

Sedgwick County

525 North Main Street 3rd Floor
Wichita, KS 67203



*Sedgwick County...
working for you*

Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, July 19, 2017

9:00 AM

BOCC Meeting Room

Board of Sedgwick County Commissioners

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

Anyone who requires an auxiliary aid or service for effective communication, or a modification of policies or procedures to participate in a program, service, or activity of Sedgwick County, should contact the office of Crissy Magee, Sedgwick County ADA Coordinator, 510 N. Main, Suite 306, Wichita, Kansas 67203. Phone: 316-660-7056, TDD: Kansas Relay at 711 or 800-766-3777

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

CALL MEETING TO ORDER

MEETING OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

REGULAR MEETING

July 19, 2017

The Regular Meeting of the Board of the County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kansas, was called to order at 9:03 a.m. on July 19, 2017 in the County Commission Meeting Room in the Courthouse in Wichita, Kansas, by Chairman David M. Unruh, with the following present: Chair Pro-Tem Commissioner Michael B. O'Donnell II; Commissioner David Dennis; Commissioner Richard Ranzau; Commissioner James M. Howell; Mr. Michael Scholes, County Manager; Mr. Thomas Stolz, Interim Deputy County Manager; Mr. Eric Yost, County Counselor; Mr. David Spears, Director, Bureau of Public Works; Annette Graham, Executive Director, Department of Aging; Colonel Richard Powell, Sheriff's Office; Mr. Scott Knebel, Manager, Metropolitan Area Planning Department; Mr. Joe Thomas, Director, Purchasing Department; Ms. Kate Flavin, Public Information Officer; Ms. Lynda Baker, Deputy County Clerk; Ms. Heddie Page, Deputy County Clerk.

GUESTS

Mr. Lonny Wright, 1721 South Lulu Street, Wichita

INVOCATION: Pastor Ron Pracht, Olivet Baptist Church.

FLAG SALUTE

ROLL CALL

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

PUBLIC AGENDA

Chairman Unruh said, "Commissioners, I haven't had anyone sign up to speak on specific issues this morning before our meeting, so we will continue and ask for the next item."

APPOINTMENTS

- A** [17-638](#) ACCEPT THE RESIGNATION FROM BILL FAFICK (BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSION APPOINTMENT) IN THE EDUCATION POSITION OF THE SEDGWICK COUNTY JUVENILE CORRECTIONS ADVISORY BOARD.
Presented by: Eric Yost, County Counselor.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Accept the Resignation.

Mr. Eric Yost, County Counselor, greeted the Commissioners and said "Item A is a resolution to accept the resignation of Mr. Faflick from the education position of the Juvenile [Corrections] Advisory Board (Team Justice). Mr. Faflick is moving out of the community. He was an at-large appointee, and his term would have expired June 30th of 2018. So he will need to be replaced for that, and I would urge adoption of this resolution."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you. Commissioners, what is the will of the Board?"

MOTION

Commissioner O'Donnell moved to accept the resignation.

Commissioner Dennis seconded the motion.

Chairman Unruh said, "Commissioner Dennis."

Commissioner Dennis thanked the Chairman and said, "Just a couple comments. I have known Bill Faflick for a lot of years. He was the Athletic Director when I first met him of USD (Unified School District) 259, when I was working over at North High School. I was the announcer for North High School at that time before I moved over to Northwest [High School], announced for them. I served on the Kansas State High School Activities Association (KSHSAA) Executive Board of Directors with Bill. I worked with him as he was Assistant Superintendent for USD259.

"He is going to be sorely missed in our community. I just want to pass on my congratulations in his new job as Director of Kansas State High School Activities Association up in Topeka. So, I am sure I will still be able to work with him, but I just wanted to tell everyone how much I appreciated working with him over the years and how much he contributed to the youth in Wichita."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you, Commissioner. I would second those comments. I had the privilege of worshipping with Bill for several years at our home church, and he is a great community citizen. He will be missed. Seeing no more comment, Madam Clerk, call the vote."

VOTE

Commissioner Dennis	Aye
Commissioner Ranzau	Aye
Commissioner Howell	Aye
Commissioner O'Donnell II	Aye
Chairman Unruh	Aye

Chairman Unruh said, "Next item."

Approved

NEW BUSINESS

B

[17-635](#)

PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING THE 2018 SEDGWICK COUNTY BUDGET.

Presented by: Mike Scholes, County Manager.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Open the public hearing, receive public comment, and close the public hearing.

Mr. Mike Scholes, County Manager, greeted the Commissioners and said, "It's great to be here today. Today being the first public hearing for the 2018 budget. The publication filed with you last week was a total budget of \$407,276,187, and an ad valorem property tax levy of \$137,441,377, which is approximately equivalent to 29.359 mills, based on the estimated assessed valuation and subject to technical adjustments. With that, Commissioners, we can start the public hearing."

Chairman Unruh said, "Alright, thank you. Commissioners, are there any questions of the Manager before we begin the public hearing? I see none, so at this time I will open the public hearing and ask if there's anyone here who wishes to speak on the budget. So, if you would step to the podium and state your name, and you have three minutes."

Mr. Lonny Wright, 1721 South Lulu Street, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I want to compliment both the budget and the process. You know, last year when our new County Manager presented the budget, I recall that he was the commander of a war zone. I always prepare myself for some slash and burn, maybe even some blood on the floor. But instead I got the opposite. You know, he raised some salaries for employees, added some safety personnel, didn't cut services and had a surplus. It was almost like magic. I think he's done the same thing again with this budget. You know, he's recognized employees, added public safety, had another surplus. But again, this time he's been able to add some services. So, as far as I am concerned, he's 'Magic Mike'."

"I want to tell the Commission how much I appreciate the transparency and openness of the budget process. It makes it so much easier for us to understand how the county and the departments work. I am referring to your public hearings. When certain department's was dealing with the Manager, they deal directly with you, and they summarize what they are doing and the challenges, and it is you open to the public. Secondly, reading the budget online is easy. Instead of having to scroll down a bunch of pages, hundreds of pages, looking at numbers, you can just click on each item and go back and forth. So I want to say I'm pleased with both 'Magic Mike' and the process and thank you for your transparency. Thank you."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you Mr. Wright. Appreciate that. Those are very kind words. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak regarding the budget for 2018? I see no one rising to speak. I don't recognize someone that I, from the public, so that being the case, we won't linger here. No one wishing to speak, so therefore we will close the public hearing, and Commissioners, do you have any comments before we move on? Alright. This doesn't take any action from the Board, so we will just close the public hearing, and announce once more that our next opportunity for citizens to weigh in at a public hearing is in the evening of July 31st. Is that correct? Alright, thank you. Then social media interaction is on, what day did Kate say that was?"

Mr. Yost said, "July 25."

Chairman Unruh said, "Okay, July 25. I don't know much about social media. That's one reason I'm stumbling, but we can go online for that forum at any time on our website. Okay, that being the case, Commissioners, we will move on to the next item of business. Madam Clerk, please call the next item."

C [17-637](#)

DISCUSSION OF EMERGENCY AMBULANCE SERVICES
AGREEMENT.

Presented by: Eric Yost, County Counselor.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Take action as deemed necessary.

Mr. Yost said, "Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, I'm not 'Magic Mike', but I will do my best. Item C is the proposed agreement between the County and the City of Wichita related to EMS (Emergency Medical Services) services. Just by way of background, the city did take this matter up yesterday, they did approve it, they did modify it also, and what I am asking be handed out is the new language that they have approved. Sedgwick County, of course, has been the exclusive provider of emergent medical ambulance service in Sedgwick County since 1975, and the exclusive provider of non-emergent services since 1985. We are currently operating under an agreement from 2003, which was a five-year agreement with automatic renewals every year, and it's been renewed every year.

"But during this last year, we have been discussing with the city certain changes we would want to make to that agreement. Those negotiations have resulted in what you have in front of you today. Many of those discussions have been conducted by members of our Commission and members of the City Council, and with some help from council in drafting the language. I think everyone is in agreement that the emergency side of these medical services, being ambulance services, has been exemplary. No one has been, stated any unhappiness with that. I think it's actually a model for the whole state and nation how we handle emergency ambulance services.

"We've been talking about the non-emergent services, and in the agreement that you have in front of you, paragraphs 6 and 10 relate to all of that. Paragraph 6, as it is in front of you today, states that our goal is to have non-emergent response time of one hour or less 100 percent of the time. But that we know we have to be held, actually held to a certain standard and be required to meet that standard, and so that standard is one hour or less response time, 98 percent of the time. That's what has been written in the language. It is up to the county how to achieve that. They can do that, we can do that by either enhancing our capabilities, meaning added personnel, added ambulances, stations, or we can contract with third-party providers if we wish to do that. That is at our sole option and discretion.

"If the county chooses to go, to have third-party, they can control that process entirely, according to this language, and it also states that the private providers must meet the same standard that we meet as far as response time. The county has also agreed that it will make best efforts to secure a list of vendors. The city understands that that may not be possible. There may be a lack of interest, or people may not be qualified because they do have to meet certain qualifications. If you look at the agreement you have in front of you in paragraph 6 on page three, you have certain standards. I won't read through them all, but it is pretty rigorous. It's possible a lot of people won't meet those qualifications.

"So, we have language in the agreement that you have in front of you that says that if no one qualifies, or if no one has an interest in doing this, that does not constitute a breach of contract by us. If EMS fails to meet the standard of one hour or less, 98 percent of the time for two consecutive quarters, a rehabilitation plan must be prepared by EMS and provided to the city, and then they will have two additional quarters to try to implement that plan. Again, it's our sole option and discretion as to whether or not to enhance our own capabilities with that or to use third-party providers. If, at the end of those four quarters, the standard still has been, we have not been brought into compliance by that, the city has the option under this agreement to provide written notice of termination. The notice would have to be for at least 180 days out, but they have the right to terminate the agreement under those circumstances.

"We have agreed to compile a list of those qualified providers, as I stated, to the extent that we can do so and to the extent that they are qualified. The new language, though, and I would direct your attention to that on page four, the yellow highlight that we've distributed to you, their new language states that if we know that when someone calls us and we are not going to be able to be there within an hour, that we must call off that list and provide them with that transport. That's the new language that the City Council adopted yesterday. We have also some reference in paragraph 10 that says that in doing all this, in helping to implement this program, that we provide reports to the city. We will provide reports on a quarterly basis, but if we ever fall below the standard of 98 percent at any given month, we then have to report monthly until that has been rectified.

"This is an agreement for initial term of five years, with automatic renewals of three one-year terms. So the most, the longest this can go under the current language is eight years. Either party can choose to not renew after the first five years by simply giving notice by July 1st of that given year. This is a little bit different than the 2003 agreement, in that the 2003 agreement was something that could be renewed annually without any action by any party in perpetuity. They can give notice to quit by July 1 of any year, but it would have gone on as long as anybody wanted to. This does not. This has an eight-year limit. So with that, I will be happy to answer any questions you might have. I know that Mr. Hadley is here for any technical questions related to EMS."

Chairman Unruh said, "Alright, thank you Mr. Yost. We appreciate that synopsis of this contract. Commissioners, are there any questions or comments? If there are questions or comments, now is the time. What is the will of the Board? I will allow public comment, but I'd like to see if there's any Commissioner comment first, and I don't see any. But, we can go ahead if you'd like to have public comment now, that's fine with me. Is there anyone from the public that would like to speak on this issue? I see no one rising to speak, so Commissioner Dennis."

Commissioner Dennis said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I've got a number of comments. First of all, I am not a life-long politician, so everything I am going to say is probably not politically correct, okay. First though, I do want to thank a number of people. Our County Manager, Mike Scholes and his staff were fantastic. "Tom Stoltz gave me advice that was unmatched. Scott Hadley and his folks, and especially his EMS folks, really are the ones that we're doing all this for. We are very proud of them. We are very proud of the record that they've had. The people that we're really fighting for is not only our EMS folks, but all of the citizens here in Sedgwick County. All of those citizens in Sedgwick County are our citizens, in Wichita, are citizens of Sedgwick County, so we care very deeply about each one of those folks. Some other folks that were deeply involved in this is Eric Yost and his staff, especially Misha, who has left, Karen who has worked it after Misha's departure. I want to give credit to each one of those folks that were involved in what happened here. This process stretched over a number of months, naturally. During that number of months, I am not certain that the City of Wichita negotiated in good faith as we moved forward. They moved the bar every time that we had a new contract supposedly put together.

"My folder here is all of the different versions of contracts that we put together over those months. Every time we sent something across and we thought we had an agreement, we found out we didn't have an agreement. We went across the street and City Manager Layton said that we were going to have a contract, so we went over there. A group of us went over to watch them vote on it, only to find out that they weren't going to vote on it. We then had an En Banc, actually in between, we had

another side meeting with some of the folks that had been negotiating. Then we had an en banc meeting. I think that meeting was kind of enlightening to some extent, in the fact that it appeared to me that all of our discussions weren't entirely about this EMS contract.

"I think there was an underlying distrust from the City of Wichita with the County Commission. What they haven't done is haven't opened their blinds lately and recognized that there is a different County Commission sitting over here than there had been in the past. But I think they are still trying to basically poke a stick in the eye of County Commission at times. They were making sausage yesterday when they decided from the bench to add seven new words to the contract. They had that existing contract that we gave them about a week and a half to two weeks ago and not once in that week and a half to two weeks did we hear a single word that there was a problem with that contract.

"A number of us went out to watch the Change of Command Ceremony instead of going over to the city council meeting yesterday because we were assured once again, and the words were directly, you've got 7-0, it's going to be voted 7-0. That was the direct words that we received on what this was going to be. So, I didn't have any worry about not going to the meeting yesterday and not speaking, because I was under the impression it was going to be 7-0. But what we found out was even at the en banc, when things that had happened at this Commission prior to this, at the previous Commission, prior to this body as its meeting today, they are still holding a grudge on it. They even mentioned it at the en banc. So if that's truly the way that they feel, I think that they need to start worrying, just as I do, about our citizens.

"True, yesterday when I saw these seven words, and it is a material change to the contract, I was at the point where that I was going to delay this contract so that we could go back and see if we could negotiate again. Some cooler heads, actually, came and spoke to me. Several of them, and reminded me once again of my own words that we're doing this for the citizens, and we are not doing it for us. If I'm going to delay it, then I'm guilty of exactly what I am blaming the city council of doing, is holding a grudge, and I am certainly not doing that.

"I promised when I ran, that I was going to be a good partner, and that's what I have tried to be all along. I am not sure that all seven members over there are trying to be good partners. One thing I totally don't understand is how that one member over there, even though we promised 100 percent, can still say that that's not good enough and votes every time, no. So bottom line, I'm going to make a motion that we adopt the contract of the ambulance service as written, as amended by the city council, because I think it's the best thing for the citizens in Sedgwick County, especially the citizens in Wichita.

"We've got a huge investment. We've got like a \$30 million investment just in infrastructure and people. We spend 16 million [dollars] a year just in city of Wichita on what it costs us for salaries for the people that are serving our citizens in Wichita. We can't jeopardize an investment that large. We can't jeopardize the health and welfare of the citizens in the city of Wichita. That's why I make my motion. Again, I am sorry if I am not politically correct, but I was not pleased with the fact that we did not know until we were sitting out there at the Change of Command Ceremony and received a text that there was any question, whatsoever, on what we sent over two weeks ago. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

MOTION

Commissioner Dennis moved to adopt the contract.

Commissioner "O'Donnell seconded the motion.

*Chairman Unruh said, "Is there further discussion from the Commissioners?
Commissioner Howell."*

Commissioner Howell thanked the Chairman and said, "I appreciate the previous speaker's comments. I have some questions about a couple of the aspects of the contract I would like to ask for some clarity. By reading the contract, looks to me like, if we believe we are not going to make the call within 60 minutes, that we're the ones that have to make the call to the third-party, is that correct? In other words, Sedgwick County has to make the call to the third-party?"

Mr. Scott Hadley, ACM Public Safety/EMS, greeted the Commissioners and said, "That is correct that we would make that decision on whether to call that third-party. That would be EMS's call."

Commissioner Howell said, "Okay, and, again, how many of these, please remind me, I guess in 2016, how many times did we have, did we not make our 60-minute threshold?"

Mr. Hadley said, "I don't recall 2016 off the top of my head, but 2017 for the first six months, city of Wichita, and we are excluding Wesley, because we have a contract for them to provide service, was 18 calls that were over an hour within the corporate city limits of Wichita, January 1st through June 30th of 2017."

Commissioner Howell said, "I am just curious, on those 18 calls, did we know, maybe you can't answer this, I don't know if this is information that you have or not, but how many of those 18 calls did we know at the beginning of that hour that we weren't going to make it in an hour?"

Mr. Hadley said, "I can't give you a good answer. I don't know the answer to that on the 18 that we knew up front that we were so busy there was no way we could make it in an hour. There may have been some. I think it's fair to say that we may have known, but others, it's not that clear because we dispatch a unit and they may get pre-empted to go to an emergency call and get called off that. So that happens quite frequently."

Commissioner Howell said, "Yeah. That's my understanding is we do use our regular vehicles, our regular paramedic crew to do these non-emergency transports, and if they are the closest resource to an emergent issue, they're going to be redirected, I would think."

Mr. Hadley said, "Correct, and that's the way it should work."

Commissioner Howell said, "Yes, and again, I don't know but, if we had a non-emergent crew that simply did not provide, you know, the same type of skill set, perhaps they could stay focused on meeting their appointments or whatever. But the extent that we have got an emergency crew that's doing this type of work, they do get redirected. So it does make sense to me that's probably, out of those 18, I'm going to guess at least a good majority of them probably are that type, that they got redirected. So let me ask a question, so let's say we are planning to be somewhere to do a non-emergency transport, let's say we'll plan to be there within the hour. Say

about 40 minutes into that call, we get redirected. At that point we call the third-party, is that what we have to do?"

Mr. Hadley said, "Yes."

Commissioner Howell said, "Do we have an hour at that point for them to respond?"

Mr. Hadley said, "They would have to meet the same requirements that we are. Granted we are 40 minutes into it, but the goal is..."

Commissioner Howell said, "They have to be there in 20 minutes."

Mr. Hadley said, "Correct."

Commissioner Howell said, "So, they have another whole hour."

Mr. Hadley said, "Correct."

Commissioner Howell said, "So theoretically, this could be a two-hour wait by even using a third party. We have up to an hour..."

Mr. Hadley said, "It could."

Commissioner Howell said, "...we call third party, you know, five minutes from the end of our time limit, and then they have another whole hour."

Mr. Hadley said, "Yeah, they could be busy. They could not be available. There is a variety of things that could occur for us not to be there within that hour."

Commissioner Howell said, "Because the way this contract is written, we actually have to call that third-party. We don't have a choice to redeploy a different unit. The way this is written, it says, according to that paragraph that was edited yesterday, it says we must call from a list of third-party providers."

Mr. Hadley said, "If we know we're not going to be there in an hour. Again, we don't always know. It could be at shift change. We could hold a unit over to have them make the call and not call the third-party. There are flexibility and options. That's our call to do that."

Commissioner Howell said "Let me ask the question differently. Okay, so let's say it's 45 minutes into this call, this ambulance gets redirected to an emergency situation. We know we are not going to make that in 60 minutes..."

Mr. Hadley said, "Correct."

Commissioner Howell said, "...as required."

Mr. Hadley said, "Correct."

Commissioner Howell said, "The way this is written, the only option we have at that point is to call a third-party, even if we have another resource that can get there in 25 minutes, it doesn't matter. We have to call from this third-party list, and they have a full hour to get there. You see my point? In other words, if we are into that hour, a significant amount of time..."

Mr. Hadley said, "Correct."

Commissioner Howell said, "...and we find out we're not going to make it, we have to call off this third-party list, and they have a full hour to respond, even if we have other resources that could have made it. Maybe the reason is that we're not going to make the hour is because the closest resource to an actual emergency was, they were planning to do this non-emergency transport but they got redirected. Let's say that is 45 minutes into a 60 minute call..."

Mr. Hadley said, "That's right."

Commissioner Howell said, "...a 60 minute response time. Now we got 15 minutes, and we know we're not going to make it in 15 minutes..."

Mr. Hadley said, "Correct."

Commissioner Howell said, "...the next resource is 20 minutes away. What this says is now we have to call from a third-party list..."

Mr. Hadley said, "Yes."

Commissioner Howell said, "...and they have a full hour to respond. Am I correct in saying it that way? That's what this says."

Mr. Hadley said "Yes."

Commissioner Howell said, "That's what I believe this says."

Mr. Hadley said, "They would have an hour to respond."

Commissioner Howell said, "Let me ask a couple of other questions? If this, if we do not adopt this today, and I perceive based on my colleagues comments already, I am sure this is probably going to pass, but assuming for just a minute this did not pass, what would be the next step? We would not have a contract. Presumably Wichita would notify us they are not going to renew the contract. We would start, then, negotiations on a new contract, I would assume."

Mr. Hadley said, "They could."

Commissioner Howell said, "That's what happens?"

Mr. Hadley said, "They could give notice. They have 'til the end of the month to provide that letter of notice that they didn't want to renew it. They could renegotiate that between now and then. There's a variety of things that could occur should you not approve it today."

Commissioner Howell said, "What if we do not approve it, again, it doesn't mean we don't have EMS services in Sedgwick County."

Mr. Hadley said, "Correct."

Commissioner Howell said, "It means we have got to continue our discussions..."

Mr. Hadley said, "Right."

Commissioner Howell said, "...with the City of Wichita."

Mr. Hadley said, "Our current contract carries us through the end of the year."

Commissioner Howell said, "We've essentially gone through the process as if they have given us notice. We have renegotiated the contract in good faith as if we've already received notice, so to speak, that the old contract wasn't going to be acceptable to them. So, we have been doing that process all along. To me, this is a little bit arbitrary whether this is adopted today, because we've been negotiating for, how many months has it been going on now? Several months at least."

Mr. Hadley said, "Yes."

Commissioner Howell said, "In fact, I would say since last year we've been talking about this contract. So, if this was not adopted today, doesn't mean we don't have EMS services in Sedgwick County. It means the conversation would continue."

Mr. Hadley said, "Correct."

Commissioner Howell said, "I listened to the meeting yesterday, although I did go to the Change of Command Ceremony with Commissioner Dennis. I did listen to that meeting intently, listened to all the comments of the City Councilmembers. It was obvious to me that many of the members were, well at least one of the members was very interested in just providing freedom of choice to his constituents and said, I believe, that was the compelling reason why he voted no. He doesn't think we need to manage this part of it."

"Again, I didn't walk into the meeting today, literally on the fence. I see arguments to vote yes, and I see arguments to vote no. On the side of voting no, I think I understand the arguments of Councilmember Clendenin that he wants to provide choice to the people he serves. I think that's a commendable position to take. We talk about free market, we talk about choice, and it could be, what do we charge typically for a non-emergency transport with someone with the ability to pay? What would that charge be?"

Mr. Hadley said, "Our current charge for that level, for non-emergent basic life-support is \$350 plus \$13 a mile."

Commissioner Howell said, "Okay, so someone is going to probably pay around [\$]400 bucks, let's just say. It could be that the third-party might be half that, we don't know. So once again, if there is no emergency, you know, allowing the people to shop around and get something they could eventually more afford, that might be something that we ought to allow them to do that. On the other side of the equation, I am concerned about upsetting our revenue stream, because I think we've got a very good balance of EMS services that depends on revenue for it to fully operate. I am concerned about upsetting that balance. So, you know, you get, we're only talking about 18 ambulance rides in 2017. I don't think it's, that's not a significant amount. I don't know what that calculates out to, but let's say all 18 of those chose a third-party provider, it's not going to substantially upset our balance of our EMS services otherwise. Do you see my point? Does that make sense?"

Mr. Hadley said, "Sure."

Commissioner Howell said, "Am I misunderstanding something here?"

Mr. Hadley said, "No"

Commissioner Howell said, "Okay. So I guess I see the concern about the revenue"

stream. It may be a little overstated. I am not sure I have a concern about that so much because it's not a substantial number of people who would have that option. I don't know. If they did choose to terminate the agreement, again, either we did not adopt this today and then they wanted to terminate that, the conversation would continue. But within this agreement, if they choose to, let's say we don't make 98 percent in two quarters, they have the option to terminate the contract at that point."

Mr. Hadley said, "No."

Commissioner Howell said, "They gave us notice, they have to give us notice that, no (inaudible)."

Mr. Hadley said, "After two quarters, if we don't meet 98 percent, we have to provide them a rehabilitation plan to address that. Then we have two additional quarters to come back in compliance."

Commissioner Howell said, "Okay. I remember that, that's correct. But again, that could be any time of the year that that would happen. It could be any quarter of the year that we would come to that fourth quarter. That could happen in March, or June or September."

Mr. Hadley said, "That would be two consecutive quarters that we fall below that mark."

Commissioner Howell said, "So it could happen basically when we're far away from the budget cycle, potentially."

Mr. Hadley said, "Yes."

Commissioner Howell said, "That's another concern, I guess. This, I think this is intended to create a new contract starting January the 1st..."

Mr. Hadley said, "Correct."

Commissioner Howell said, "...of the calendar year. But we potentially might end up having, might have to adjust our contract with the city, it would start sometime, it would not be matched up with the calendar year. In other words, we might have to start a new contract potentially in March where we didn't have a budget cycle to adjust our revenue expectations, so to speak, because it is no longer tied to a calendar year. It could happen at any quarter. It might be in a situation where we would have to renegotiate a new contract. (inaudible) a new contract."

Mr. Hadley said, "I don't know that we have to renegotiate it, but we have, if we fall below that 98 percent for two consecutive quarters, we have a remediation plan in place and then we have two more quarters to have corrective action to get above 98 percent. Once that happens, we don't have to renegotiate anything."

Commissioner Howell said, "Okay. If we get to that fourth quarter, if we haven't met our 98 percent and the city wishes to go forward, do they terminate, could they give us notice at that point at that point to terminate?"

Mr. Hadley said, "They could give us 180 days' notice if we fail in the remediation period, they could give notice. It doesn't mean they will."

Commissioner Howell said, "If at the end of that 180 days could be any time of the calendar year. It could be..."

Mr. Hadley said, "Yes."

Commissioner Howell said, "...virtually any quarter. Okay. My point is, it gets us out of the calendar year cycle potentially."

Mr. Hadley said, "Right."

Commissioner Howell said, "So, I just wanted to make that point."

Mr. Hadley said, "Okay."

Commissioner Howell said, "Let's see, I think I have one other question. Again, I would much rather, I guess, if we know we are not going to make the hour, I guess I would prefer it if we would let the person that needs the service know that, let them call from that list. I think that would be preferable to me. I don't know that I want to be responsible to make that call on their behalf. What happens if the third-party is busy, and now it's assumed that they are going to be there within one hour, but they only have limited resources in the county as well? Let's say they're busy. What happens then if they can't make the hour? They don't think they can make it in one hour. Then what happens?"

Mr. Hadley said, "Then we make it as soon as we can. We don't, be there, no one will be there within the hour, and we let the patient know that it's going to be longer for them, they're going to have to wait longer."

Commissioner Howell said, "I will tell you, I have a number of concerns about this contract. The words that they added yesterday, in my opinion, are concerning for one reason, and that is that I think the county has done a tremendous job of getting this number to 98 percent, and actually we have exceeded 98 percent. We are committing in this contract to stay there, above 98 percent. To me, that's a huge commitment. I appreciate our EMS personnel, they do a tremendous job, you do a tremendous job. It's taken a lot of investment on Sedgwick County by taxpayers to get us to this high level of service, it's a very high standard. It is not perfect, but nothing by anybody is perfect.

"You know, I think having government agencies operating at 98 percent is a just a tremendous, high standard for us to benchmark ourselves. So, I am extremely impressed with what we are currently doing. But one thing that bothers me about this is in the words that were added yesterday, in my opinion, it actually puts us in a corner. I have a concern about whether or not that makes sense. Maybe the next provider is 20 minutes away, but we don't have the option to call them. I think this is intending to resolve how we would manage this issue, but I think it falls short. It doesn't actually give us all the options that it should. I think it really ought to be up to the Sedgwick County Service Management, it would be the director or manager or others that have input into our system. It ought to be up to them to determine the best ways to resolve those kinds of things when they happen and let us manage the system. Again, I think if we are going to manage the system, we ought to be allowed to manage the system.

"But this, the words they added yesterday puts us in a corner. I think it attempts to solve a problem, but I think it actually limits our options, and it actually is trying to tell us exactly how they think that ought to be solved. In reality, I think that it falls short, because it limits what we can do to solve the problem, so I guess I have concerns about that. I would say I appreciate the negotiations. I know that our Chairman and Pro Tem, and I think Commissioner Dennis have spent a lot of their time meeting with people at the City, negotiating ideas, and I agree with Commissioner Dennis, there's

been a series of proposals, one after the other. I felt that the last contract that was given to them was fairly good, and people I thought were agreeable to that. But with the changes they made yesterday, makes me feel less, I don't agree with this as much as I did before.

"I do appreciate those that negotiated, and I appreciate our friends across the street. I know they want the best for the citizens, as I think we do as well. But I think what's best for the citizens is maybe the previous contract. So, I guess right now I am probably going to not support going forward. I think that the small delay would be much more appropriate. We just got this language yesterday. We haven't even had time to talk about this in any way. We received the language, and in my opinion, this is just very, very late change, and it has a major significance to what we do here. So, I guess I would be much more willing to support the contract potentially in a week, but I think delaying this one week would be much more reasonable.

"I am not going to make a substitute motion. I think I've already heard that three Commissioners want to move forward, and that's fine. I would be willing to support this potentially once we have some time to talk about some of these details. But right now as it sits, I am not going to support it. So, again, I will say I appreciate you, Director Hadley. I appreciate EMS personnel. I think we've got one of the best systems in the nation. I think we are doing things very, very well and to be critical of that system and not let us manage this at that high standard, I think is just a mistake. So, I think that this contract falls short, and for that reason, I am not going to support it this morning. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

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

Commissioner Ranzau thanked the Chairman and said, "I think as far as Commissioners are concerned, I've probably been the most sympathetic to the city's concerns. As such, I continue to have problems, or concerns, with this contract as well, albeit somewhat differently than my colleagues. I am actually okay with the language as was inserted. I guess I have several issues with this contract, but for brevity's sake, I'm only going to mention two. First of all, I think as a result of this protracted negotiations of paragraph six has become very convoluted, confusing, you might even say contradictory. If we had a dispute over this, it would be a mess, I think, trying to iron that out. I would suggest that as everything calms down, that maybe at some point we would want to go back and take a look at that and perhaps see if we can come to better wording for that whole thing.

"Then the second thing is, we've been talking about calls over 60 minutes or 45 minutes, I think that was, yeah. I had Scott Hadley do an analysis. If we gave up every call over 60 minutes, that would cost us \$12,000 in revenue. I feel like we have been spending a lot of time and effort just to protect \$12,000 of revenue, while at the same time, I am not sure we have done a cost benefit analysis to see if it's even worth arguing about it or debating about this. I mean, as the response, percentage of responses that goes up that have to be within an hour within a certain time frame, but the amount of resources you have to put into it to achieve that goal, outpace the revenue. So there's a cost benefit that could get out of whack over time. I am concerned we are maybe past that. So as we move forward and we do this, and there again, as things calm down, I think we should look at this.

"We may find that actually by partnering with third-parties after a certain time, whether it's 60 minutes, 45, 30 minutes, we actually may be able to improve services to the community, while at the same time directing more of our services towards emergent and then be able to provide service at a more cost-effective manner. I think that's a very distinct possibility. We have been given a monopoly, and we've kind of

acted like a monopoly, and we are doing everything we can to preserve that monopoly. Every single call we want, but I am not sure if we did a cost benefit analysis, we would come to the conclusion that it was actually cost-effective for the taxpayer and everyone's best interests.

"That being said, I know there's been a lot of negotiating back and forth. I appreciate everyone involved on both sides. The city has voted to support this current agreement, and I think the majority of my colleagues are willing to do so as well. So with the very last caveat, I would say is, I think as far as the city is concerned, they expect these six words to make a difference. I think we should exercise this contract in good faith and exercising paragraph 6, as convoluted as it is, as we move forward. Nevertheless, those are my comments, and I will be supportive. Thank you."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you, Commissioner. I don't see anyone else asking to speak. I would just say that this has been an arduous process and sometimes somewhat frustrating, but I think that's the way it is sometimes in partnerships where there is a lot of back and forth. I just would want to make a couple of statements here to say one of clarification that we are talking about non-emergency medical transports. So these are folks who are not in any sort of crises. We find that 40 percent of those non-emergent calls do turn into a higher level of care. So that's why it's important that our trained EMS folks are on-scene and able to provide that transport.

"We are not talking about those transports that are not medical, where someone, perhaps in a wheelchair or for some other reason needs a transport. They can call one of a dozen other folks in the community who provide that level of transport. So these are medical transports, and we are committed to providing the highest level of care for those individuals. The high level of performance that we impose upon ourselves, and that the city has imposed upon us, I think is remarkable and admirable. If we provide pickup within one hour, 98 percent of the time, to non-emergency folks, I mean, that's pretty outstanding.

"I think both the city and the county should be talking about that in a very positive tone. That's excellent service. Now, we are going to try to make it all, in, 100 percent within an hour, but as has been noted, it's pretty hard to be absolutely perfect on every incident that's called. But I think that this has proven itself to be a great partnership with the city.

"I think that not only do our counterparts in the City of Wichita, but Sedgwick County Commissioners speak repeatedly about functional consolidation, about ways that we consolidate to save money and provide the best services for our citizens. This is probably the crown jewel example of good cooperation between city and county governments and between consolidations. There's only one ambulance service. It's been doing a great job for 30 years, or whatever length of time it's doing. We are continuing to invest more into the system. We are adding crews as we see necessary. We have plans to add two more EMS posts, both in the city of Wichita.

"So I want to point out the excellent job that's been done, our commitment to continue at that high level, and I believe our citizens, on the whole, are very pleased with the response that they are getting. It's reliable, we have the highest level of accreditations, and I think that, well, I just think folks appreciate that. We will abide by the contract. We will look to try to find those other carriers in the community who can provide non-emergent medical transport at the somewhat the same level that we're providing. We want to make sure they are certified. We are not asking them to meet the highest level at which we're certified, but we want them to have some credentialing. So we are going to have a good list of people, and I would want the citizens to know that we are not going to yield the service over to someone that we

don't think is, that we think is incapable of providing our level of service.

"We will abide by the rules of the contract, and if we think we can't get them, make that pickup in the time, we'll call people off the list. It is a little disconcerting that when we've been providing this level of service and have been investing at the high level we have in EMS posts and personnel and doing a great job, that there would be any criticism of us at all. I guess that's what kind of, I don't figure that out. We are doing great, and I want the citizens of our county to know that as we go forward. This has been said by some of my colleagues, it's been a, you know, a difficult process, and I know that some members of the City Council say they just want freedom of choice. We had freedom of choice 40 years ago, whenever it was, when we had different ambulance services vying for it. One of the reasons the county took it over, because it was chaos. It was a mess. It was all kinds of problems, even bordering on legal issues. So, we've had a great system, we are doing well.

"One really important comparison I think in our research, as we talk this out, is that we found out that the city of, or in Johnson County, I believe that their per capita cost of emergency, the per capita cost of running their system is about \$20 per capita in Johnson County. Ours is \$5.78. We are doing a remarkable job here. You know, they got more people and a smaller area. So we got fewer people bigger area, and we're doing that. So to try to drive home the point that not only have we excellent service and performance, but we are doing it very, very efficiently.

"So my point is, we are doing a great job, and even under the terms of this contract, we're going to continue to do a great job, and a little chagrined that some of our folks at the City Council think, they want to kind of tell us how to do our business. But nevertheless, we've got to this point. We are going to do a job, and I think I am ready to sign off on the contract. I don't see it as being something that Mr. Hadley and his people can't manage in a way that still provides great service to our citizens. So with that ramble, I will ask if there's any other questions or comments. Seeing none, we have a motion and a second. Madam Clerk, is that correct? Please call the vote."

VOTE

Commissioner Dennis	Aye
Commissioner Ranzau	Aye
Commissioner Howell	No
Commissioner O'Donnell II	Aye
Chairman Unruh	Aye

Chairman Unruh said, "Mr. Hadley, thank you."

Mr. Hadley said, "Thank you, sir."

Chairman Unruh said, "Appreciate it, and I would also thank for this process, our Manager and also Mr. Stoltz for their work and input in getting this to a resolution. Madam Clerk, next item."

Approved

D [17-623](#)

CONSIDERATION OF A GRANT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$ 2,969,873 FOR THE KANSAS DEPARTMENT FOR AGING AND DISABILITY SERVICES (KDADS) FY 2018-2021 AREA PLAN.

Presented by: Annette Graham, LSCSW, Executive Director, Central Plains Area Agency on Aging.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approve the new Area Plan and authorize the Chairman to sign.

Ms. Annette Graham, Executive Director, Central Plains Area Agency on Aging, greeted the Commissioners and said, "This is the Central Plains Area Agency on Aging (CPAAA) Older Americans Act Area Plan. This is a new cycle, so it is for 2018 through 2021. This plan that you have before you outlines how those funds will be allocated and expended for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2018, which begins October 1st, 2017. This is at the Central Plains Area Agency on Aging, we serve Butler, Harvey and Sedgwick senior citizens age 60 and older, and this is for the grant amount is, \$2,969,873. Under the area plan, this is an allocation. The state gets federal dollars that come down, and then they are allocated to 11 Area Agencies on Aging across the state based on an allocation formula that looks at our population, our numbers, our percentages, low income and minority.

"So, they set this funding up in titles, and that outlines how those funds can be spent. So under the administration funding, we have \$95,980. Under Title III B, support and community services, \$473,736. Title III C-1 is the congregate nutrition.

"There are some additional funds in this, and that's state dollars and nutritional services incentive funds, so its \$735,627, federal, state dollars is [\$]24,950, and the NSIP (Nutrition Services Incentive Program) money is [\$]58,235. Title III C-2 is the home delivered, also known as Meals on Wheels program, federal dollars, [\$]432,435; state dollars, \$697,596, and the NSIP of \$161,103. Title III D, smallest of the programs, and that is health promotion and disease prevention, \$35,938. Then Title III E is our National Family Caregiver Support Program (NFCSP) at \$254,273. Now, this is an estimated budget. It's based on our current 2017 Area Plan Budget. As you are aware, the Federal Budget has not been established yet, so we always use the previous years, the current year's budget, and then when that allocation is announced, then we adjust the budget accordingly.

"So, there is a required grant, I mean a required match of \$175,619. Out of that, the Sedgwick County responsibility is \$73,693. Our providers contribute to the match as do Butler and Harvey County Departments on Aging, and they provide the remaining match. So, the total sources of this grant are \$3,145,492. We do have a Central Plains Aging Advisory Council that's made up of members of all three county Department on Aging, so the members that you appoint to Sedgwick County Department on Aging Council, three of those are elected and serve on that. So that Advisory Council did review and approve this on March 29th. We've also had a public hearing where it was presented an opportunity for discussion. I presented it to both the Butler County and the Harvey County Commissioners, who have reviewed it and provided their approval for the Sedgwick County as the governing board to sign off on that.

"There have been no major, no really major significant changes, other than one, and that was in the area of nutrition. So, what we see state-wide, locally and nationally, is some movement and trending that there are less utilization of the congregate nutrition sites and more of the home delivered. There are less numbers with that. We've been seeing that for a long time. So we are able to move money between the two, and we have moved some of the funding allocation from the congregate program to the home delivered. The home delivered program serves a more senior population, a more frail, and a homebound population. We are seeing more of that, as nationally, the fastest growing segment of the population is age 100 plus. So, I will be happy to answer any questions you have on this and would request that you approve the Area Plan and authorize the Chairman to sign."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you, Annette. Commissioners, do you have any questions or comment on this item? Seeing none, what's the will of the Board?"

MOTION

Commissioner Dennis moved to approve the Area Plan and authorize the Chairman to sign.

Commissioner O'Donnell seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

Commissioner Dennis	Aye
Commissioner Ranzau	Aye
Commissioner Howell	Aye
Commissioner O'Donnell II	Aye
Chairman Unruh	Aye

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you, Annette."

Approved

E [17-622](#)

CONSIDERATION OF A GRANT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$ 285,181 FOR THE CONTINUATION OF THE INTERNET CRIMES AGAINST CHILDREN TASK FORCE FUNDED BY THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION.

Presented by: Col. Richard Powell, Sheriff's Office.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approve the application for the grant, and if awarded authorize acceptance of the grant, the establishment of budget authority as provided in the Financial Considerations section of this Request, and implementation of the Staffing Table changes identified in the Personnel Considerations section of this Request.

Colonel Richard Powell, Sherriff's Office, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I brought before you this morning for your consideration, a grant in the amount of \$285,181 which will be used for the continuation of the Internet Crimes Against Children (ICAC) Task Force. This funding being provided by the United States Department of Justice (USDOJ), the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). For the benefit of those Commissioners that are new to the bench this year, I thought I would maybe provide a little bit of historical information for you to help you make a more informed and better decision, or a decision.

"The Sedgwick County Sheriff's Office is the grantee and administration focal point of the Kansas Internet [Crimes] Against [Children] Crimes (ICAC) Task Force. The Sheriff's Office uses ICAC, is the acronym, continuation program proceeds to fund one Sheriff's Office detective, and one Wichita Police Department detective, who are both dedicated to the ICAC investigative portion of the program. The Sheriff's Office and the Police Department supplement ICAC staffing with their own respective budgets and also have supervisory personnel, other detectives, other investigators that also work together to support ICAC operations. Kansas ICAC also works directly with the Sedgwick County Exploited and Missing Children's Unit (EMCU).

"Together these units investigate all exploitation, missing, human trafficking, physical and sexual abuse cases involving child victims. Our Kansas ICAC office here locally supports 39 other affiliate ICAC agencies across the State of Kansas. They serve locally some 500, and almost 4,000 residents of the county, and another collectively all together, over 2.8 million residents throughout the state of Kansas. We've noticed that this residential count, the number of people that we support through this program, has increased about 1.1 percent over the last census. The affiliate agencies that I spoke of across the state include other law enforcement agencies, both city, county and tribal enforcement agencies.

"I would also mention that Kansas has over 8,000 registered sex offenders on their rolls. Fifteen percent of them live in the greater Wichita/Sedgwick County area. ICAC also partners with state and federal prosecutors and other agencies to ensure proper prosecution of these cases that we are involved in. The State of Kansas has increased in the number of identified domestic minor sex trafficking cases, specifically here locally at our EMC Unit, we have identified 61 