indirectly with Senator O'Donnell was that we have a significant investment with WATC and with WSU and we have both tax dollars and buildings involved with the WATC and NCAT (National Center for Aviation Training), and we were not going to be given a seat at the table in the approval of the merger, and so, we did inform them that this would be discussed today and that I would be asking the Board for the opinion on whether or not we needed to intervene and ask for some sort of approval authority over the merger itself."

"At this point with the bill, apparently to be dead, I don't think the issue is necessarily dead. It may not come up again this session. It may be in a future session, but I think now that the issue has been put out there that the legislature is aware that we have a significant investment and that we would have a seat at the table when a merger is brought up again."

"The merits of it, I mean, I think there's pros and cons with the merger. I think the primary thing is to ensure that those students who aren't necessarily going to be university students, who aren't using WATC to get some of their general education credits and then go on to the university, they are there for technical training, that they don't get swept up in the merger and that those opportunities are still available for those students who are there to learn a trade as opposed to those who are there to get a full four-year college degree at some point. So that's out there. I always say bills die, concepts don't. So that concept is still out there. It may not come up again this session, but it is something that we did raise because I thought it was important to raise. We have an investment out there and if we're going to divest ourselves of the investment."

Chairman Howell said, "Let me tell you as a former legislature, nothing is ever really dead in Topeka. There are about 100 different ways to kill a bill, but nothing is ever really dead. It's good we're having this discussion and at and point we need to have further discussion on developing a position for Sedgwick County, and hopefully we can educate the legislators on what we would like to see them do with this bill should this ever comeback alive."

"This is our chance to act and react. We may not have that chance when this comes

up on the floor. We're going to go through the other items here, I suppose, but we probably need to have a little bit more discussion about this Senate Bill 451 before we're done here today."

Mr. Von Achen said, "Yeah, I would agree. One of the things that was a topic of discussion were House Bills 2568 and House Bill 2570. 2568 dealt with community colleges and 70 dealt with technical colleges. The [house] bills that allow the governing bodies of those institutions to institute a 2 mill levy for a five-year period.

"Now, at the technical college, I don't think it would be as much of a concern for us, considering the board composition, but it is out there. The one that's slightly more troubling would have been the House Bill 2568. It involves satellite campuses of which we have three in Sedgwick County. Cowley County Community College, Butler Community College and Hutchinson Community College have satellite campuses in Sedgwick County. I know the Board is aware of how those governing bodies are comprised and how they're put together, but the public may not know, because we don't have one here, that in the counties where those main campuses are located, those trustees are voted on by the public. Those positions are elected. The [house] bill would allow those elected officials in other counties to institute a 2 mill levy on Sedgwick County residents for the people they did not vote on and for a tax that they did not vote on.

"With three of those institutions here in Sedgwick County, you're talking the possibility of an additional 6 mills for a period of five years, and the purpose of which is to either acquire real estate and build a campus or to acquire a building and remodel it for that purpose. It would require, that if a governing body voted to do so, that the electors would have to scramble to get a petition together within 60 days to put it up for public vote, which is, even at a five percent number, is significantly difficult to do. So that's an issue of concern, a little bit counter intuitive considering all of the legislature's current efforts to have the electors have greater say and more accountability in raising of taxes, and this would seem to be a little less so."

Chairman Howell said, "Jon, let me interrupt you just a little bit. When you said five percent, I may have just missed the point. So the electors would have a petition with five percent of the electors signing that, which would trigger what?"

Mr. Von Achen said, "Which would trigger a general or special election for the county in which the mill levy is proposed to occur for the electors to have a vote on that mill levy."

Chairman Howell said, "So that's in a proposed amendment to this bill?"

Mr. Von Achen said, "That is actually in the bill. It would not, for example, bring the issue before the Board of County Commissioners and the county where it's proposed. It would require that the electors put together a petition."

Chairman Howell said, "So for them to oppose this would require them to be successful in getting the petition, having the vote and then basically overruling that. But if the electors don't do that successfully, then the default is it's approved. Before we go on, Commissioner Peterjohn has a comment."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Let me understand this. If we're talking about a petition, if they basically wanted to impose a 2 mill levy, would they impose it in their home county as well as in Sedgwick, or could they impose it in Sedgwick County, without imposing it in their home county, whether it's Butler, Cowley or Reno counties?"

Mr. Von Achen said, "The purpose of the bill is to allow those institutions with satellite campuses to impose a mill levy in the county where the satellite campus is located, not a sister tax in the county where the institution is primarily located. For example, if Butler were to do this, the Butler Community College Board of Trustees would institute a 2 mill levy on Sedgwick County residents, but not on Butler County residents."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "This isn't a hard call to me. I think we need to be in adamant opposition for several different reasons. I'll go back to the taxation without representation on their board. I also cite the fact that this petition provision is a joke. I mean, five percent of all the registered voters to force a tax referendum. Any and all property tax increases ought to be voted upon by the people. And this is an affront to common sense in my opinion for this type of bill."

"The other thing is a little bit of history. These satellite campuses for community colleges, when community colleges were being created back in the 20th century, there were provisions to keep them out of the counties where regents institutions were located. Now, there's six counties that have regents institutions. I could go through them here, but for purposes of time, I know that's of a concern to some folks, I won't. But just to say that if the community colleges want to expand into Sedgwick County, that wasn't the intent to have them do so. I know they've kind of got their nose under the tent a couple different ways. That's part of the history."

"The idea that we would have a third party outside our jurisdiction imposing property taxes on us from the legislature, I'm appalled. This is so beyond the pail that it needs to be strenuously opposed at all levels. Record to give folks some idea out there who may be following Sedgwick County government, we are deeply involved in technical education. WATC and NCAT wouldn't exist without Sedgwick County's contribution of over \$4 million a year in funding. Most of it is to pay for the buildings, but 10 of the 11 members on the WATC-NCAT board, one is appointed by the members of this County Commission, one is appointed by a member of the Wichita City Council, because we are on city land, and the other nine are all appointed by the County Manager, so the county is up to its eyeballs on this issue and will be as long as we have these areas of structure, and the board is fully responsible. If there is some sort of a merger and the Board for WATC-NCAT becomes advisory underneath WSU, which is one of the ideas tossed out, that may change. For this current Commission at this time, under this law, we are deeply involved with WATC-NCAT and that's why we've got to focus very closely on the changes within that operation. Thank you."

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

Commissioner Ranzau said, "I was just going to say I agree with my fellow colleague. Don't we have a legislative agenda item that says we support voter approval for tax increases?"

Mr. Von Achen said, "Yes, that is on our legislative platform."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "I think for that very issue, we should oppose these, as Commissioner Peterjohn said, all tax increases at all levels should be voted on by the people, and I appreciate you bringing this to our attention, Jon."

Chairman Howell said, "Jon, real quickly, on House Bill 2570, we talked about 2568 on this mill levy idea, but can you explain 2570."

Mr. Von Achen said, "It is almost identical, except it's technical colleges rather than"

community colleges, and actually technical colleges that are in the county in which the mill levy is proposed. The Boards of those would have the authority to do the exact same thing to mill levy up to five years for capital improvement projects and then the same provisions once that intention is published, if the electors wish to put it to a vote, they've got a petition with five percent."

Chairman Howell said, "Do we know whether the revenue generated by the mill levy they would impose, does all of that go to the school or is some of that shared? Do we get involved and share that with any other schools, do we know?"

Mr. Von Achen said, "The way the bill reads it is intended to, and I think with technical colleges not as big of an issue because they're in that county, but a community college, it establishes a larger footprint."

Chairman Howell said, "It seems like, though, this would be an incentive for schools anywhere in the state to set up an office because they could essentially impose another 2 mill levy on our county residents. Does it describe how much operation they have in the county? Every one of these colleges has a college seat in some other community in their own counties, but all of them have offices here. It doesn't necessarily mean they do a lot of classes here necessarily, but because they happen to have satellite classroom, this qualifies them to potentially invoke this 2 mill levy. It doesn't require any description on how much they're doing here in the county."

Mr. Von Achen said, "It is essentially described as a satellite campus. The definition of which is very amorphous."

Chairman Howell said, "I wonder if our tech schools and community colleges would like to set up satellites in other people's counties and exercise their option that way? Just a thought. I think we ought to be opposed to both of these. I would like to, whatever time is the right time, to have the Commissioners motion to make that official, that with we would be strenuously opposed to both of these bills and hopefully we would be able to encourage the legislators not to support these."

"By the way, I have had some discussions with some of the legislators on this, and it sounds like these bills have a fair amount of interest. I don't know that I would think these are not going to move forward. I'm very concerned about them. And by the way, just with those three colleges alone, that would be 6 mills potentially for our county. So it's all additive. It's not limited to any one school. They can all do it."

Mr. Von Achen said, "Correct."

Chairman Howell said, "Commissioner Peterjohn was next."

MOTION

Commissioner Peterjohn moved to take a stance in opposition for House Bill 2568 and House Bill 2570, in their current form and authorize the Chairman or his designees and lobbyists and staff to submit testimony.

Commissioner Ranzau seconded the motion.

Chairman Howell said, "Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh thanked the Chairman and said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Jon, yesterday in the staff meeting, you indicated that we didn't even know who the authors of this bill were."

Mr. Von Achen said, "As most nefarious things are in the legislature, they come out as committee bills. I find it interesting. The two issues, [SB]451 and these issues, there can be a connection made because of the insertion of potential of a substitute bill on [SB]451 would have kept a lot of the technical college stuff in with the community colleges, so I think they come from the same source, but I haven't identified which source that is."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Well, it's just totally absurd that this thing is even wasting ink to put it on a piece of paper. One way you can test the theory is push it to its extreme conclusion. I suppose then the folks in favor of this, would also be in favor of Missouri imposing a tax on the state of Kansas?"

Mr. Von Achen said, "I believe we discussed that on Monday that it would be about that equivalent, if the Missouri assembly did that to us."

Commissioner Unruh said, "If you push the thing to the extreme, it is so absurd. It's almost maddening that they would even be thinking about it. So I'll be supportive of a motion."

Chairman Howell said, "It reminds me of the Boston Tea Party when [Great] Britain was trying to impose a tax on people across the ocean. It's about the same idea. We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? Seeing none, Madam Clerk, please call the vote."

VOTE

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

Chairman Howell said, "We're still on Legislative Issues."

Mr. Von Achen said, "Conversely, House Bill 2719 would change a lot of things with some of the smaller taxing authorities. Obviously there's been a lot of discussion about Kansas Statute Article (K.S.A.) 79-2925b. and elections with cities and counties regarding tax increases, but those things wouldn't necessarily trickle down to the smaller taxing authorities."

"Well, 2719 gets some of the really minute ones into a little bit of focus where things like Airport Authorities and Recreation Commissions and Board of Regents at universities, one, it would change the requirements that the governing bodies that created those, as far as mill levy funding for those, to the extent they have the separate authority to impose a mill levy that would go back to the authority that granted their existence. For example, the Airport Authority would have to then come back and ask permission to have a mill levy increase. So it's a little bit of a furtherance of some of those ideas put forth in things like Senate Bill 316."

"It just seems to be a little opposite of what we just discussed, which is there is a

constriction, there is an allowance of some sort of oversight regarding either directly with the voters or through the governing body that created the smaller taxing authorities to have some oversight to have some say in whether or not those increases do occur so that's a relatively new bill. I know some of the smaller taxing authorities have contacted the Clerk's Office about what exactly does this mean for us. I've had some conversation with the Clerk's Office about this particular bill, but I wanted to bring to the Board's attention some of the discussions we've had about Senate Bill 316 and the house bills that are all associated with that K.S.A 79-2925b. concept that is being expanded not upwards towards the legislature but downwards towards the smaller taxing authorities.

"One last note, Senate Bill 316 is scheduled for further discussion and possible final action tomorrow."

Chairman Howell said, "Do we know whether House Bill 2609 did have a hearing. Is there anything planned for that, do we know?"

Mr. Von Achen said, "I have not heard anything further about the bill being worked, no further possible discussion. I don't know that there's necessarily a race for one side or the other to get their bill out there. I suspect that something will come out committee tomorrow on Senate Bill 316."

Chairman Howell said, "Just for the reminder for our listeners, Senate Bill 316 is being called the Tax Lid Bill. It's a cleanup bill that adjusts five of the exceptions that are in the current language that was passed last year and it also speeds up the implementation into 2016. Commissioner Peterjohn and myself traveled to Topeka and offered testimony that our position is that the concept of the language is really something that we would support. However, we do need to have the options for an election, I think municipalities have that right to ask their constituents for the right to raise taxes above reasonable growth rates. And so without their permission, they can raise it up to a threshold, but beyond that threshold requires a vote, which is currently not possible. So what we've done is we've offered an apartment amendment that moves deadlines around that would make the mail ballot election possible. So it's no longer de facto lid, but simply voter empowerment is the way we would describe that. Future more, the implementation day, since we are already in 2016, the base bill this year speeds it up from 2018 to 2016 which we believe is not workable.

"We are asking for therefore, we're always for a 2017 and I think all of our departments have said it works well for them and they are willing 2017 implementation date, we could certainly support that logistically. So we think that is the right answer there. We offered these ideas, and it sounds to me like this is something that the committee seems to be very favorable to when we were there.

"I anticipate those changes being adopted. Let me further say, I know our friends across the street, they have asked for reconstruction or remodeling costs to be calculated into the new construction, and I am personally supportive of that. I'm not sure what the position of the board is here, but I think that's reasonable request, and I am personally supportive of that, and I talked to some of the legislators last week and the committee members as well as the lobbyists. It sounds like there is across the board acceptance of that idea. So I anticipate that will also be adopted when they work the bill. Any other comments from Commissioners on legislative issues?

"With regard to Senate Bill 451, the merger bill, I guess my hope is that we would develop a position. One of the things that I think that we ought to have a position that says that should a merger proposal come forward, through this bill, that Sedgwick County would have ability to approve that merger because we are invested in both

WSU and WATC-NCAT, to the extent that we are, I think that we ought to have some ability to understand the merger and have the right to. I know right now the language out there says that the Higher Learning Commission is who approves this, so there is no governing body who has any say on this. Even though these are our buildings, it's a tremendous investment by Sedgwick County every year, I think we ought to have some say. Especially from the perspective of WATC-NCAT, I think that gives us a right to approve that merger, I think we have that right. I would like to see that be a position that we would take.

"To me, I think it would be the most important because the agreement that would be developed by WATC and WSU, I want to ensure we provide the same similar access to the community in terms of cost of education and admission standards so that a community that has traditionally accessed this technical education will continue to be able to access this opportunity.

"I think that's my most important part of this, but I want to be sure that language is in place to protect that access to education. That's my concern. As long as we see that in whatever language is developed, I think there may be a likelihood we would approve that. We need to be assured that that would be something that's protected in the merger language. Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "I agree with your comments. I would point out if you add Sedgwick County taxpayers through Sedgwick County, we've got 1.5 dedicated mill levy that goes to Wichita State University, and when you add that with funding for the principle and interest for WATC-NCAT and the operational support we provide, my ballpark figure, we are talking over \$11 million, over 2.5, approaching 3, mills in terms of property tax support for those institutions in our community. Sedgwick County is involved in education in a very significant way, so if there are changes coming down the line, I think we need to be very proactive in this area and appreciate the Chairman's comments."

Chairman Howell said, "If there's no further discussion, I would, if not right now, then in the future meeting I would like us to consider developing a position from the county that says we would like to have some ability to approve the merger language before it's completed. And as the bill is currently written, there is no approval required by us, even though it impacts us in a great way. Commissioners, I don't see any further discussion on Legislative Issues. Thank you, Mr. Von Achen, I appreciate your briefing this morning. Madam Clerk, next item, please."

OTHER

Chairman Howell said, "Commissioners, do you have anything for 'Other' this morning? Commissioner Ranzau."

Commissioner Ranzau thanked the Chairman and said, "I want to make a few comments about today's editorial. It was called 'Stand up to intolerance and hate' some out there may question the sincerity of the [Wichita] Eagle's editorial board in this regard. I, for one, am optimistic this may be a sign of change. A change to where we are more tolerant and have less hate towards others. Because there's not a lot of tolerance and love out there for a lot of people.

"If you happen to be an illegal alien or an immigrant from Syria, there's lots of love out there for you. But if you are an immigrant who came here legally into the United States, spent time and money to get here the appropriate way, and then has a problem with illegal aliens getting a pass, there's not much love for you. If you are a hard-working American out there, who has lost his job to an illegal alien or seen the

wages lowered as a result of illegal immigration, there's not much love out there for you. There's not much tolerance. If you are an American who sees the targeting of Christians in Middle East countries, and Christians who are being raped and murdered because of their Christianity and you have concern about the safety of your family as Syrian refugees are brought to America without any consultation from local or state officials, there's not much love and tolerance for you out there. If you are a taxpayer who is struggling to make ends meet, and you want the government to live within its means, stop raising for these ever-growing government interventions in our lives and you say something about that, there's not much love and tolerance for you out there. If you are an elected official who wants to stand up for his community and say I have a concern about possible terrorist attacks in our community, because he knows of an ongoing investigation and we should be aware, there is not much love and tolerance for you out there. If you are a woman who comes before this Commission that talks about female genital mutilation because you are concerned about what's going on in our community, there's not much love and tolerance for you. If you're someone who has a different viewpoint, or you want to exercise your free speech, in a lot of areas in academia, there's not a lot of tolerance and love for you. If you believe in Christian values, constitutional principles, core American values, and you express those values, there's not a lot of love and tolerance for you out there.

"So I will say to the Wichita Eagle and others, let's stand up to tolerance and hate no matter where it comes from. Let's be sincere in that. And understand that people with different ideas and values aren't just a bunch of racist bigots. They are Americans who have honest concerns about a wide variety of issues that are going on in our community. What you are seeing is a lot of frustration in America because people won't listen. You have the establishment in both the left and the right, and that includes much of the media and our universities, et cetera. Just want to call people's names and say you are a racist and bigot for having any of these values or any of these concerns; and they are not. They are hard-working Americans who have a difference of opinion.

"If the Wichita Eagle Editorial Board truly wants to stand up to intolerance and hate, and I hope they really do, then I would say the first step they need to take is take a look in the mirror. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

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

Commissioner Peterjohn thanked the Chairman and said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I hadn't planned to get into comments in today's newspaper. I was still celebrating the good feelings from the basketball game in the state where I went to college, in Dayton, Ohio last night.

"But let me begin this way, by saying, March 16th is an important day in American history, and I want to point out a few important facts that have occurred on March 16th. It has some connection here to Wichita in a sense, and certainly for our neighbors over in Reno County even more so.

"A fellow by the name of Robert H. Goddard on March 16, 1926, launched the first liquid fuel rocket at a farm in Auburn, Massachusetts. Goddard had been a fascinated by H. G. Wells, 'War of the Worlds' and had tinkered around in this area, but he came up with a rocket that by current standards was really almost less impressive than some of the fireworks we have whenever there's a community celebration. It went only 60 miles an hour, and only went 41 feet in the air and only landed 140 feet away. Pretty soon the idea that he grew into, and the work that he continued until his death in 1945, his work became the foundation for all of mankind's exploration into space, and of course the Goddard Space Flights Center in Green Belt, Maryland named in

his honor.

"I would also point out March 16th that the United States Congress authorized the establishment of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point on this date in 1802. Interestingly enough, March 16, 1995, Astronaut Norman Thaggard became the first American to visit the Russian Space Station, Mir. March 16th is an important date in American history. I wanted to get that on the record, Mr. Chairman.

"I appreciate Commissioner Ranzau's remarks and will save my comments for a later date, because as a person who grew up in the 20th century, I have seen a lot of hate and intolerance on college campuses. In the 1960s and 70s, the Marxists of that era didn't have the power that they have now that they have kind of grown into positions of authority and in the culture and academia, and the media, and many other places.

But to quote Yogi Berra, 'when I see the hate and intolerance out in today's environment and the fact that unfortunately people are getting killed. There was certain atrocities that occurred in San Bernardino from Islamic jihadists who unfortunately killed 14 people and injured many, many more. In the words of Yogi Berra, unfortunately it's deja vu all over again, and I just hope that one of my responsibilities as an elected official is working to keep this community safe, and that remains a priority for me. So I will just include my remarks in that, on that, Mr. Chairman, thank you."

Chairman Howell said, "Thank you, Commissioner. Let me raise another issue that this is more information for the listeners on the television. I hope that they will write this down. As I look out in the audience, I see more members of the media than I see people of the community here. And one thing that I have wanted to do as Commissioner since I've been here was try to move these meetings in such a way that we can actually invite the people in the community in a way that makes sense. We have our meetings typically Wednesday mornings, but a lot of folks that would like to participate in our meetings or come and talk to Commissioners, or even see us face-to-face and have a discussion with us, many of them are at work and they can't be here. So one of the things I've done, I've asked Commission staff and my colleagues to support the idea of having in district meetings in the evening. They won't happen all the time, but we will see a number throughout the year. We are going to start, the very first one will be April 18th.

"April 18th, it will be in Derby at the Derby Welcome Center at 611 North Mulberry Road, Suite 200. And if you aren't familiar with Derby, that's just a little west of the intersection of Madison and Rock Road, on the north side of the street. There is a nice facility there that has a Senior Center, a Welcome Center, and the Derby City building, all in one facility. So the Welcome Center is a nice large facility in the middle of that. We will be meeting there. We'll have a meet and greet at 6:00 p.m. Commissioners will be there, ready to talk to constituents and people interested in meeting us face-to-face. We will be there to talk about whatever is interesting to people who will come. Of course the meeting will begin officially at 6:30 p.m. and we will conduct regular business at that meeting.

"Of course we are always interested in hearing from the community. They will have a chance to speak to us on any issues they find important. It will be a public commentary option for people to sign up and address the Commissioners.

"With that said, I want to make sure, I will probably talk about this every week from now until it happens, just hope try to get some interest in this, and hopefully people will write this on their calendars and will meet with us at these evening meetings. So first one will be, again, April 18th at 6:00 p.m. is our meet and greet, meeting officially

starts at 6:30 p.m. Derby at the Derby Welcome Center, 611 North Mulberry Road, Suite 200. I would encourage everyone throughout the community to hopefully come out to that meeting and we will sit and visit with you there.

"The other thing I wanted to bring up, there was action this last week on the Law Enforcement Training Center. I want to mention, one point, and that is, the Wichita Eagle editorial staff did write an editorial on this. I wanted to insert a couple quick questions. Number one, we are committed to this as much as we ever have been in Sedgwick County. We just need to let the process work. The Board of Bids and Contracts should hopefully open these bids and deliberate on these options and make recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners very soon. When that's done, the Board of County Commissioners, in an open meeting, will receive that recommendation and we will also deliberate and hopefully reach a decision, at which point we will work with the city to hopefully come to terms on whatever that agreement might include. There have been no decisions by the County Commission as of this time, but we will certainly be doing that as soon as possible.

"Having said that, I just wanted everyone to know we are committed to this. The editorial staff makes a point that this has been an ongoing discussion, a need for 17 years. We understand that. We are not pulling away, we are not going to kick this can down the road. We are going to develop a solution we think is best and hopefully find a way to agree with the city on that. So that is coming up. We are committed to that as much as we ever have been.

"We did need to push the date back for the deliberations on these proposals back to May 18th. Between now and May 18th, our current proposal that we will in fact be able to reach a decision, and hopefully agree with the city. So that's where we are at on that. Let's be encouraged. This is good news. We are doing our job, and doing it in an open and transparent way. We will move forward to a solution. We are committed to that. That's all I want to say about that.

"Commissioners is there anything else that you would like to bring up before we dismiss today? Manager, anything else you want to bring up? Seeing none. So with that, I think we are adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no other business to come before the Board, the Meeting was adjourned at 11:37 a.m.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF
SEDGWICK COUNTY, KANSAS

JAMES M. HOWELL, Chairman
Fifth District

RICHARD RANZAU, Chair Pro Tem
Fourth District

*DAVID M. UNRUH, Commissioner
First District*

*TIM R. NORTON, Commissioner
Second District*

*KARL PETERJOHN, Commissioner
Third District*

ATTEST:

Kelly B. Arnold, County Clerk

APPROVED:
