

Sedgwick County

525 North Main Street 3rd Floor
Wichita, KS 67203



*Sedgwick County...
working for you*

Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, May 11, 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

The Regular Meeting of the Board of the County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kansas, was called to order at 9:03 a.m. on May 11, 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. Michael Scholes, County Manager; Mr. Eric Yost, County Counselor; Mr. David Spears, Director, Bureau of Public Works; Sheriff Jeffrey Easter, Sheriff Office; Ms. Jeannette Livingston, Assistant Director Sedgwick County Developmental Disability Organization; Ms. Linda Kizzire, County Treasurer; Ms. Susan Erlenwein, Director, Environmental Resources; Mr. Joe Thomas, Director, Purchasing Dept.; Mr. Steve Claassen Facilities Parks Director; Mr. Lynn Packer Public Works; Ms. Kate Flavin, Communications; Ms. Laura Billups, Deputy County Clerk and Ms. Erika Hills, Deputy County Clerk.

Guests:

*Ms. Ashlea D Thompson, Clerk, Treasurers Office
Mr. Joe Norton, Gilmore and Bell
Mr. Craig Brown, 12515 West 35th South, Wichita, KS
Ms. Tammy Sheridan, 12340 West 34th Court South, Wichita, KS
Mr. Doug Sheridan, 12340 West 34th Court South, Wichita, KS
Mr. David Nance, 3502 South Cedar Downs Street, Wichita, KS
Mr. Caleb Everitt, 12401 West 35th Street South, Wichita, KS
Mr. Steve Martins, 810 North Cypress, Wichita, KS
Mr. Lonny Wright, 1721 South Lulu, Wichita, KS*

CALL MEETING TO ORDER

INVOCATION: Pastor Joplin Emberson, Crossway Church.

FLAG SALUTE

ROLL CALL

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

PUBLIC INFORMATION ANNOUNCEMENTS

PUBLIC AGENDA

Chairman Howell said, "I do have four people signed up to speak this morning. I'd like to go ahead and hear from them. I'll tell you, we do have an item coming up here in a little bit for the, it's a hearing for Redmond Estates. If you want to speak on that topic, it might be more appropriate for you to wait until we get to that agenda item. I'd be glad to give you an opportunity to speak at that time. If you're not here to speak for Redmond Estates, I'll like to have you up here now. There's, I believe, looking at my list here, it looks like all four signed up are for Redmond Estates. Is there anybody else here that would like to speak this mornin g before we get on with the next agenda item? Alright.

"We do give our audience members a chance to speak on business items as they come up in the Agenda, so you'll still have a chance to speak later on, on specific items that come up during the Agenda. We do have some proclamations this morning. Madam Clerk, next item please."

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

- A** [16-290](#) REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 9, 2016.
All Commissioners were present.

MOTION

Chairman Howell moved to adopt the regular meetings of March 9, 2016, March 16, 2016, March 23, 2016, April 6, 2016, April 13, 2016 and April 18, 2016.

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*

Approved

- B** [16-283](#) REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 16, 2016.
All Commissioners were present.

- C** [16-219](#) REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 23, 2016.
All Commissioners were present.

- D** [16-259](#) REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 6, 2016.
All Commissioners were present.

- E** [16-261](#) REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 13, 2016.
All Commissioners were present.

- F** [16-282](#) SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 18, 2016.
All Commissioners were present.

MOTION

Chairman Howell moved to adopt the regular meetings of March 9, 2016, March 16, 2016, March 23, 2016, April 6, 2016, April 13, 2016 and April 18, 2016.

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, "Madam Clerk, next item please."

Approved

PROCLAMATIONS

G [16-263](#)

PROCLAMATION DECLARING CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS' WEEK.

Read by: Chairman Jim Howell or his designee.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Adopt the proclamation.

Chairman Howell said, "I do have a Proclamation I would like to read. It says:

WHEREAS, in 1984, then-President Ronald Reagan signed Proclamation 5187 creating "National Correctional Officers' Week." The first full week in May has since been recognized as National Correctional Officers' Week to honor the work of correctional officers and correctional personnel nationwide; and

WHEREAS, the dedication of these Correctional Officers and Detention Deputies who serve our community quietly, taking on the very difficult and dangerous duties; and

WHEREAS, we would be unable to operate our Adult and Juvenile Detention Facilities and Community Correctional Programs without the hard work of these professionals that staff these facilities 24 hours a day, 365 days a year; and

WHEREAS, Sedgwick County, Kansas is pleased to join in celebrating Correctional Officers Week, recognizing these men and women who risk their lives and serve so diligently and faithfully.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that I, Jim Howell, chairman of the Board of Sedgwick County Commissioners, do hereby proclaim the week of May 1 – 7, 2016, as
CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS' WEEK

in Sedgwick County, and encourage all citizens to honor and show sincere appreciation for the correctional officers who make it possible to keep the detention and correctional facilities safe each day.

"Commissioners what's the will of the board?"

MOTION

Commissioner Unruh moved to adopt the Proclamation.

Chairman Howell seconded the motion.

VOICE VOTE

After the voice vote was called, Chairman Howell announced the adoption of the Proclamation.

Chairman Howell said, "To receive this proclamation, I do have, I believe, in the audience Sheriff Easter. There he is. There we go. I'd like to ask the sheriff to come and say a couple of words, please."

Sheriff Jeffery Easter, Sheriff Office, greeted the Commissioners and said, "We appreciate the Commissioners recognizing Correction Week. The deputies that work inside there are very committed to the job they do, very committed to serving the citizens of Sedgwick County, and we appreciate you recognizing that. Thank you."

Chairman Howell said, "Thank you we appreciate what they do very, very much. Commissioner Norton has comments."

Commissioner Norton thanked the Chairman and said, "You only have to tour the jail once or twice and know that correction really do some Yeoman's work in our community. They deal with people that, many of them that are bad people and many of them that have made mistakes and are going to be incarcerated for a while, and they still have to work with both populations under extreme conditions sometimes. So I honor all of them for the work they do. Please pass that on to them. We know it is not easy work under conditions where people are in some of the worst conditions of their life, as far as what they've done, the decisions they've made, and they still have to treat them like human beings and make sure that they're safe and get out and be functional back in society. We really appreciate that."

Sheriff Easter said, "Thank you, sir."

Chairman Howell said, "Seeing no other comments, I just want to say thank you again. I'd like to say I agree with the previous comments. I also visit the jail a number of times up to this point. I don't want to be behind the windows or the bars. I would like to be on the other side. It's just a place to visit and I appreciate what those folks do over there. It is certainly a tough job. Madam Clerk, next item please."

Adopted

H [16-264](#)

PROCLAMATION DECLARING POLICE WEEK.

Read by: Chairman Jim Howell or his designee.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Adopt the proclamation.

Chairman Howell said, "We do have another proclamation relating to Law Enforcement folks. It says

WHEREAS, in 1962 the United States Congress first passed Public Law 87-726 designating May 15 of each year as "Peace Officers Memorial Day," honoring Federal, State and local officers who have been killed or disabled in the line of duty, and the corresponding week as "Police Week;" and

WHEREAS, over the years, devoted Law Enforcement officers of America have courageously sacrificed their personal safety, while working on behalf of the people; and

WHEREAS, because of their steadfast efforts to enforce our laws, we as citizens can

enjoy a system of peace and order; and

WHEREAS, Sedgwick County desires to honor the valor, service and dedication of, not only its own Sheriff's deputies, but peace officers everywhere; and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that I, Jim Howell, Chairman of the Board of Sedgwick County Commissioners, do hereby proclaim May 15 – 21, 2016 as

POLICE WEEK

In Sedgwick County, and call upon our citizens to show their sincere appreciation for the many Law Enforcement officers of Sedgwick County, past and present, and their legacy of humble dedicated service to the community.

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 a voice vote was called.

VOICE VOTE

After the voice vote was called, Chairman Howell announced the adoption of the Proclamation.

Chairman Howell said, "Once again I have Sheriff Easter here to accept. Would you like to say anything else? We'd like to hear from you on this one, as well."

Sheriff Easter thanked the Chairman and said, "Well, we do appreciate the Proclamation and every year that it takes place, we want to make sure and invite everyone here, including the Commissioners, next Friday, as the Law Enforcement Memorial is held across the street in front of the Joint Memorial City Building. That's a time to remember the folks that have given their lives for this community.

"Unfortunately, a couple days ago, a Kansas City police officer was shot and killed and it reminds us of the dangers that we face every day. Again, you know, the men and women of the Sedgwick County Sheriff's Office dedicate their lives to protecting the citizens of Sedgwick County, and we appreciate the Proclamation and the recognition of those sacrifices that we do every day. So thank you again for your kind words."

Chairman Howell said, "Thank you, Sheriff Easter. We do have some comments from Commissioners. Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn thanked the Chairman and said, "In light of the event you just mentioned, and unfortunately, it's one of a number that have occurred this year, and the fact that other levels of government, there have not been the public statements stated by our leadership that I think should have been made in recognition of the valor and the dedication for those officers who have given their lives, trying to keep their communities safe.

"My worst day as a commissioner was the day when we lost Deputy Ethridge. I hope that nothing like that occurs in the future, but unfortunately, looking at the past, we do

face these challenges, and I as an elected official, and I think elected officials across this state recognize the hard work, dedication and 24/7 activities of Law Enforcement officers and whether they're commissioned in your road patrol or detention related, I wanted to publicly provide accommodation for you today and do plan to attend the event Friday. Thank you."

Sheriff Easter said, "Thank you."

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

Commissioner Norton thanked the Chairman and said, "Thank you, Sheriff. I know this is a poignant time for your family, as well as many families in our community, if you've never been to the Law Enforcement memorial service, I would urge you to go sometimes. The calling of the names and the last call brings to mind how important Public Safety is and how first responders risk their life in harm's way for our Public Safety every day, and we hate these events that might happen in our community. But we know in today's society with the ills that we do have that Public Safety is critically important and that we need strong training and Law Enforcement folks to be sure they're out on the streets protecting our public every day. And the memorial brings to mind that they're in harm's way to protect our community every day. Please pass on to everyone that we really appreciate that."

Sheriff Easter said, "We will. Thank you."

Chairman Howell said, "Sheriff, I just want to say a few other comments at the moment. I want to say thank you so much for being the leader of this community. You have done great at the Sheriff's Department. I am very, very impressed with your professionalism and the kindness they show. I've seen them in their role interfacing with people around the community. I just love what they do, they give me a lot of confidence that they're providing the best Public Safety possible."

"Of course, we're going to talk about the Law Enforcement Training Center today, so it's important, I think, that we acknowledge the fact that we have a great department. We've done a great job in the past and looking forward to finding innovative ways to do that in the future. I just want to say I appreciate what they do for our community. I'd like to say I do remember also the story about your family's loss years ago. It has never been forgotten. I just want to say I appreciate what you do. With that and seeing no other comments Madam Clerk, next item please."

Adopted

I [16-291](#)

PROCLAMATION DECLARING NATIONAL PUBLIC WORKS WEEK.

Read by: Chairman Jim Howell or his designee.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Adopt the proclamation.

Chairman Howell said, "Commissioners, I do have another proclamation to read. It says

WHEREAS, public works services provided in our community are an integral part of our citizens' everyday lives; and

WHEREAS, the support of an understanding and informed citizenry is vital to the efficient operation of public works systems and programs such as streets, highways, bridges, drainage improvements, environmental services, household hazardous waste and noxious weed control; and

WHEREAS, the health, safety and comfort of this community greatly depends on these facilities and services; and

WHEREAS, the quality and effectiveness of these facilities, as well as their planning, design, and construction, is especially dependent upon the efforts and skill of public works officials; and

WHEREAS, the efficiency of the qualified and dedicated personnel who staff public works departments is substantially influenced by the people's attitude and understanding of the importance of the work they perform.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that I, Jim Howell, Chairman of the Board of Sedgwick County Commissioners, do hereby proclaim May 15 - 21, 2016 as

NATIONAL PUBLIC WORKS WEEK

In Sedgwick County and urge all citizens all citizens and civic organizations to acquaint themselves with the issues involved in public works and to recognize the contributions which public works officials make every day to our health, safety, comfort, and quality of life.

"Commissioners, what's the will of the board?"

MOTION

Commissioner Unruh moved to adopt the proclamation.

Commissioner Norton seconded the motion.

There was no further discussion and a voice vote was called.

VOICE VOTE

After the voice vote was called, Chairman Howell announced the adoption of the Proclamation.

Chairman Howell said, "I'd like to give this to Public Works Director David Spears and invite you to say a few things here."

Mr. David Spears, Director, Public Works Department greeted the Commissioners and said, "Since 1960, APWA, which is American Public Works Association, has sponsored National Public Works Week across North America. More than 29,000 members in the United States and Canada use this week to energize and educate the public on the importance of the contributions of Public Works to their daily lives. Planning, building and managing and operating the heart of our local communities and building the quality of life. There would be no community without the quality of life public works provides. There would be no community to police and protect, no public to lead or represent.

"This year's theme, Public Works Always There, showcases the pervasiveness of our department. Communities depend on public works and the men and women of the profession are always there and always ready. Thank you for the Proclamation. Here's the poster this year."

Chairman Howell said, "That's fantastic. Is that going to be hung on your office

walls? Where is that going to be?

Mr. Spears said, "We'll leave it out here for a couple weeks, and then we have all of them from the past years down at public works"

Chairman Howell said, "I see. That's great. It's a beautiful piece of art there. Who designed the artwork today?"

Mr. Spears said, "I don't know. It's from the national folks that put all of this together."

Chairman Howell said, "It's well done. That looks beautiful."

Mr. Spears said, "One side note. Tomorrow evening, the State APWA Conference is in Newton, Kansas, and I will be there to receive an award for our first place bridge up at Mount Hope over the Arkansas River on 279th Street West, and we won first place in the state on that. It will now be entered into the national tournament, so to speak, and we'll see what happens. I just wanted to throw that out, too."

Chairman Howell said, "Thank you. We have a couple of comments from some commissioners. Commissioner Norton."

Commissioner Norton thanked the Chairman and said, "Well, this is my 16th presentation. David, I'm sad that you didn't say your one line that you always say."

Mr. Spears said, "I have it on there. Infrastructure is the mother's milk of economic development. It's in red at the bottom of the speech."

Commissioner Norton said, "Okay. I just wanted to afford you the chance to be able to say it, because I want to stay consistent after 16 years. Well, we so honor what Public Works does, and I truly believe that good infrastructure is one of the core values that we should always have at Sedgwick County, not only out in the unincorporated areas but partnerships with the small cities. These are second and third class, and the City of Wichita. It is very, very important to do those projects that keep our people mobile, moving around and ability to use the public infrastructure with a safe manner and a quick manner. Thank you very much for what you do. Pass that on to your staff. I see some of them here. Please pass that on to them."

Mr. Spears said, "I will, thank you."

Chairman Howell said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn thanked the Chairman and said, "I certainly agree with Commissioner Norton's comments concerning second and third class cities and townships we have across this county that often rely on Public Works. Dave, I figured you would work in somewhere about 582 bridges and 600 miles of road, but since you didn't do it, I'm going to throw those numbers out, because it's an important point, and I wanted to congratulate all the folks down at Public Works, particularly those who are involved in the bridge project that won the award. I don't know how you handled it, but the fact that I think we had a record low usage for salt and sand for this season also helps. I don't know how you worked that one."

Mr. Spears said, "Can't take credit for that."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Anyway, congratulations. Thank you."

Chairman Howell said, "Thank you for those comments, as well. I'd like to just say

from the community's perspective, it's hard to know which road is a county road, which road is a township road, which road is a state road or local government road. Sometimes there's a lot of sentiment perhaps when people just get frustrated when they see a pothole here or road construction there, but the reality is I think the county does the best I've ever seen so far.

"The state highways I think are a tremendous amount of work for the state to maintain. The cities, I think, struggle with trying to keep their roads in good repair. I think the county does a great, does a tremendously great job. Our roads are in very, very good shape, and I know this just speaks well of you that you've done a great job over a very long period of time to maintain these roads, and you've advocated for the right things, made the best decisions, and I'm just extremely impressed with what you've done so far. I know you have great people, and I know this is the time that they're extremely busy, probably the busiest time of year right now, so many projects going on simultaneously, so I want to say thank you for being a good leader of your department and for providing the best roads for our community to enjoy. I just hope that they understand that the county roads, which roads are county roads and give us credit for that. If they get mad about a road, maybe it's not our road."

Mr. Spears said, "Thank you for the comments."

Chairman Howell said, "Thank you so much, David Spears. Madam Clerk, next item, please."

Adopted

APPOINTMENTS

- J** [16-288](#) RESOLUTION REAPPOINTING SANFORD ALEXANDER (COMMISSIONER DAVE UNRUH'S REAPPOINTMENT) TO THE WICHITA/SEDGWICK COUNTY ACCESS ADVISORY BOARD.
Presented by: Eric Yost, County Counselor.
- RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approve the Resolution.
- K** [16-289](#) RESOLUTION REAPPOINTING BRIAN J. POWERS (COMMISSIONER KARL PETERJOHN'S REAPPOINTMENT) TO THE WICHITA/SEDGWICK COUNTY ACCESS ADVISORY BOARD.
Presented by: Eric Yost, County Counselor.
- RECOMMENDED ACTION: Adopt the Resolution.
- Mr. Eric Yost, County Counselor greeted the Commissioners and said, "Item J is Resolution reappointing Sanford Alexander to the Wichita Sedgwick County Access Advisory Board. He is the appointment of Commissioner Unruh. His paperwork appears to be in order, and I would urge adoption of the resolution."*
- Chairman Howell said, "Counselor, it's similar to Item K would it be reasonable to do them at one time?"*
- Mr. Yost said, "Item K is the reappointment of Mr. Brian Powers to that same board, the Sedgwick County Access Advisory Board. Mr. Powers would be Commissioner Peterjohn's replacement."*

Chairman Howell said, "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, "Thank you for that, are either one of them here? I don't think they're here, we'll deal with the paperwork and other things with them later. Madam Clerk, next item please."

Adopted

NEW BUSINESS

L [16-267](#)

PROJECT SEARCH GRADUATION.

Presented by: Jeannette Livingston, Assistant Director Sedgwick County Developmental Disability Organization.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Receive and file.

Ms. Jeannette Livingston, Sedgwick County Developmental Disability Organization, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I'm here today to recognize our 2016 graduating class of Project Search Interns. Project search is an innovative program that provides real life work experience for students with disabilities in their final year of school. Sedgwick County has partnered with [Unified School District] USD 259 for four years on the program. Interns do three 10-week rotations, working 20 hours a week in a variety of county departments.

"In 2016, we hosted six interns and eight different county departments, all based on their skills and abilities, including Andrew Bleakley. Andrew stocked supplies, provided customer service and light custodial at Explore Store at Exploration Place. He also assembled booklets and assisted with mailings in the print shop mailroom and then worked in the dining room at Catholic Care Center. Andrew enjoys volunteering with the elderly, reading books and has an extraordinary memory. He's looking for a position where he can work with the elderly.

"Dontrae Brooks, while an intern Dontrae entered data at the SCDDO (Sedgwick County Developmental Disability Organization), assembled booklets, ran machines at the print shop, washed dishes, prepared foods and served meals at Corrections, and he must have been very good at that, because they have hired him part-time. Dontrae is an amazing graphic artist and enjoys sports.

"Kevin Cabrales. Kevin worked as a custodial assistant at Exploration Place, did file

prep at the Department of Corrections and has entered data for the SCDDO. Kevin is an excellent dependable worker and a gifted photographer. Kevin has been hired on at Bitco.

"William Casteel. William has done data entry, assisted with recruit assessments at the Sheriff's Department. He did file prep at Corrections and data entry and custodial in our department, the SCDDO. William has an engaging personality, and an enthusiasm for all things firefighting. He is currently looking for a job in customer service.

"Kris Phillips. Kris has assisted with data entry at the Sheriff's Department. He did data entry and recruit assessments at the Sheriff's Office as well. He's done records management and archiving at the housing program at the Department on Aging. Stocking, custodial and cashier at Explore Store as well as demonstrations and customer assistance at Exploration Place. He's also washed dishes, prepared and served food at Corrections. Kris currently works part-time at Olive Garden and enjoys sports and fast cars. He's looking for more work in the customer service field.

"Derris Quick. Derris processed mail-in tag registrations at the Tag Office, data entry and file management at the Department on Aging and a variety of tasks at the print shop and mail room. Derris enjoys sports and living in the country and he recently obtained a job at Goodwill. This was his first week on the job.

We have a great, great set of interns for 2016. For 2017, we're expecting 10 and 12 interns. So I would probably be approaching other county departments looking to develop additional internships. With that in mind, I would like to invite Linda Kizzire, our Sedgwick County Treasurer to talk about her experience with Project Search."

Ms. Linda Kizzire, Sedgwick County Treasurer, greeted the Commissioners and said, "We began with Project Search a couple of years ago. We had three wonderful interns. We had a job opening come up at the Tag Office, and Ms. Ashlea Thompson did the testing, passed all of her test tests with flying colors, had an interview and was hired full-time in Sedgwick County one year ago today. Ashlea, if you renew your tags online, this young lady right here is the one that screens you for delinquent taxes or returned checks, processes your renewal, gets it in the mail. She also works our personalized plates, our reorders, and Ashlea I'd like for you to say just a few things to the Commissioners about what you do."

Ms. Ashlea Thompson, Clerk, Sedgwick County Tag Office, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Yes. I am dependable, and I have good organization skills, and I'm always there on time, and I check to make sure the work is completed before moving on to new tasks. And thank you so much, Tim Norton."

Ms. Kizzire said, "Are you going to thank the others?"

Ms. Thompson said, "Thank you so much, Tim Norton, Karl Peterjohn, Jim Howell, Richard Ranzau, David Unruh."

Ms. Kizzire said, "I'd like to encourage all the county departments to at least take the experience firsthand and let the interns come and work. I know Darris worked at the Tag Office. He did an excellent job. It's a good program. I firmly believe in it. I think that it's a way to get people engaged in full-time work, and I just really appreciated the opportunity that SCDDO, thank you Tim and Jeannette, for asking us to host in interns, and I'll looking forward to this next school year. Thank you."

Chairman Howell said, "Thank you very, very much. Commissioners, do you have any comments this morning?"

MOTION

Chairman Howell moved to receive and file.

Commissioner Peterjohn seconded the motion

Commissioner Peterjohn thanked the Chairman and said, "I wanted to thank each and every one of the individuals who were recognized here today and want to wish them well as they venture out. I think it's just been a wonderful experience, and I appreciate all of your comments and want to wish you the best. Thank you."

Chairman Howell said, "Thank you Commissioner. I will also say I'm very, very impressed. Thank you for the program. I think it's a good vision that you have that you find folks that are able to do these things and give them a chance, you know. They're doing real work, and it's important that they have that opportunity. I'm glad that the county is looking for ways to connect these folks with the positions that we have open in our county. I think it's important. I love what you're providing in terms of that connection for this internship. I am curious. While they are doing the interning, I assume they do get paid for that?"

Ms. Livingston said, "No, it's an unpaid internship."

Chairman Howell said, "Unpaid, okay I see."

Ms. Livingston said, "They're also foregoing all of those school things you would do in your final year in order for invest in their future."

Chairman Howell said, "So they get credit for the internship for the school programs. But once we hire them, Ashlea, she's making money?"

Ms. Livingston said, "She is making money."

Chairman Howell said, "I'm sure she's making good money. All right, and maybe the others will as well. Well, thank you so much for the program. We do have a motion and a second."

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, "Madam Clerk, next item please."

Received and Filed

M [16-245](#)

CONTRACT FOR A HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE REMOTE
COLLECTION EVENT ON MAY 14, 2016 FOR CITY OF GODDARD,
KANSAS.

Presented by: Susan Erlenwein, Director, Environmental Resources.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approve the contract.

Ms. Susan Erlenwein, Director, Environmental Resources greeted the Commissioners and said, "Sedgwick County has a household hazardous waste facility. This is a place where residents can take unwanted oils, paints, solvents, cleaners, old gasoline, even fluorescent light bulbs for proper and safe disposal and recycling. This facility is located at 801 Stilwell and it is open Tuesday through Friday 9 A.M. to 5 P.M. and Saturday from 9 A.M. to 3 P.M. But in order to better serve our community, we also have five remote household hazardous waste collection events every year. This Saturday is our second remote event. It's going to be located in Goddard, and it will be at the Goddard City Shop Saturday the 14th from 9 A.M. to 1 P.M.

"That city shop is located at 1206 South 199th Street West. This is approximately half a mile north of Highway 54 on the east side of 199th. So we encourage anyone in the area, western part of the county, who has unwanted household hazardous waste to take the material to this remote collection on Saturday. Hoping for good weather. We have a list of what we will accept or won't accept on our website, or if people have a question, they can call 660-7646. And again, this is the website, www.sedgwickcounty.org. The city council of Goddard approved the contract that's before you today, and I would recommend your approval and ask the Chairman to sign and I'd be willing to answer any questions."

Chairman Howell said, "Thank you for the presentation. Commissioners, what's the will of the board? Commissioner Peterjohn."

MOTION

Commissioner Peterjohn moved to approve the contract.

Commissioner Norton seconded the motion.

Chairman Howell said, "We have a motion and a second, any other discussion? I would just say this is a good program, taking this opportunity out to the public in their own communities I think probably gets some stuff collected that otherwise would never make it to Stilwell"

Ms. Erlenwein said, "That's true."

Chairman Howell said, "That stuff gets put in the trash or flushed down the toilet, buried in the backyard or just ignored, and frankly, that's not good for the community. We need stuff taken care of properly. So by having this resource at Stilwell but also in the community close to where people live, I think, is a great resource, great opportunity, a better way to handle this."

Ms. Erlenwein said, "The more that can make it, the better."

Chairman Howell said, "Did you say you take old medicines as well?"

Ms. Erlenwein said, "Right. We'll take prescription medicines, over the counter medicines as long as they're not controlled. Controlled would be what you would need for pain, Lortab's, codeine, morphine. Anything like that, we will not take. We need sheriff officers there for that. Besides that, the typical prescriptions over the counter, we will take."

Chairman Howell said, "Very good. I understand also that the facility there at Stilwell

also sells, resells some of the stuff that people turn in that has value. There's paint, other things that you can get."

Ms. Erlenwein said, "Well, we have a swap and shop area, and when materials come in that are in good condition, for example, we would open the cans of paint, make sure it's not moldy, that the labels are readable. We'll put those out on the shelf to help people take those. People get it for free, except we do mix paints in 5-gallon containers and we have white, tan and gray, and we sell those 5-gallon containers for \$25. But all of the other material is free. We have regular customers who come in, teachers.

"I do give paint away to the Police Department or Sheriff for covering up graffiti, and some nonprofits, I give the paint away too as far as the five gallon containers. But the other stuff, one gallon and all, free for anyone who comes in. And last year, the swap and shop saved the county over \$98,000 by us not having to dispose of that material."

Chairman Howell said, "That's wonderful. I appreciate that. Good information, as well, and I hope the community takes advantage of the opportunity there on Stilwell to get some free stuff that might help them out in their homes."

Ms. Erlenwein said, "That's right."

Chairman Howell said, "And also get rid of things they don't need."

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, "Madam Clerk, next item please."

Approved

N [16-286](#)

PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A PETITION REQUESTING CREATION OF A ROAD IMPROVEMENT BENEFIT DISTRICT IN REDMOND ESTATES ADDITION AND CONSIDERATION OF A RESOLUTION DETERMINING THE ADVISABILITY OF AND AUTHORIZING THE CREATION THE DISTRICT. DISTRICT 3. Presented by: Joe L. Norton, Gilmore and Bell, P.C., Bond Counsel.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Open the public hearing, close the public hearing and adopt the resolution.

VISUAL PRESENTATION

Mr. Joe Norton, Gilmore and Bell, County's Bond Counsel, greeted the Commissioners and said, "The county has received a petition signed by residents of a portion of Redmond Estates, requesting the construction of a street and drainage improvements of an asphalt suburban residential street according to the plans and

specs approved by County Public Works in the creation of a benefit district to assess the cost thereof.

"On the map before you is a picture generally locating Redmond Estates. It is south of 31st Street South, North of MacArthur Road between 135th Street and 119th Street West. This map depicts the proposed boundaries of the district that are outlined in green and the proposed road improvement districts that are identified in black.

"This map of the benefit district shows owners of 23 of the 32 properties. Execute petition requesting the County Clerk, the district and authorizing improvements. This map shows in white the properties that executed the petition, and in red those property owners did not sign the petition.

"Public works has prepared an estimate of cost for this project, which is approximately \$679,000, which when divided equally among the 32 parcels, that would be about \$21,213 per parcel. 100 percent of the cost to be assessed, no portion to be paid by the county at large. Assuming a four percent interest rate, property owners that desire to have this project assessment spread over 15 years at four percent would be approximately \$1,908 per year.

"On April 13th, the county received this petition and set this date for a public hearing for anyone who wanted to address the commission. That notice was mailed to all property owners and published as pursuant to your request. Jim Weber and Lynn Packer of Public Works are here. They're familiar with the actual project, and are all available to answer questions either now or at the conclusion of public comment."

Chairman Howell said, "Alright. Well, thank you for the comments. Anything else from you at the moment?"

Mr. Norton said, "No. I'll put this map back up here in case one of the commentaries want to show where he or she lives."

Chairman Howell said, "Alright. Well, it's our responsibility at this time to conduct the hearing. I'd like to go ahead and open the public hearing for this agenda item. I do have four people who signed up to speak earlier. It's my assumption they will want to speak at this time. I hope they're still here. If there is someone else that hasn't signed up to speak, I would also give you a chance to speak as well. I'd like to go ahead and open the hearing now, and we'll take some public comments. Is Craig Brown here in the audience? Sir, would you like to come up to the microphone and we'll give you up to five minutes to speak to the commission."

Mr. Craig Brown, 12515 West 35th Street South, Wichita, greeted the Commissioners and said, "This is a want, not a need, and it's not wanted by everyone in the area. If you look at the majority vote, yes, majority vote passed, but if you look at the total 32 units, the 11 did not vote is one-third of that. It is my understanding that special assessments are charges levied against property owners to fund a public project which creates a benefit in those properties lying within a special geographical area.

"While I understand this premise, I have wondered how that benefit is measured. Is it based on the benefit to the property value or does it take into consideration the financial limitations that some property owners may have? Levied assessments require that the property owner benefit by measurable increase in the property's market value. The amount of tax is limited by that measurable increase in value. In order for a special assessment to be valid, the assessment may not exceed the special benefit being levied. The benefit is measured by the difference between what

a willing buyer is willing to pay versus what a willing seller may pay for the property improvements. If the assessment is set higher than the special benefit, it could be determined that this is excessive. In the amount of \$21,213 that we just heard plus any interest added depending on the property's owner ability to pay.

"Ten years ago, a special assessment to the property owners building at that time was \$9,000, which would be a little bit more reasonable benefit value to our property. Continuing with these assessments exceed the special benefits received from the project. There are numerous negative impacts of the projects including increased noise, trash, traffic, decreased safety, privacy, accessibility and potential liability to others trying to visit the property owners.

"I'm off on Tuesdays with my daughter who is five years old. We are typically outside a lot during that period of time. I see flatbed semis with trusses coming in. I see concrete trucks, dirt haulers, all kinds of traffic coming in and out of the residence. This is also going to detour them from being able to get their projects done on time. I've heard that this board had made mention recently that it didn't wish to front personal projects like this. If that is the case, I would like to see that upheld here.

"I personally contacted a few real estate agents and a previous County Appraiser who is now a real estate agent that I know and mentioned the situation to him. He said it would be extremely tough to put a value on a home just because of a paved road. He was familiar with the particular instance where a road was paved much like we're talking about here and the increase was minimal. For example, saying to a \$150,000 home, maybe an increase of 1,000 to 1,500 bucks. I know we're talking about homes of considerable higher values here than the one mentioned above, but he couldn't say exactly how much it could increase our property depending upon its current value.

"I feel a majority vote should not force a financial obligation on a person or family that could put them in hardship, plus keep in mind one-third of the homeowners voted no. The reason you're getting opposition to this proposal is the cost, the timing for some who haven't built or are still building and the detriment to our current lifestyle depending upon each family's current responsibilities or situations. Some of us may be taking care of elderly parents, have a child with special needs, kids in college or still raising a family where costs rise as the kids get older. Such activities further help them with interaction with others in a competitive environment, increased tuition fees.

"They may need a vehicle to go to and from work, and of course, the extra cost of putting them on our insurance policy. We've all had these responsibilities or will incur them at some point in time in our life. Personally, I have four children, two of which are teenagers, and my spouse is currently taking advanced education. These are all costs that I have and will increase as time goes on.

"Put yourself in my shoes and consider how you would feel if someone made you financially obligated for something you didn't feel was worth the cost versus spending the money on your own family to benefit them. And for those who have to finance this obligation, that cost is even more. Please take time to take a look at the things I've mentioned, knowing that every family's situation and obligations are different and don't put them into additional hardship for something that we already have that functions well. Thank you for hearing me."

Chairman Howell said, "Thank you Mr. Brown. We'll allow commissioners to ask questions at the end of this. So if anybody wants to have further discussion with Mr. Brown, that would be fine. I'd like to call up Tammy Sheridan, if she's here."

Ms. Tammy Sheridan, 12340 West 34th Court. South, Wichita, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I've helped facilitate the blacktop petition for Redmond Estates. I'd like to take a brief moment to give you a little history on the petition and why we think it's imperative we move forward with paving our streets. First a little history. My husband and I first began looking at Redmond Estates about eight years ago. At that time, there was only one phase completed. The houses are situated on one acre lots in a plot the subdivision. Phase one was fully blacktopped and had two entrances with a decorative brick wall along the eastern edge.

"When we discussed options at that time, phase two was not ready to be opened, but was already plotted. We asked about the roads and were told the plan was to have like kind in the next phase. For many reasons, it took phase two longer to open than expected, but fast forward four years to the beginning of phase two. When we decided to build a gravel cul-de-sac had been made so our neighbors could get to the property they had purchased several years earlier. This opened two more lots, one of which we purchased. Before purchasing our lot, we again discussed blacktop. We were told once half of the lots were purchased, we could petition for blacktop. Obviously that process has been a little more detailed than originally laid out, but the intention has always been to have blacktop in the next phase once houses were built and that matched phase one.

"When we built our home, electricity had not been laid in any of phase two or phase three, and instead of just laying electricity to the two lots, the developers decided to cut the roads for phase two and open the next phase. Several months later, phase three roads were added as well. Once again, we were told the intention was to have the roads black topped once lots were sold and houses were built. So we waited. Approximately a year and a half ago, we started the process, we had seven of fourteen houses build in phase two. By the time we met in April 2015, several lots in phase three had also been purchased.

"At that meeting, it was decided to include phase two and three as one petition. In August 2015, we had thirteen yes votes, six no votes, three no responses and nine lots owned by the developer. I personally spoke with the developer several times. They did not want to be responsible for the vote on nine lots. They knew several were getting ready to sell and they wanted to the homeowners to make that decision as they would be responsible for the specials. We waited a little more.

"By January 2016, all 32 lots have been sold. We began the inquiry process again with all 32 lot and homeowners. Current owners were contacted through e-mail. I personally mailed letters to all new lot owners as well. All 32 owners were notified of the meeting and petition inquiry. We held a neighborhood meeting February 22nd. Prior to the meeting, I advised Mr. Packer from Sedgwick County planning that we had more than 50 percent and felt we should move the petition from an inquiry petition to the official petition for blacktop.

"The official petition for blacktop was presented at the meeting. This included the petition process, estimated costs and estimated timelines. There was also a question and answer period. Owners were also able to contact Mr. Packer directly for questions and answers. It took about one week to connect with all 32 homeowners. We received a response from all but one owner when the petition was completed, we had 23 yes votes and 9 no votes, which left us a little over 70 percent in favor of the petition.

"This brings us to today's meeting. I am here as a yes vote, and I'm also representing several families that were not able to join us today due to work schedule conflicts. We have three main reasons that we feel strongly about the petition. Expectation, based

on the conversations that we had before we purchased personally and during our build, we expected to have blacktop areas. It is a reasonable belief that if you drive into a neighborhood on blacktop, the blacktop would be extended to the new phase. Knowing that we would eventually have payment was part of the determining factor in purchasing our lots

"Quality of life, we have lived in our house for three and a half years. We moved to Redmond because it has a country feel but not actually in the country. We are 1.5 miles from the city limits. Some say we moved to the country so it's not an issue to have gravel. I disagree. I like some aspects, but I do not like the gravel, how it has impacted the quality of our life. I have been told that I should not be bothered because I have farm fields around me. I do, but I don't have dust from the farm fields. I have dust from the gravel when the cars hit the blacktop to the gravel every single day.

"I can close my windows when the farmer comes by once a year, but I can't close my windows every single day when the dust hits from the cars. It covers the inside services of my house. It irritates my allergies. If it is dry, the dust flies every time a car goes by. If it is wet, we track mud into the garage. I love having my windows open so I can hear the birds and feel the breeze. The gravel does not allow this. I didn't move into a \$300,000 plus house so that I could be a prisoner inside. I am tired of fighting these elements.

"Property values, although we will not be able to increase our property value by \$20,000, the lack of blacktop can decrease our property value. If we were to sell our house, we would miss out on buyers that would not even look at houses on a gravel road. Most of the houses in our development are of a higher end house. Most buyers looking in that price range would not expect to be on a gravel road. Because of this, we may have to have a lower asking price for property tax. I realize the cost is great to have blacktop in a neighborhood. Unfortunately, as the gravel road ages, the costs will not be reduced but more likely be increased. We'd like to have this done while the structure on the road is good. We realize it will take sacrifice on our part. However, we feel the long-term benefits out way the cost. This was put to a vote, and 70 percent agree the benefits outweigh the cost. My hope is you vote yes and move forward with the petition. Thank you for your time."

Chairman Howell said, "Thank you Ms. Sheridan. I would like to call up Doug Sheridan if he's here. Thank you Mr. Sheridan for being here. I'll give you five minutes as well."

Mr. Doug Sheridan, 12340 West 34th Court. South, Wichita, greeted the Commissioners and said, "We were the second house to build within phase two. I would like to point out on the map, the red circle, the red highlighted area is the area of concern and it's all gravel road right now. The area to the right of that is the old phase one and that is completely paved right there all roads in there. The far right is 119th street. That's paved also. Everything is coming in paved until you get to the phase two and phase three developments. There have been several comments about the value of paved roads versus the appraised value of homes.

"I agree that one is not likely to see an appreciable bump in value due to paved roads. There is a marketability for a house that is for sale for potential buyers and the intrinsic value of that sale. There is a marketing advantage to having a paved roadway. There are people who would not consider a house on a dirt or gravel road, and this reduces the potential buyer market. This in turn raises the possibility of longer times on the market and reduced selling prices. Given the price point of houses in this neighborhood, when you try to sell and the time comes to reduce the

price because you're not getting offers, that reduction will likely not be one or two thousand dollars but maybe 10 to \$20,000 depending on how long it's on the market and the need to sell. Right there is your road cost.

"Will this be true of everyone? No. But given the number of houses in the neighborhood, it is likely there is a significant number. A number of people in the next 10 to 20 years that may be affected by this. I normally, I would not normally consider a house on a dirt and gravel road. We only considered this with the anticipation the road would be paved in the same manner as in phase one.

"I moved here 17 years ago, took a job at Cessna. I came from Ohio. You have to look long and hard to find roads out in the middle of nowhere that are actually gravel. Most roads tend to be paved, even in the townships and stuff. Like here, we're even in the middle of the city, you find gravel roads. So when we first moved here, unless it was absolutely necessary, I avoided all gravel roads at that time, before the Maize Road flyover. We used to live in that development south of Kellogg and west of Maize. I could have taken the "Maize Road traffic light, gone south and turned right on to Car Road that had a small gravel stretch. That might have been easier instead of going up to Lark and making a left turn across traffic on Kellogg where there was no traffic light.

"Obviously, the flyover now eliminates that problem. I avoided the dirt roads at all costs. I mentioned also, it might not be logical. I mentioned the road conditions, the paved road in phase one. It's not logical to come into this neighborhood to believe that phase 2 and phase 3 would not be paved.

"Some other cost considerations. The dollar amount provided by the county is the worst case maximum. This includes having to refurbish the road bed, high asphalt costs, having to modify all culverts, having to perform all full driveways reconstruction. Most likely given the condition of the existing gravel road, this will not be required.

"Second, the cost on vehicles, increased wear on vehicles due to the wash boarding on the roads, extra dirt, rock abrasions and wear and damage on your vehicle. Cost on the house, tracking that dirt, dust, and gravel into the house increases wear and damage potential to wood, tile and carpet, dust on the furniture and blowing everywhere, and finally allergies, as my wife mentioned earlier.

"We are surrounded by farm fields. There is dirt and dust generated from these fields, but these are only plowed a couple times a year. During the summer, there are crops, and that maintains the dirt and keeps the dirt and dust down. So very windy days do not pick up much dirt. This significantly limits the number of days that dirt and dust would be blowing into the neighborhood. That's all I need to say. Thank you."

Chairman Howell said, "Thank you very much, Mr. Sheridan. I'd like to see is David Nance here?"

Mr. David Nance, 3502 South Cedar Downs, Wichita, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I believe Mr. Sheridan covered all the bases that I was thinking about talking about, too. I believe what I can say is that the quality of, sorry. I feel naked. I don't have any notes. But I do believe the quality of houses we are building out at Redmond Estates, I've talked to many people and they said they would love to build out there but only with asphalt roads.

"I think it would add value to it, the quality and expense of house we build out there. The people that could afford those and like to afford those tend to have nicer cars.

You cannot have a clean car out there, there's no possible way. It's just the small things you think about. Oh, yeah, I like dirt roads I built. Mr. Coleman and Kelly both told us there would be real good possibilities that those roads would be paved, and that's what my expectations were. Okay, I'll live there for a year, year and a half and hopefully get those expectations. As they said before, \$681,000, that is the worst case scenario.

"The interest on that, I'd rather spend towards my family. My answer to that is how about the interest you're paying on your house? Ten times, twenty times more than what the interest is going to be on a paved road. Your children play on a smooth paved road, ride their bicycles, whatever they do out there, they can, skate boards. Sand, rock, gravel, it's slippery. Bicycles very easily slip and hurt yourself. I do simple things, and I see that it's feasible to have paved roads, and that's what I was hoping for. That's all I have to say."

Chairman Howell said, "All right. Thank you. Is there anybody else here that would like to speak to the Commission before I close the public comment part of this? Seeing none, and I probably should have had you state the addresses for the record. We do have them written down on the comment sign-up sheets. We do have the addresses for the record. But seeing no other comments, I'd like to go ahead and close the hearing for Redmond Estates and bring it back to the Board. Commissioner Ranzau."

Commissioner Ranzau thanked the Chairman and said, "First, I have some questions for Joe, just to kind of clarify. I looked at this petition, and there are a lot more than 11 people who haven't signed."

Mr. Norton said, "The statute provides that for a signature for a property to be valid that all the owners of that property need to sign. So where there are multiple owners of a parcel, a husband, a wife, sometimes other family members, all of them have to sign for that property to be included. So I think the petition that was prepared by public works shows all of the record owners of property. So there may be multiple owners of a parcel that did not sign."

Chairman Howell said, "Let me interject on page two of our backup material, it lists the names of the owners. That repeats itself on page 54 of the backup material. It repeats on page 61."

Mr. Norton said, "Also Mr. Chair I might add Mr. Webber reminded me, there were two different petitions circulated and combined together. So some will show that."

Chairman Howell said, "I see at least one signature on the second petition and the bulk of them on the first petition. It's the same list of names."

Mr. Norton said, "Correct."

Chairman Howell said, "I counted them up. I think I see nine names on the first petition, or nine areas that are not signed on the first petition. Maybe I'm wrong in counting them. But that's what I see right now. Commissioner Ranzau any further comments or questions on that or anything else?"

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Yes, I have some questions for Public Works. Can you tell me what the length of these roads are all together and what exactly, how is this being paved?"

Mr. Norton said, "I'm going to defer to Lynn. He put the project together and has

worked with these folks and he can answer those questions better than I can."

Mr. Lynn Packer, Public Works, greeted the Commissioners and said, "The length is approximately a little over a half a mile. The manner in which it's going to be constructed is meeting county standards. Our intention is to have a good sound road base. If we find what was previously built out there, which did meet our expectations at the time that road was built, is a solid base, we'll leave that and add 7 inches of hot mix asphalt. If we find issues with the sub base, we'll end up having to remove the gravel that's there now and replace it with what we commonly just refer to as a rock and tensor which is a gravel base with a mat below that, that spreads a level of forces and provides a good strong base for that road along with the typical seven inches of asphalt.

"The estimate we've prepared also includes, obviously, shoulders matching that, which was done in the first phase of Redmond Estates, and if we have any culverts, ditches that aren't draining, things like that, we address those issues as well and we go through there and make the improvements."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "So my question is, this is about half a mile, and its costing 678,000. Well, I know in other areas we're doing miles, a mile for that cost. So it seems to me, is this twice the cost of what we are doing in some other areas, and what's the explanation there?"

Mr. Packer said, "Probably the most basic explanation, and I'll defer to the county engineer, when we have a situation where homeowners are going to be paying for roads for the next 15 years, we are going to utilize tried and true methods and construction. Those methods right now that we're utilizing in some locations, specialized locations, to get a lower cost are experimental and have not been fully vetted by public works. We think we're on a cusp of making some great strides in some alternative construction methods that will help us reduce costs in the future, but we don't know the longevity of those roads and those bases, and we would definitely hate for someone to be paying for these roads for the next potentially 15 years and have to find out that after five, six, seven years the base goes up on them or fatigue cracking."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Well, that's true for the taxpayer too, though. Have more cost effective alternatives been offered?"

Mr. Packer said, "We have discussed them, but they were ruled out as an option to pursue."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Who ruled them out?"

Mr. Packer said, "That would be the County Engineer."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "So it hasn't been offered to the public?"

Mr. Packer said, "No., this particular situation, some of residents had heard about options, other options, when they called around to find out what it would cost to do a road from other contractors, and they inquired about them. We discussed it. And ruled that out as a legitimate option."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Well, I don't think the government should rule that option out. I think we should give that to the landowners, myself. \$21,000 is a lot of money. I would be sympathetic, if I was out there, to alternatives. That's a lot of money. I'm disappointed that we didn't offer those alternatives and let the people

decide for themselves. That's all I have for now. Thank you."

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

Commissioner Peterjohn thanked the Chairman and said, "Let me ask you. Did you say seven inches of asphalt?"

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

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "That's just a hot mix, cold mix, or something else?"

Mr. Packer said, "That is hot mix asphalt."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Hot mix asphalt, because I was interested in terms of the cost. It's a little hard from looking at this and having driven out there. My eyeball isn't as calibrated as it used to be. What's the average size of the lots out there? Is that something that's, I didn't see that in the backup material. Maybe I missed it."

Mr. Packer said, "I believe those are one acre lots. They're all very similar in size, plus or minus an acre."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Roughly an acre in size, okay."

Mr. Caleb Everitt, 12401 West 35th Street South, Wichita, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Can I mention one thing? Phase one, when they had their blacktop, I imagine, I think it's seven years ago. They were half the cost of what they're wanting us to pay, but I just wanted to bring this that up. They were about 10; I believe \$10,000 a lot, and they want \$21,000 from us, and I believe oil prices were lower back then than they are today, or no. They're lower now than they were back then. I just wanted to make a point."

Chairman Howell said, "Well, thank you very much. Lynn Packer if you'd like to respond to that. If you'd like to, it's up to you."

Mr. Packer said, "We did look at phase one assessments when this came through. I was with the department when that was instigated by the developer in phase one and saw the end of that. The per ton asphalt prices on that project came in, if I remember correctly, it was very close to about \$21 a ton. Currently, as of this year, we're paying around \$65 a ton. At the time the petition went around, we originally talked about this in 2014, this was, excuse me, 2015. There was about \$80, \$85 a ton. It does fluctuate. I can't speak to oil prices back at that time, it was 15 years ago. But I can say that I did look up the estimates for the construction actual bids, and that was the price for asphalt at the time."

Chairman Howell said, "Can you verify the road type of construction in phase one, is that the same as we're talking about here for this phase?"

Mr. Packer said, "It's identical."

Chairman Howell said, "Okay, Commissioner Peterjohn any other comments?"

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "No, thank you."

Chairman Howell said, "Commissioners, I don't see any other comments at the time. What's the will of the board? Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn thanked the Chairman and said, "I'm familiar with this area, and the efforts to develop down in the southwest part of the county. An event like this is always a challenge, because you've got to try and internalize community costs as we're structured under state law. Other states handle these types of situations differently than Kansas does. I have some concerns in terms of the costs here, and hopefully we can come up with a project that would meet the needs of the community and tries to do so at a reasonable price as possible.

"So I'm going to recommend that we adopt the resolution, but I understand the challenges, and I would state to public works, the costs here are significant, but there's very nice homes in this development. I'm glad to see it continue to grow and flourish, but this is a significant burden that would be added to the folks who live in that area, and that's one of the reasons why I'd like to try and see where we could in the future try and internalize and obviously if the costs can be reduced and we can get a good quality product, try and do so. That's my proposal at this point."

Chairman Howell said, "Thank you commissioner. So we have a motion. Let me say further that looking at the petition again, I recounted a couple times. There's 32 property owners, if I counted correctly, and nine of those did not sign. So we do the quick math, 72 percent in favor. I did hear from those that spoke during the public comment part of this, and I understand the point that it would be nice if 100 percent of the property owners would agree to this. I don't know that's a reasonable expectation. I'm not sure you can ever get to 100 percent. The nine that did not sign, I don't know how to interpret that, if that means they're neutral or they're opposed. It could be either. Obviously those that did sign the petition are in favor of this, but those that did not sign, it's not clear to me by looking at the petition what their position actually is.

"I do understand from Craig Brown his position, because he came and spoke to us today. I don't have any other information to go from. The testimony of the Ms. Sheridan was very compelling to me. I believe that the expectation was clearly communicated to them when they purchased the property. I would assume that most property owners out there probably were told similar things, and it seems like a reasonable expectation. Quality of life is a pretty big deal. To the extent that 72 percent of the people want this, to me, the democratic position ought to be we should let the community choose for themselves what they want to do, and I think they've spoken to us through the petition. So I would like to second the motion."

MOTION

Commissioner Peterjohn moved to adopt the Resolution with instructions to Public Works to investigate cost reduction and quality of product.

Chairman Howell 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	No
Chairman Howell	Aye

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

Adopted

O [16-253](#)

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS' REGULAR MEETING ON MAY 5, 2016.

Presented by: Joe Thomas, Director, Purchasing Department.

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

Mr. Joe Thomas, Purchasing Director greeted the Commissioners and said, "The meeting of the board of bids and contracts of May 5 results in eight items for your consideration this morning:

1. DENTAL SUPPLIES. HEALTH DEPARTMENT.

Recommendation is to accept the overall low bid from Dental Health Products Incorporated and establish contract pricing for one year with two one-year options to renew.

2. OUTDOOR WARNING SIREN EQUIPMENT. EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT.

Recommendation is to accept the quote from Acoustic Technology Incorporated and execute contract pricing for three years with two one-year options to renew.

3. HP DESKTOP COMPUTERS, LAPTOPS & TABLETS. METROPOLITAN AREA BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION DEPARTMENT (MABCD).

This Recommendation is to accept the low responsive bid from CDW-G in the amount of \$114,888.04.

4. PAINTED PAVEMENT MARKING. PUBLIC WORKS.

Recommendation is to accept the low bid from Traffic Control Services in the amount of \$420,686.50.

5. BUILDING FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER. FACILITIES DEPARTMENT.

Recommendation is to accept the proposal from MWCB, LLC and enter negotiations with the intent to execute a contract to purchase a newly constructed building at the Wichita State University Innovation Campus for a total cost of \$9,542,379.

6. HVAC CONTROL SYSTEM. FACILITIES DEPARTMENT

Recommendation is to accept the base bid with alternate no. two from Five Star Mechanical Incorporated in the amount of \$135,151, and to establish unit pricing for alternate number one, which involves replacement of dampers and actuators. A unit price of \$890 each.

7. PHARMACY SERVICES. CORRECTIONS DEPARTMENT.

Recommendation is to execute an agreement with Dandurand Pharmacy for a not to exceed amount of \$100,000.

8. DAIRY PRODUCTS. CORRECTIONS DEPARTMENT.

Recommendation is to accept the low bid from Dean Foods doing business as Southern Foods Group, LLC, and to establish contract pricing for two years with three one-year options to renew.

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

Chairman Howell said, "Thank you for the information. Commissioners, what's the will of the board? Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn thanked the Chairman and said, "I'm going to make a motion that we approve the recommendations of the Board of Bids and Contracts except for Item five."

Chairman Howell said, "Item five, I think it's our intent to talk about that one independently so we're not taking a position on item five right now, but the rest of the items together, except for item five, the motion is to accept everything."

MOTION

Commissioner Peterjohn moved to approve the recommendations of the Board of Bids and Contracts except item five.

Chairman Howell seconded the motion.

There was no further discussion and the vote was called.

VOTE

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

Chairman Howell said, "We're on item number 5, Law Enforcement Training Center. I expect we'll have some good discussion on this. Commissioners, I'll open this up to you and allow you to ask questions or make comments as we get started here. Commissioner Ranzau."

Commissioner Ranzau thanked the Chairman and said, "Joe, I have a couple of questions. The information we have here says there were two assessments. The first one, was there any objective data that was created, a ratings scheme? We have four of them."

Mr. Thomas said, "Yes, sir. Usually when we, and I was not part of this particular evaluation committee, but generally there is a matrix we evaluate the specifications as outlined in the RFP (Request For Proposal). Whether part of that committee, would like to be more specific."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Maybe Steve can talk to this."

Mr. Steven Claassen, Facilities Parks Director, Facility Maintenance Services, greeted the Commissioners and said, "The first committee did create a list of criteria that we wanted to evaluate the proposals on. There was not a formal calculation or

vote taken on it. Each committee member assessed this independently on their own and vocalized their position on it. It was clear that the Law Enforcement Training Center at that time for the first group, it was heavily weighted on Law Enforcement, a lot of representatives from Law Enforcement in that first group. And it was very clear that the Law Enforcement Training Center at Innovation Campus was the preferred option."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "What were the results of the objective criteria? Were there numbers assessed given to all four?"

Mr. Claassen said, "Not formally."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "But what was the assessment that came out on those four?"

Mr. Claassen said, "As I said, each member looked at it independently."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "I understand, but what was the assessment given. Each of them were given a number, right?"

Mr. Claassen said, "It was not compiled that way, Commissioner."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "What do you mean it wasn't compiled that way? There was no number, there were numerical assessments made on all four buildings."

Mr. Claassen said, "Are you asking me whether there, I don't. What is the question?"

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Yes. I mean, that's a statement of fact, is it not?"

Mr. Claassen said, "That numerical values were assessed, were provided?"

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Yes, and all the numbers were added up"

Mr. Claassen said, "But as you know, when we spoke in Executive Session on this topic, the, it was unclear as to what that criteria would even be, and so we factored in the input that we received through those executive sessions on those criteria."

Mr. Michael Scholes, County Manager greeted the Commissioners and said, "If I recall, there's two evaluation teams. First one met, as Steve was indicating, four City of Wichita Police Department representatives and four Sheriff Deputy representatives, and they did develop a table with scoring criteria, etcetera. I threw out those recommendations in order to give the Commissioners a chance to weigh in on the criteria itself."

"I felt it was predetermined, and I wanted the Commissioners who hadn't had a voice yet in determining the criteria to get a voice in the criteria before that was tabulated, and so the Commissioners did, when we met with all the Commissioners, then there was another evaluation team after that, that met to discuss the different proposals. And so the second evaluation team met to discuss those proposals and chose the Innovation Campus after that."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Was there any objective criteria used in there that can be revealed?"

Mr. Scholes said, "I was not in that evaluation team."

Mr. Claassen said, "And there was, again, no numerical assessment, nothing recorded."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Okay. There wasn't a numerical assessment, there was a numerical assessment in the first one. Why aren't we revealing that? What is wrong with revealing that?"

Mr. Scholes said, "It was revealed to you?"

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Yes."

Mr. Scholes said, "And based off of us changing that criteria, it would make whatever was done in that session moot because the criteria changed from what they rated it at."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "But I think it's important to publicly expose the numerical evaluation that was done initially. I don't know why the criteria was changed. This is the deal. We have four options here. The preferred option, \$9.5 million. There's a cheaper option, for example, for \$6.2 million. What I thought initially was evaluated on par with, I thought three of them were tied. So the question is, why you talked to the, we're talking to the taxpayers. We want to know the objective criteria for paying \$3 million more if we go that route. Keep in mind it this original thing started at a \$30 million project, and now we're down to where we are today and I think we need to get a quality project at a good price. I have concerns about the process. I'll review a little bit.

"Last year, after the City of Wichita got a first, got a new Mayor, I contacted him and set up, got together, and the very first meeting we had, the very first item we talked about was this item. My suggestion was that we have an RFP for this so that we can get all bids, open process, people can bid, get the best product for our community. A month later, he came back and said, okay, let's do it. So we did this. We did an RFP on behalf of the City of Wichita and Sedgwick County, and I thought this was a process that both of us were involved in and a process that is supposed to provide open government and add some integrity to the system.

"It's problematic, I think, that elected officials make public statements about one particular choice prior to the procedure following course. I think it's premature and inappropriate and brings significant harm to the integrity process. I want to be able to tell the taxpayers and the other bidders, not just in this RFP process but any process, when you put a bid in, the outcome is not predetermined. And when public officials make statements that predetermine the outcome that is problematic. That sort of thing is what makes people lose confidence in the credibility of government, which we have plenty of nowadays. There's a couple on this list that I think would be excellent choices. I'm not opposed to what's been recommended here. But I'm not opposed to in others that are more cost effective. One of my biggest concerns is that we can look at the taxpayers in the eye and say this was a system whose integrity was not violated. That's important far beyond just this particular decision.

"So that's why I'm trying to get information out and try to see how we got to this position and wrap my mind around what's going on. Not taking the lowest bid rarely happens. It has happened in the past. The most famous example is the airport, and that caused a lot of brouhaha about that. But when there is no objective criteria, that's also problematic, because that's just, that's problematic. So I guess we're not going to disclose all the details, but I just have some concerns about how we move forward here. Certainly this is an important situation that we need to resolve, and I think we will at some point, but my concerns about, those are some of my concerns that I have

here. I'm not quite sure how to resolve that and get to where we need to be while at the same time insuring that the public knows that there's integrity in the system. That's you all I have for now, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Howell said, "Thank you for your comments. Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh thanked the Chairman and said, "I am in agreement with much of what Commissioner Ranzau says. The first pass through, there was in the numerical analysis of rating, there was a three way tie, and that's one of the reasons we thought we should take another go at this, because there wasn't a clear leader in the options we had at that time. And so I think probably that was a reasonable thing to do if it wasn't a clear indication of what was the best option and we're spending this much money.

"Of the options that are presented to us, it's clear that there is one option that is substantially less expensive, less of an investment for the citizens to make, but my thinking on this is that we definitely need to move forward with the project. We have to get this Law Enforcement Training Center established. We have to do it in partnership with our counterparts in the City of Wichita, and we have to do something that is satisfactory to both the Sheriff's Office and the city police.

"Because of the way that this has evolved, it seems to me like the Law Enforcement Training Center at Innovation Campus is what seems to be the preference of most people, but I would agree that you're going to have a hard time, well, Joe, maybe you can tell me why the \$9.2 million, \$9.5 million proposal is better than the \$6.2 million. What was that process?"

Mr. Thomas said, "Generally in a proposal, sir, cost is an important factor, and again, since I wasn't part of either one of the evaluation committees, that is taken into consideration, but a proposal allows us to look at other factors that may be outside the cost, again going back to whether it's qualitative or quantitative, but to tell you the reason the difference, what, why it was accepted, looking at this tells you it's not strictly the costs. A proposal allows us that latitude of not having the cost as the determining factor. It is an important factor, but not necessarily the determining factor."

Commissioner Unruh said, "That's helpful, and I know we're in a situation here where we need to get this facility going and we need to work in conjunction with our partners and that's an over lot riding consideration for me as I am about to make a vote on this but it is clear as Commissioner Ranzau said, that there is a substantially less expensive option. I don't know Mr. Chairman if I recognize some of the folks who have bid on this, I don't know if they want an opportunity to speak, or how you want to handle this."

Chairman Howell said, "Thank you Commissioner, I certainly want to hear from the audience as well on this item, we typically do that on any New Business, so I would do that here at some point before I do that."

Mr. Scholes said, "Chairman can I make..."

Chairman Howell said, "Yes, sir."

Mr. Scholes said, "Getting back to Commissioner Ranzau's remarks, going back to the evaluation teams, there were two evaluation teams. I felt the first evaluation team was pre-determined. I think a lot of the participants of that board, of that team, came in with a predisposed, pre-selected outcome. The reason I insisted on a second

evaluation team was to have a clean process, so that second team actually came back together and met. Now, I don't know if they did or didn't do a table, because I didn't influence or talk to or be a part of that in any way, shape or form, but the reason I held that second team was to do a second look, to make the process as clean as possible.

"Because I felt like that first team was predisposed to choose a particular course of action. So I threw those results out. I felt that table was influenced by that pre-selection, so to me, getting you into the process and establishing criteria, which changed, if you remember, from what that team chose, so it did change what they were looking at, based off your input, in which allowed for that second team to meet and do it through your filter as well."

Chairman Howell said, "Let me respond to that comment quickly. In the paragraph that's on the backup material, it says that there's a number of folks that were involved in the second review, and recognize most of these have connections directly to the county, not to the city. Thomas Stoltz is half and half, but it says this committee, second committee also reviewed the process, deliberation outcome of the initial review committee, and concluded it to be an adequate and appropriate process and recommendation.

"So despite any concerns we may have had in the first review process, the second committee basically validated what was presented at the first committee. My recollection to that was that there was a three-way tie, but in addition to that, there was some discussion, the Sheriff was there, gave some commentary in addition to the objective numerical weighting, his comments were, there were two bids he felt were very capable of providing all of the Law Enforcement training needs for the county, and that either one of those would have been great selection.

"So happens one of those was the low bid. But further comments were he talked about some of the other issues about the Innovation Campus location, the fact that we have a high crime area of the city, it would be nice to have a larger police presence, having connection to our criminal justice students at WSU (Wichita State University) was another consideration. And because of those items he felt that Innovation Campus afforded some unique opportunities that the other location did not support.

"Considering those things, even out of the two that he was recommending the one personally, but going back to the objective weightings, again, it was a three-way tie, and the discussion that day talked about there was two that would be very, very adequate for solving this community need. So anyway, again, I am just trying to reflect on what I remember, and if I am wrong about that, please someone correct me. But let's go ahead and go on. Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn thanked the Chairman and said, "I appreciate everyone who preceded me in comments. I agree with a large part of what they have pointed out. I think it is important for folks who have followed this how long a history we are talking about for this project. I have tried to dig into it. Of course I have an interest in history, but literally this does go back. I haven't run into anybody, I've gotten different data on how long this goes back from different people, but everybody agrees it goes back at least into the last century, so this is something that is not new by any stretch of the imagination. I think it's important, what we have here is a significantly lower cost for city and county taxpayers than the original proposals that we had in place that looking at cost between \$30 and \$35 million.

"I would also add that we have a challenge here, and I think it's a challenge that the

county, and also our friends across the street with the city, have met. We've had, I think an excellent example of city, county cooperation with the MAPCD (Metropolitan Area Building and Construction Department), it's taken a long time to do, but not nearly as long as we're talking about here in this case, but to have a continued city and county joint training facility, and this is unique.

"They teach up at the state facility that trains Law Enforcement folks for the other 104 counties and for the folks who are not part of either the Sedgwick County Sheriff or the Wichita Police Department. That state training that occurs up near, state facility near Yoder, we largely do not utilize except for the road training portion of the training that the county and city folks who are going to be sheriff deputies and police officers go through.

"So the factor that I look at here, and have been a concern when people have said, hey, what would you support, Commissioner. My response has often been at what price. Trying to look at the best value that we can get for the taxpayers, that's going to enhance Public Safety in this community. That's two joint, important priorities for me. So that's the approach I'm looking at in addressing this issue, and I very much appreciate the discussion we are having today, because this process has taken longer than I wanted, and there have been twists and turns along the way that I have stretched this out, and it is something, it is a need, in my opinion, that needs to be addressed, and I was hoping it would have been addressed prior to today. But it hasn't. So I am going to leave that there, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Howell said, "Thank you. I don't see any other lights on at the moment. It is an extremely important decision for this community, and I would love to have people from the audience that are here that are showing an interest in this agenda item, I would like to invite you to come to the microphone and give any comments that you would like, if you would like to do that, please come to the microphone, state your name and address, we will give you, see how many there are. Please raise your hand if you want to speak. Just a couple, okay. I would like to give you up to five minutes apiece."

Mr. Steve Martins, 810 North Cypress, Wichita, greeted the Commissioners and said, "My Entity, I am a part owner of the Entity Commerce Center, which is the low proposal. And I thank Commissioner Ranzau for his comments. One of the things I wanted to talk about today was having faith in the process and a little bit of what goes on the other side when a substantial RFP is sent out, and what the effort people put in believing in this process to go through.

"If you haven't, I invite you to visit Wichita State University's website, they are very excited about announcing the new building on their campus. It is a beautiful building, quite frankly, it rivals any corporate headquarters I'm aware of in the City of Wichita. But they certainly are very excited about having that there. As Commissioner Ranzau pointed out, and Mr. Thomas alluded to, there was a proposal sent out to various individuals. I believe based upon information that Mr. Thomas's office provided you all there were 14 people, 14 groups that responded, and four of those actually went forward and created a proposal.

"This is our proposal that we created, and we went through step by step of the needs and the utilization of the space, and the requirements that were set forth in the county proposal. I was fortunate enough to have Mr. Mark Hutton here today of Hutton Construction join our team, and work with us in analyzing this and putting it together. I can assure you we took the task very seriously, we spent a lot of our time, a lot of our effort to try to bring a solution to you, what we hoped would be a cost-effective solution. And it is extremely difficult. And I got to admit to you guys, disappointing to

listen to the conversation today, and I am familiar with this process, as many of you know, and I have worked on these teams that there is, there isn't a rating system or predisposed, pre-determined, I've heard those terms today, used, process in what's made here.

"If it's pencils, pickup trucks, computers, you look at a spec sheet, it's a pretty straightforward deal. You win or you don't. It's very, I think this is a very complicated process, and, you know, again, the beauty of this facility is very nice. I don't recall in, and I think we went back and looked, it was not there in the original proposal, that it had to rival a corporate headquarters facility in Wichita and the price be according to that.

"We have at is a good location. Well thought out plan. And I think this plan, based now upon what we see in the cost proposals, deserves additional consideration. I certainly don't want to be one to slow the process down, believe me. But it is just very troubling to me on what I am hearing for the first time on how this process has gone. As a business member of the community, and involved, that really, really disturbs me. We had zero communication with any of the committee, other than just me calling, asking for updates, and, again, I don't know the process, I don't know when Wichita State (University) first had this on their website, but it is just very disappointing. I thank you for the opportunity to speak. Mr. Chairman, if there are questions I would be happy to answer those."

Chairman Howell said, "Any questions for Mr. Martins? Seeing none right now. We will reserve the right to call you back up if you'll stay around. Any others that would like to speak? Please state your name and address."

Mr. Lonnie Wright, 1721 South Lulu, Wichita, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I feel there is added value locating the educational training facility with education. I think we'd end up with better educated and better trained officers, plus, a great resource for recruitment. I think the best value for taxpayers would be to locate at WSU, regardless of the politics involved. Thank you."

Chairman Howell said, "Thank you very much for your comments. Anybody else in the audience want to speak to the Commission on this agenda item? Seeing none, bringing it back to the board. Lights are not on right now. Let me make some comments, ask some questions as well. Just want to say the first committee that looked at this was, consisted of ten members. There were five from the city, five from the county. The commission had no awareness of this, in fact, we had no, nothing to do with this, it was Steve Claassen, if I understand correctly, your department took the lead and decided it was important to have the city's input at every step of the way.

"Of course looking at these bids initially, you guys had five folks from the city, five folks from the county, most of those, I guess there was a number of Law Enforcement officers, including the Sheriff's Department, I believe, who was representing the city's police department involved in that review. So, again, we want to make very clear that every partnership with Wichita, we have included them every step of the way. And someone said earlier that they felt it was pre-determined that the Innovation Campus in the first committee review, perhaps they pre-determined themselves, that that was the most important maybe before they actually looked at the data.

"Let me point out again that what we got back was a three-way numerical tie, and the comments that followed that were there was two of the bids they felt were totally met the requirements and needs of the county and the city. So you know, I really feel like the first committee did a really good job in terms of it represented both sides, and

they came back with the best they could, an objective evaluation of the bids, and they did not come back and simply say there's only one answer to this. They actually gave us a much more robust discussion about the options ahead of us, and it was not just Innovation Campus. So I appreciated that very much. Commissioner Ranzau?"

Commissioner Ranzau thanked the Chairman and said, "I just want to say that I appreciate the manager of that on the second committee, but I have to say for a variety of reasons, I don't believe there's any chance that the second review committee was going to come to any other conclusion than the University Campus, University Innovation Campus. I forgot what I was going to say. That's it for now."

Chairman Howell said, "We will come back to you. Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh thanked the Chairman and said, "I guess I will ask Joe or Steve, all along the way we had participation with folks from the city, their staff who we elected, is that right?"

Mr. Claassen said, "That's correct. Particularly in the first review group, it was equally represented between the city and county. The second group was exclusively county staff that did that, participated in that group."

Commissioner Unruh said, "So city elected or staff was not in the second group."

Mr. Claassen said, "Correct. It was exclusively, well, Tom Stoltz, I guess, has a joint, dual role. Not exclusive, but close to."

Commissioner Unruh said, "And we followed that procedure because the city had already declared their preference, is that the statement?"

Mr. Claassen said, "I think that's right."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Mr. Manager, have you had any conversation with the City Manager? Have we approached as we approach decision time on this?"

Mr. Scholes said, "Yes, we've had several discussions."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Okay. That answers my question."

Chairman Howell said, "Alright, Commissioner Ranzau."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "What I was going to say, I don't think there was any chance the second committee would come to a different conclusion other than Innovation Campus. My recollection, I don't remember anything being said at the committee that would change the fact that there were two solutions. That's all."

Chairman Howell said, "Thank you. I want to say number one, I will say from the very beginning that I think jointly training together with Wichita is certainly the decision we would like to keep as our goal. I think jointly training is the best, and it would be nice to train in a facility that actually had the right resources, and the right space available for that training to happen. So the best model for Law Enforcement training for this community is to jointly train Sedgwick County Law Enforcement along with Wichita City Law Enforcement."

"Training together provides synergy, they actually attend many emergencies together. They know how each other thinks and works. I think there is added safety because they understand each other's processes and procedures, and they know

each other. I think there's a reason why jointly training Law Enforcement for the city and county is very, very important. Of course, having inadequate space has all the right resources and the right spaces available is critically important as well. Between the two of those things, you know, having the right space and having the right resources, we could train independently to me that's not as good. As long as we have adequate space and the right resources, we could, in fact, train independently. But, I don't think that's the best model.

"The best model is to train together. I think we have to be committed to that. I feel like I am committed to that. I don't know if all partners across the street feel exactly the same way I do on that or not, but it is difficult when you have two entities that are partnered together for them to somehow hone in on the same decision is a difficult process. And there is a risk that we would choose something different than what the city would choose. Then we have to find a way to get back on the same page.

"As long as we are going to be committed to jointly training together, again, I hope that that's the end result. But I don't know again, if we end up picking something different than what they have already said publicly, then I don't know how we do that. We'll have to figure that out if that's what happens. I would like to point out that we have, Commissioner Ranzau did have multiple meetings with the mayor, just to talk about whatever happens to be of interest, and of course Law Enforcement Training Center has been one of the most important topics of this community for a very long time.

"So that topic I think was discussed a lot at those meetings. I was able as Commissioner to attend some of those meetings. The topic came up a number of times while I was in of the room. I remember hearing the discussion. Let me back up just one more step here. During the RFP (Request For Proposal) process we also included the city in making sure the right elements in were the RFP that represented their needs as well. It wasn't a unilateral RFP, it was something we partnered with Wichita, from the very beginning, again, it was suggested by Chairman Ranzau, the city thought this was a good idea. They have been included even in the writing of the RFP. So they have been our partner from the very beginning. I will suspend my comments for just a minute. Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh thanked the Chairman and said, "I don't recall, and to help me clear up my thinking, has the City of Wichita council voted on this officially? I mean, are we making assumptions here, or I mean, I know the Mayor came out clearly and had a press conference saying this was their choice. I am not trying to make a big tipping point, just trying to get my mind, my facts straight here."

Chairman Howell said, "I guess I will respond to that. I had talked to some of the City Council members about the process, and how we got to where we are right now, and seems to me like most of the City Councilmembers have not been included in some of the detailed discussions. In fact, I think they felt like they've not really been part of the conversation, unfortunately.

"We were invited to stand with the Mayor when he announced publicly that they have chosen Innovation Campus, and we declined that. I urged the Mayor not to do that, because I think it was premature, we weren't ready to make that decision. We need to let the Bid Board do their job, continue discussions and find out the details of what that would mean if that was in fact the direction we wanted to go.

"But it was premature for us to have that disclosed at that time. So I asked the Mayor and unfortunately, that's not what happened. I am curious, I will state I have been following this very closely, and I think it's clearly obvious that they've never had an

open meeting where this has been discussed. And actually have gotten comments in support of the Council members. So when they announced publicly that this was their decision, I don't know if that represents the Mayor's personal opinion or if it represents the City Council also.

"It is not clear to me. But I know that we can't do that. If I was to make that announcement, I would be criticized, I'm sure. I am not a dictator, once again, I can't disclose to the community what the decision of the County Commission is until we publicly debate this and make a decision in an open meeting, which we are doing right now. This is the process we need to follow. As far as I know, that never has happened across the street. So that is why we were not able to participate in the unilateral announcement they picked a particular direction to go. And with that in mind, I wanted to say that I appreciate that announcement, but I need to let that not influence me too much here. Need to let the process work.

"We want to let the data speak for itself. We need to have the freedom to thoroughly analyze these bids and pick what we think is best. If we disagree with the city, ultimately we've got to find a way to get back on the same page. Back to what we were saying a minute ago, we have met with the Mayor a number of times. Since I've been Chairman, we continue to meet with him. We try to meet once a month. We actually added meetings to that with the intent to actually talk about, again, just one Commissioner talking to one elected person over there at the Mayor, not saying I, representing a decision of the board, just me personally, wanted to understand the perspective, see if we could talk out some of the details. I met with the Mayor a number of times on LETC (Law Enforcement Training Center). Unfortunately some of our meetings lately have been cancelled. My father died a couple weeks ago, interrupted one of our meetings.

"He's had a wedding in his family that interrupted one of the potential meetings we would have had. Life is complicated, our schedules are very filled. It is hard to get together. We have had a number of meetings on Law Enforcement Training Center. I've included Manager Scholes, the Mayor's included the Manager of the City. I asked the Counselor to sit in on a couple of the meetings, they have had theirs as well. We had a nice meeting with the Vice Mayor as well in one or two of those meetings. We've done all we can to talk this out as partners, trying to find out the best direction.

"I would like to raise another issue that I have talked about pretty freely last couple of months, because it's become obvious to me, and that is the same reasons why jointly training in the state-of-the-art facility for Law Enforcement Training is critically important, we've done it this way for decades. We've done a great job. Our Law Enforcement officers are the best. No doubt about it. And that's because we train together, in a facility, but it is not the best facility. We need to step that up and make it a state-of-the-art facility. That is true, and I think what I am committed to wanting to -- I want to see that solution in place at the end of the day. When we get done with this decision today, or whenever this happens, I think that's the goal. I would like to make sure we jointly train in a state-of-the-art facility, but it is obvious to me Public Safety is a much bigger topic than just Law Enforcement.

"And it is come to my attention, because I have attended the Firefighter graduations for Sedgwick County, I've seen the videos, I've talked to the Firefighters, talked to our leadership and our Fire Department, but we have a Public Safety disparity between Wichita and Sedgwick County. The training that they have is in the state-of-the-art facility. And it's wonderful. It's called the Wichita Regional Fire Training Center. RTFC for short. I think Wichita chose to go that direction years ago when the Hartman Training Center idea dissolved. The reason that dissolved I think was the

cost. It was about \$30 million, \$15 million to each entity. I think that was too much money for them to continue.

"So they, both the city and county, made choices to go in a different direction. City to their credit, they were able to get it on their agenda and they approved \$4.4 million, eventually I think they spent \$5.8 million to build the Regional Fire Training Center. Unfortunate thing is that they are the only entity that routinely gets to use that facility, and does the majority of their training in that facility has been unfortunate for Wichita, sorry, unfortunately for Sedgwick County Firefighters we haven't had a chance to access that facility. We would like to.

"It is true, they've got a lot more Firefighters than we do. We have got nine fire stations, they have 22. Other fire stations around the county, it's around 45 stations county wide, Derby has two, a few others, volunteer fire departments. All together about 40 fire stations in the community, and we have nine of those. If you do the math, the head count, Sedgwick County versus Wichita, we have about 25 percent of the Firefighters providing fire safety to the unincorporated part of the county, plus we have automated and mutual aid agreements with Wichita and other communities as well.

"So our Firefighters go inside the city a lot. In fact, I would say we provide more support inside the city limits than outside the city limits. But those Firefighters are paid for by the Fire District. So it is, it's unfortunate that their Firefighters have the state-of-the-art, it is great their Firefighters have a state-of-the-art facility, they do extensive training with wonderful resources, and a very adequate facility, provides space and the things they need to be the best they can be. It is unfortunate for Sedgwick County Firefighters that we train in parks, in parking lots, we are using innovative ways to train. And I appreciate that very much.

"We are talking about Innovation Campus, potentially for the Law Enforcement Training Center. Our Firefighters had to be very innovative to train. I think we have the best Firefighters also, but it's to their credit they found a way to get that done, despite the fact they don't have adequate facilities. I talked to Chief Leake and Chief Tangney others in the Fire Department. This has been a long desire, very little ability to actually reach any type of partnership or agreement with Wichita to allow that, to attract that type of training to continue, to happen.

"We've had more discussions about this of recent. This issue with the Mayor, I raised it with the Mayor and Manager of Wichita. They have offered us some training opportunities, although not adequate, in my opinion. I showed those proposals to our leadership in our Fire Department, and they confirmed it was not, would not be beneficial to us for that to be the agreement if we were to move forward.

"But I would love to see, if I could raise the issue this way. I would love to see a partnership with Wichita, Law Enforcement Training, jointly train with them in in a state-of-the-art facility. And I think that along with that, I would like to jointly train with Wichita and the fire in the state-of-the-art facility. Just so happens they have a state-of-the-art facility. We just don't have access to it. Not adequate. I would like to have a partnership there as well.

"So here's the point. We don't have, we don't really have a way to make that happen. The Fire District, of course, is low on resources to be able to get into that. It's my vision, if I could, I would say it's my vision, you know, one model would be, we would have Law Enforcement and Firefighters and other Public Safety type training like 911, EMS (Emergency Medical Services), CPR (Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation), you name it, all in one facility. It would be similar to what the Heartland was proposing

only smaller, county-based facility, and it would have something that does all types of Public Safety training, and the fire department would have the resources they need to train in that facility. That would be one model I could imagine what that would look like.

"If Law Enforcement then gets a chance to jointly train with Wichita at the state-of-the-art facility, then that need is met. We still have all the other needs. And I wish it was really a regional training center. It should be including the other 19 facilities, other 19 cities in Sedgwick County. Invite them to be partners as well. The taxpayers own these things, it is important that we recognize that the more we partner with these other entities, the more we work together, better Public Safety gets. Anyway, it is a vision of mine that if we can't come together on joint Law Enforcement training, that we would in fact have a facility that would have Law Enforcement and everything else in one facility.

"If we can come together on joint Law Enforcement training, that's wonderful. But we still have a need for other training. To me, the easiest and most likely solution to that would be for us to jointly train with Wichita in the state-of-the-art facility they already own. I have asked Commissioners, and Commissioners here today, that were here at the time, to speak to this. I would invite you to say what you want to say here, but I've asked some of the Commissioners around the community that have been here previous to this current board, and at least one of those already on the board right now, whether or not they were given the opportunity to partner with Wichita on the Regional Fire Training Center.

"Unfortunately, the answer was from their perspective, they don't have any recollection of that discussion happening. It could be that the Chief of our fire department turned down that opportunity. It's possible that happened. I don't know if that's true or not true, I have no idea who decided that this wasn't good for Sedgwick County. It could be that Manager before Manager Scholes was here, maybe he made the decision that Sedgwick County was not interested in this opportunity. I don't know if it was offered or not. I did ask the question to Wichita. They say it was offered in Sedgwick County and we turned it down. The question is who turned it down. Whether that was the fire department themselves, or whether or not it was our Manager, I don't know.

"But I can tell you that a partnership there makes just as much sense as it does for Law Enforcement Training Center. And I am disappointed that we have, you know, 508,000 people in this county to protect, we have tremendous investment by taxpayers, protect the citizens of Sedgwick County, and although we are doing really well on the Law Enforcement side, I hope we continue doing really well, we have a huge need on the fire department side. Doing the best we can with what we have, I appreciate that. But we can do better. The public I think demands the best. So right now we are not doing what we can.

"I think there's a couple of different ways this can go here. What I aiming asked right now by the bid board, for us to support something that's going to cost the county \$1.65 million above our low bid. What I am being asked. If we had a partnership with Wichita to solve our own training needs, that would be a great recommendation. Short of that, we might need that cash to go solve this problem another way. So I'm reluctant to support the recommended action today, because I don't know that we have cash to do both.

"If I accept this recommendation, it limits my ability to solve the problem of our other Public Safety training needs. So I would ask our Manager to continue to work with the folks across the street, Manager Robert Layton and see if there's ways you guys can

get together to have a memorandum of understanding or a letter of intent that would allow us to be partners at the RFTC. I think partnership ought to be our vision again here and there, both for Law Enforcement and for fire training. Along with that, we would like to make sure we have the same credentialing for our EMS personnel. We had a nice budget hearing, I think it was two days ago, we talked about EMS credentialing.

"We have the Chief Medical Officer for Sedgwick County that has developed a tremendous program to demonstrate hands-on proficiency, and with that training comes credentialing from his department, and he's offering that to, for every Firefighter across the county. And I think that we are certainly want to participate in that to make sure we have the best skills, demonstrated skills, and credentials we need to provide that best quality to those folks that have emergencies. The problem is, if you call 911 and a Firefighter shows up, you want to know they got the best skills possible. They have been trained, everything they can possibly know, they can do everything to the best of their ability, because we have given them all the resources they need to be their very best.

"Right now that's not exactly true with the fire department. I know that we have got a wonderful department, and I don't mean any negative comments to them in any way. It is not something they can solve by themselves. County Commission needs to solve it for them. But the state-of-the-art facility matters. We need to have better training opportunities available to our Firefighters as well. So if you call 911, if a Firefighter shows up, say it is a fire call, it could be that the Firefighters that show up from Wichita have some training that our Firefighters can't get. It's not possible.

"It's also possible that if it is a medical call and our Firefighters get there first, by the way, which is by design, no offense to our EMS personnel, again, we have got roughly 45 stations across the county. Number of people who can respond to an emergency call from the fire departments is enormously more capable than our EMS personnel. Only 15 EMS stations. More than likely, a Firefighter will show up first. That's by design. Not a bad thing. It's fine. We designed it this way. But it could be that that Firefighter, if it's from the county, has credentials, verified credentials that other Firefighters may not have. Again, another disparity that needs to be fixed.

"So these disparities in my opinion are the issue. I want to lean forward and say I would like to be a partner with Wichita everywhere. I think it is important. Public Safety is one of the most important things we do as government. We've got to provide the best. We are not where we could be right now because we've allowed politics and broken relationships with Wichita to impact these decisions. So it is my vision that we would not just solve LETC. Again, I am not sure how I can pick a choice off this chart, not knowing how we are going solve the rest of the problem. I have a motion in just a moment, I will read that probably, but for right now, we have other comments. Commissioner Unruh."

"Commissioner Unruh thanked the Chairman and said, "I was going to start off with something different, but after your comments, I want to say that I really believe we need to keep these issues separate so that we can have a decision to go forward with different funding sources for the Fire District than there are for the Sheriff's Department and to try to roll EMS and 911 and fire training and police officer training all together I think is not, probably not practical, but I am not sure how wise it is. I think we need to deal with what's in front of us right now.

"So having made that comment in response to yours, Mr. Chairman. I want to say my first day on the bench, there was a topic came up that was controversial, and I wasn't fully aware of all the details, and I asked for deferral, and there was a loud moan from

the whole room. I know how folks, this is the business, let's get on with the business.

"But as a suggestion, would this be, if we think the city has not yet made an official, formal vote on this, and we have not, and it's a decision that I think that our citizens want all of us to be in the spotlight on, and be responsible for a vote, is there any sense in let's have an en banc meeting in the near future, where the City Council and the County Commission get together and stand up for their votes and can make these comments, and we vote at that time to go forward since this is a partnership, it has high visibility. Police Department is involved, Sheriff's Office is involved.

"So I'm not sure how strongly I'm trying to advocate this. I'm trying to ask if there's anybody else that thinks perhaps en banc for this specific issue would be a reasonable next step, rather than us vote today."

Chairman Howell said, "At least for the listening, e-n-b-a-n-c. It means the city and county would have both governing Boards in a session together jointly. Again, we've had these in the past, not since I've been here, but a number of en banc meetings have happened in the past. Being an open meeting, they could take up real about is and actually vote independently during that meeting. So that is one option that could be done. I will tell you, I did offer this to the Mayor before there was an announcement from the city. They were going in this direction. I think the idea of an en banc, we have to get to the same page somehow, to me that made sense. We did offer the idea to Wichita before their announcement that happened a few months ago. Unfortunately that was declined.

"But continuing to meet with Wichita I think is imperative. I have a meeting planned with the Mayor tomorrow, just to let the public know. We plan to meet tomorrow. Hopefully to continue some of this discussion. But, and I understand the previous Commissioners' comments, we would rather not mix these things up. My problem with that is we have limited cash. And if I commit more cash to this, this bid item, than is necessary, then it limits my ability to solve the problems in other areas we have needs for.

"Again, it is unfortunate that a Regional Fire Training Center is really not regional. It's been not totally exclusively used for Wichita, but there have been other departments that have had access to that once in a while, but not like partners. And, again, we don't have a lot of ability to pay for that training within the Fire District. But what I envision is a Public Safety Training Center where the fire department would get to use it. It would be Sedgwick County Government creating the training center, it would be not just for fire department, it would be for whatever Public Safety training needs would be out in the community. It would be a partnership with other cities as well. It would not just be Wichita, it would not just be Sedgwick County, it would be as many partners as we can find that have a need.

"So my interest, the reason I raise this issue, number one, I want the public to know we have a Regional Training Center that's not regional. We have a need to train our Firefighters, but we cannot possibly train them to the highest degree possible, we sort of give them the facilities and the tools they need to do that training. And, again, if that's true, to some degree, Public Safety is not as good as it can be. I can say that Public Safety has been harmed to some extent.

"Again, the taxpayers own that training center. I know Wichita made the decision to put in \$5.8 million, and I appreciate that. But, again, let's be clear, that's owned by taxpayers. We provide fire protection services inside the City of Wichita to the very same people. I think there's arguments I can make that say that we ought to find a way to get together on other areas of Public Safety become partners broadly, not just

narrowly with LETC. LETC is vitally important. I am committed to that. I believe my colleagues here are also committed to jointly training in a state-of-the-art facility.

"But I don't know how I can choose off this list, knowing what I know. Again, we are time limited. We need to make a decision pretty quickly. We have been putting this off long enough. We have been wanting to have this for previous Commissioner said, since last century, I believe he's correct. I think for 17 years we've talked about doing something better than where they are at right now. There's been discussions, just so everybody knows, Southeast High School has been discussed in the past. It was not offered. Not one of the bids. I think that would have provided a great opportunity. Great location. Probably would have been a less expensive option, but that was not offered to us.

"We talked about Judge Riddel's Boys Ranch. Some unique, good things about that location. Also disadvantages. I personally discounted the idea of JRBR (Judge Riddel's Boys Ranch) as a legitimate location. How do we move forward? I guess right now I am not sure I can make my mind up on which one of these to support, because I feel like we have got a much larger discussion that has to be solved somehow. If I have to choose based on what I know right now, then I am not sure I am willing to accept something that's a higher cost which limits my ability to fix, to solve the problem in other areas that in my opinion must be resolved.

"I did talked to Manager Scholes about some ways he could negotiate with Wichita to create equity between Wichita and Sedgwick County in terms of long-term relationship and partnership for the Regional Fire Training Center. I think he has tools at his fingertips he could talk about some things he could bring up to create equity between Sedgwick County and Wichita to make that agreement possible. I will stop for a little bit. Commissioner Norton."

Commissioner Norton thanked the Chairman and said, "Well, I hesitate to even speak today on this issue, because I've spoke on it for 15 1/2 years. I first started talking about the Law Enforcement Training Center in the middle of a tornado as the Mayor of Haysville just happened the Adjutant General of the State showed up and had a vision for a Preparedness Center that included National Guard, Highway Patrol, Sedgwick County, Wichita, both fire organizations, 911 and the Marines.

"We worked on that, had a plan. Now the federal side has been done, but along the way, politics got into it, and arguments got into it, and fractured relationships got into it, and we ended up having a facility up there for the National Guard, but nothing for police and fire, particularly on the Sedgwick County side. And the city did move forward. There was a lot of dynamics to that. I probably know way too much, I am not going to talk about today, because I don't think it's appropriate.

"We owe it to our Public Safety folks that have great facilities. If you have been in the facility on North Meridian, you know we have skimped on that for our Law Enforcement for many, many years. So I think we need to keep that as a separate issue and move forward in some manner.

"Now, whether this was a bid process or an RFP process, those are two distinctly different kinds of ways to get to a final end. We can revisit if we need to, but we have sat on our hands on this issue for way, way too long. And unfortunately, along the way, we have fractured many of our relationships and partnerships that are needed to be able to find something that is best for the community and the taxpayer.

"I hesitate to even say this, but sometimes, and I quote this from 'The Right Stuff,' no bucks, no Buck Rogers.' You don't come up with some money to build what's

adequate, you don't end up with the best trained people. That's the whole idea for John Glenn saying that in "The Right Stuff." 'No bucks, no Buck Rogers.' You don't invest in people, and their training, and the facilities to get them there, you don't have the best and the brightest. You can't recruit the best and brightest. So in Law Enforcement, we need to step up, figure out what is best, swallow hard and try to partner with the city if we can, and move this forward.

"For me, it's been way too long. I probably have written 30 articles about this over the years and we still have not made any progress on it. I'm hopeful that real soon we can make a decision that is best for our community. Now, I also don't think we need to tie it to 14 other things that we think need to be done. They need to be handled, yes. I don't know that we are in a position right now to fight over a Fire Training Center when we hadn't resolved all the issues with our own fire department. We've got big issues there that we are going to deal with today a little bit. We need to make these decisions, not in a vacuum, but with our partners across the street and with the taxpayers in mind.

"It's interesting that the original number to build all of the training centers at the Heartland Training Center was \$12 million the first time that I worked on it. Now it grew to \$30 million for Little Mission Creek. Once it got to some of those numbers, everybody got their backs up, started talking about it, fighting about it, and it was easier instead of trying to get the cost down and come to something reasonable, just for everybody to walk away and be mad.

"Now we're here and we are 17 years later, and we aren't any better off than we were. I'm very saddened by politics that gets involved in public service. Our guys in Law Enforcement and EMS and firefighting are Public Servants, they are not politicians. They want to serve the public and do it in a manner that's honorable and consistent with their values, and I'm very saddened that we've got to this point that we are arguing about it one more time, going to put it off, going to defer it, and not come to any decision. And I understand that there's been people out there that have put together bids, tried to give us a reasonable alternative for what we need to do.

"But we can't sit on our hands any longer on some of these issues. We need to move forward. I don't know, sounds like we are going to defer it one more time to me. I guess I will acquiesce to that. I find that sad. I don't know that we are going to by deferring make any difference with our relationship with the city. I don't think that's going to change any time quickly. As long as we continue to have the kind of philosophy that we have towards other governments and other jurisdictions. That's all I have, Mr. Chair."

Chairman Howell said, "Thank you for your comments Commissioner Norton. Let me just say that you made a comment that you want to get the politics out of this, you want to do what's right. I believe that's exactly what I want too. How you describe, the fact is, I think I am making a moral argument that the community needs the best training possible. Taxpayers on a facility, I want to use these things to the greatest extent possible. Fact is, our Firefighters deserve the best, as much as our Law Enforcement deserves the best. And we have not solved, we have never solved the problem for the Firefighters.

"What I am proposing is a broad partnership for Public Safety training. Not just about Law Enforcement. I have been talking about this, asking about this for months. This is not something new that just came up today. I am impassioned about this. My goal is, let's solve it, let's get it done. Why we can't get along and get together on this as a partnership, that's politics. Not because we are not trying. We want to do this. It is the right thing to do the public deserves it.

"So politics is the problem. I'm proposing to get around the politics. I am proposing let's go past that. Let us create partnerships for Public Safety, public demands, the public deserves the best, but unfortunately because of politics, they are not getting the best. I think that's unfortunate. In terms of deferring this, you know, we talked about this has been going on for close to two decades now, desire to replace this.

"I am committed, I will say it once again, I am committed to selecting something that will provide a state-of-the-art facility to jointly train Law Enforcement, Wichita and Sedgwick County. That's not going to get deferred for a month, six months or a year, or forever. I think we are very close to a decision here. At least I feel like we are. But one week is not necessarily going to, in my opinion, should not be characterized as pushing this off for a long time. We are closer now than we ever have been to solving the problem. We have a number of options in front of us. It is just not as easy to pick one off the page.

"I think there is a lot more to this than just simply saying we are going to just accept this without understanding exactly how we got here, and whether this is the best we can do, and other issues that are similar to it. We need to address not just Law Enforcement, but I think other areas as well. But, again, to characterize this as pushing this off or not doing it, or, you know, putting this off for a long time, as if it's going to be years, in my opinion, is not one of the options on the table. I think we will solve this very quickly, if not today, we will solve it soon. I don't know that one week makes a bit of difference.

"I do want to give the Manager time to have these discussions. I want the community to be aware of the controversies and be aware of where we are at. One thing I have been aware of, the community has not known, I've described this dilemma of inequity, the fact that we can do better, to people in my circles, as I talked about this. Usually the reaction is, you need to get this fixed. It is a moral issue. Do it right away. Get it done. They want it fixed. They are not aware of the problems I'm describing, so what I have described today, I think allows the media and the public to be aware of it. I want it fixed. I think partnerships are the answer.

"I am just one Commissioner. If other Commissioners want to vote differently, that's their prerogative, that's their choice, fine for them to do that. Me personally, I have identified I think a bigger problem, and I would like to solve it. Again, I have tried to talk with folks, trying to find ways to get there. I will tell you, I have a couple draft proposals. I worked with the County Counselor, he helped me. Jim Howell, it is not the Commission, just me, put stuff on paper as to how the LETC would work. There's some things about who owns the building, how do you split up operations and maintenance, other things like that. We put together ideas on paper.

"I have a similar thing for the Regional Fire Training Center. Just some things I put on paper. A draft, just an idea from me, to talk to the city. And these were not my opinions seriously considered by the city. Maybe they will get more attention now. I want to solve for yes. I want to get the politics out of the way. I think the Public Safety needs to be as good as it can be, not just one area, but in every area. And the reality is the public, I think, has not been aware. You are now.

"And so there's an opportunity, I think, for the community to respond, and say what do you want. Do you want us to partner with Wichita and provide the best training possible, do you want us to solve these things, become partners, or not. If the answer is no, then fine, we will do LETC by itself and status quo with everyone else. Or we can have a better discussion and let's fix it here or there. All I am asking for is a letter of intent. Memorandum of understanding that actually creates the intent to create that

partnership. Doesn't have to be complex, don't have to have everything understood exactly. But what is our intent, what do we want to accomplish.

"It is nothing more than something can be done very, very quickly. But to do this is not as hard as it sounds, so far my proposals have landed on deaf ears. I am hoping that the community, now they understand, the things need to be fixed. I'm asking for, I guess, what is the response? Do we want to fix these or not. If we want to fix them, now is our chance. If we go down the most, if we go down the recommended option on this chart, it limits our ability to fix it independently of the City of Wichita. That's a problem for me. Commissioner Unruh."

MOTION

Commissioner Unruh moved that we instruct the Manager to schedule an en banc with the City of Wichita as soon as possible to discuss the singular issue of the Law Enforcement Training Center and how we move forward as partners.

Chairman Howell seconded the motion.

Chairman Howell said, "Any further discussion? Commissioner Peterjohn."

Commissioner Peterjohn thanked the Chairman and said, "I would feel more comfortable if we could take up the entire issue in terms of improving community safety and the idea of trying to expand our partnership, and we haven't had an en banc, trying to remember. It has occurred since I've been on the bench, but it has literally been years. I'm thinking back last one that jumps out at my mind as far as I am concerned, Amtrak service into this community. That goes back quite a ways.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION

Commissioner Peterjohn moved to schedule an en banc meeting with the City to discuss Public Safety facilities, including Law Enforcement Training Center and the issue, more broadly.

Commissioner Ranzau seconded the motion.

Chairman Howell said, "Commissioner Ranzau."

Commissioner Ranzau thanked the Chairman and said, "Just the question, do we have a timeline?"

Mr. Yost said, "May 18th is when we need to either extend our deadline for accepting or rejecting these proposals. That's one issue. The other is I want to clarify on the motion, the RFP that we issued was not a joint RFP with the city, even though they were involved in the process, it's our RFP. So I'm assuming the en banc wouldn't be for the purpose of making a decision on these proposals, it would be more of a general, or generic discussion about Public Safety. Is that a fair statement?"

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "That's a fair statement for my motion. Unfortunately it hasn't had a second yet, so my motion may be moot, Mr. Counselor. That was my intent."

Mr. Yost said, "Pertaining to en banc, I want to make sure that's what we are talking

about."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Mr. Chairman? Thank you for the clarification, Mr. Counselor. However, the intent of my motion is to get a decision on this, and I don't know how you can do it legally, whether we have to vote and they would have to vote. Let's get us together and make a public decision, we are all accountable for."

Mr. Yost said, "I think if your motion were to pass, for instance, the discussion at the en banc would be to decide what you want to do regarding LETC and whether you want to include fire, and then you all would then vote on the RFP."

Commissioner Unruh said, "However you can work that out for us."

Mr. Yost said, "That would be the safest way."

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

Commissioner Ranzau said, "I am just going to second Commissioner Peterjohn's motion for discussion purposes. I am not sure how I will vote on it."

Chairman Howell said, "I guess, my concern is, we don't have time in our schedule to schedule an en banc meeting between now and the 18th meeting. We may need a motion to extend this to make time for this to happen. I don't want this to be perceived as a big delay in the process. We've got to be, I want everyone to know we are committed to doing this as quickly as possible."

"Problem is, the community has been unaware, I think, that we've been working on this for a while. Their assumption is, man, you got the bids last fall. What's taking so long? Well, it's taking a while because we are trying to work out the bugs here. This is another, probably necessary delay, not a delay just to be delaying, but a delay for a purpose. We've got to get together and move forward together. But that might require us to push it back for a couple weeks to make that happen. I don't know what the schedule is. I don't know how complicated it would be to schedule an en banc. Again, I offered this has a way to move forward in the past. It was rejected. Whether or not they are willing to do that, it is up to them. It requires both sides to play here. I don't know if they would be willing to do this or not. Up to this point, it hasn't been accepted up to this point. I don't know if this will be change things or not."

Mr. Thomas said, "Mr. Chairman, if I can interject. This May date is an extension we've already asked for. So any other extension will be a second extension beyond the 120 days we give the proposal. That's just background information for you. We'll have to ask the four responders whether they are willing to make a second extension. So this isn't, this won't be the first."

Chairman Howell said, "If any one of those four doesn't want to do that, then what happens?"

Mr. Thomas said, "We'll have to talk about it. I really, we would have to talk about, what we could do, we could say, then, whoever doesn't want to do it, and whoever does want to do it, we would eliminate that particular responder and deal with the remaining responders. Am I correct Counselor?"

Mr. Yost said, "Right. If someone didn't want to delay another week or another month, or whatever it would be, they would have the right to withdraw their proposal."

Chairman Howell said, "Here's what I think we ought to do. Let's vote on the motion in

just a moment. But I am going to make a motion after that that we visit this again on the 18th, we will see whether or not we need to make an action to delay this to make, we will ask to do the en banc, see what the date is. If we need to push this date back with the permission of our bidders, to see whether or not they are willing to do that or not, we will talk to Counselors, see whether or not this works.

"But I think we need to have two motions. First motion already made. Substitute motion for us to get together as en banc meeting, talk about LETC, plus other aspects of Public Safety. then if this passes, I think the motion I will make in just a moment would be for us to push the topic back to May 18th for us to consider any other action, whether it be another delay, based on your recommendation, the recommendation of the Counselor or Manager, so we can at least move forward, or maybe on the 18th we could just finalize it, say we are going to pick something and move forward. So the 18th, I guess, this is just a topic, just an agenda item for us to continue this discussion and actions will be TBD (to be determined), we will say it that way."

"All right. So we have a motion right now to ask Wichita if an en banc date will be TBD. Assuming that happens, we will be able to find a way to move forward. So we have a motion and second. By the way, I will be supportive of this motion. Any other discussion? Commissioner Unruh?"

Commissioner Unruh thanked the Chairman and said, "Would somebody recite the motion for me? So I know what it is that, Commissioner Peterjohn's motion is we have an en banc for what purpose?"

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "It was more broadly defined, and I'm more pleased with the motion after hearing the Counselor's remarks in terms of keeping us on safe legal ground. But the idea was that we would set up an en banc meeting without a specific date, but hopefully it would be soon to discuss Public Safety training related issues."

Commissioner Unruh said, "So that doesn't really have anything to do with the motion I made."

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "It was a substitute in terms of, it was a broader motion, because I would view it as including LETC, but not limited to."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Our RFP was for the LETC. It wasn't for this broad description of conversation. So I would like to address the issue before us, and I am not opposed to having another en banc, but I think we have two different things here."

Chairman Howell said, "Commissioner, if you don't mind, let's vote on the substitute motion. If you want to vote no, your motion will still be on the table. Yours is only going to talk about Law Enforcement Training Center. His motion would say let's talk about that, plus other Public Safety issues that I have raised today."

Commissioner Unruh said, "So they are exclusive issues. One is a deal with the issue before us."

Mr. Yost said, "They are competing motions. If Commissioner Peterjohn, first of all apparently I am a parliamentarian for an organization that has no rules. I want to point out if his motion passes, it wipes out yours. If it fails, we're back on yours."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Look, I understand that procedure. However, if his passes, it doesn't imply we are going to make a decision on the Law Enforcement

Training Center. There is no implication."

Mr. Yost said, "There is certainly no guarantee of that, that's correct. But I think as far as, I'm just the scrivener here, I want to make sure that we all understand that it's a generic discussion, but that there isn't in fact any expectation that we would vote, that you all would vote on this RFP even at that en banc, because it is only the five of you that get to do that. Commissioner Peterjohn is that part of your motion?"

Commissioner Peterjohn said, "Basically I'm not trying to force a commitment, what I am doing is leaving the door open in terms of where we could proceed, and I think the en banc would clarify and clear the air in a way that hasn't occurred so far in our current discussions that have been going on, concerning training of Public Safety folks."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Okay. Well, I want to vote for my motion. I am going to vote against Karl's."

Commissioner Peterjohn. There we go."

Chairman Howell said, "Commissioner Ranzau."

Commissioner Ranzau thanked the Chairman and said, "Just a question for the Chairman, probably, if one of these two motions passes, and the city declines those offers, what's the next step, or how are we going to address that."

Chairman Howell said, "It would be my intention between now and next time we publish an agenda in a couple days, we'll have that known. We may need to, on the 18th, take different action depending whether or not they accept our invitation for en banc."

Mr. Yost said, "I would think for control purposes, you would want to move this agenda item to the 18th. We won't hear from the city immediately, maybe we will."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "If one of these passes, then we'll have to have another motion to move this to the 18th."

Mr. Yost said, "Correct."

Chairman Howell said, "Let me say further, we would have the opportunity to, the en banc again has no rules. One of the questions I had when I talked to the City, when you have 12 elected folks representing two governing bodies in one room, how do you vote, who goes first, and that type of thing. It is my assumption we would have opportunities for City Council to vote independently of us, that could go first or second, same with the County Commission. We could do business if we want to."

Mr. Yost said, "I have never been a part of one of those en banc meetings. I think it would require majority of both sides at the en banc to adopt some generic idea. Or concept."

Chairman Howell said, "As far as I described it, County Commission has the majority vote, or the City Council is majority vote, two independent bodies."

Mr. Yost said, "Right."

Chairman Howell said, "Okay. So we have the opportunity to actually conduct business in an en banc if we want to. It is an open meeting. We'll have an agenda

item, and if we want to make a decision regarding LETC, we can do that at that meeting. If we want to defer that from that meeting and have another time to discuss it privately or to think about it privately and come together at a future meeting after that en banc, we would have a chance to do that as well. I think that Commissioner Peterjohn's motion doesn't preclude the opportunity for us to make a vote on the LETC. In my opinion. Any other discussion? All right. Seeing none, Madam Clerk, please call the vote."

VOTE

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

Chairman Howell said, "Commissioner Peterjohn."

MOTION

Commissioner Peterjohn moved to make a motion to defer this item until May 18, 2016.

Chairman Howell seconded the motion.

There was no further discussion and the vote was called.

VOTE

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

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

CONSENT

- P** [16-274](#) Two (2) Right of Way Easements and Two (2) Temporary Construction Easements for Sedgwick County Project 825.5-W-3870; Bridge project on Clifton between 55th St South and 63rd St South. CIP# B-477. District 5.
- Q** [16-294](#) One (1) Right of Way Easement and One (1) Temporary Construction Easement for Sedgwick County Project 608-27-1270; Bridge replacement on 45th Street North between Broadway & Hydraulic. CIP# B-460. District 4.
- R** [16-266](#) Resolution designating and classifying certain roads to the Valley

Center Township road system. District 4.

- S** [16-238](#) Agreement with the Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE) and the Sedgwick County Health Department/Sedgwick County Board of County Commissioners (BoCC) to provide breast and cervical cancer screenings to income-eligible women for the Early Detection Works (EDW) cancer screening program.
- T** [16-279](#) Agreement to Provide After Hours Mental Health Emergency Services for South Central Mental Health Counseling Center (SCMHCC).
- U** [16-281](#) Agreement to Provide After Hours Mental Health Emergency Services for Southwest Guidance Center.
- V** [16-0143](#) Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Amendment: Law Enforcement Training Center Project.
- W** [16-272](#) Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Amendment: Work Release Security System Upgrade Project.
- X** **16-258** Order dated 4/12/2016 to correct tax roll for change of assessment.
- Y** [16-247](#) General Bill Check Register for April 13, 2016 to April 19, 2016.
- Z** [16-248](#) General Bill Check Register for April 20, 2016 to April 26, 2016.
- AA** [16-249](#) General Bill Check Register for April 27, 2016 to May 2, 2016.
- AB** [16-250](#) General Bill Check Register from May 3, 2016 to May 10, 2016.
- AC** **16-251** Payroll Check Register for the April 16, 2016 payroll certification.
- AD** **16-252** Payroll Check Register for the April 30, 2016 payroll certification.
- AE** [16-246](#) Plat.
Approved by Public Works. The County Treasurer has certified that taxes in 2015 and all prior years have been paid for the following plat:
- HIEGER EAST 2ND ADDITION, SEDGWICK COUNTY, KANSAS.
- AF** [16-273](#) Plat.
Approved by Public Works. The County Treasurer has certified that taxes in 2015 and all prior years have been paid for the following plat:
- KALB ADDITION.

AG [16-287](#)

Plat.

Approved by Public Works. The County Treasurer has certified that taxes in 2015 and all prior years have been paid for the following plat:

PARSON'S 1ST ADDITION.

Mr. Scholes greeted the Commissioners and said, "Request you approve Consent Agenda Items P or Papa through Alpha Golf or AG, minus Victor, which deals with the Law Enforcement Training Center Project."

MOTION

Commissioner Unruh moved to approve the Consent Agenda minus Item V.

Commissioner Peterjohn seconded the motion.

There was no further discussion and a vote was called.

VOTE

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

Chairman Howell said, "Okay. We've been going a long time. I would like to wrap up the regular part of this meeting. Yes, sir?"

Mr. Yost said, "We need to do something with V though."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Make a motion to defer, indefinitely?"

Mr. Yost said, "To May 18th."

Chairman Howell said, "Well, actually may I make a suggestion we would defer it to a future date. I don't know, even on May 18th is not the right date in my opinion. Assuming we make a decision on LETC, can we not deal with Item V at a future date?"

Mr. Scholes said, "Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding you vote for the LETC on May 18th, this has to be tied to it."

Chairman Howell said, "It has to be the same meeting."

Mr. Scholes said, "Correct."

Chairman Howell said, "Alright."

Mr. Scholes said, "So to leave your options open, it may be best to tie it to the May 18th, and then depending on what you do then with Law Enforcement Training Center vote."

Chairman Howell said, "I accept your explanation."

MOTION

Chairman Howell moved to make a motion moving Item V to May 18th Agenda.

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, "If it's agreeable to my colleagues here, I would like to skip Legislative Issues this week. We have enough on the Agenda ahead of us. I would like to skip that Item. Is that acceptable to my colleagues?"

LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

The Board of County Commissioners recessed into Fire District Number 1 from 11:44 a.m. and returned at 1:59 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no other business to come before the Board, the Meeting was adjourned at 1:59 p.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:
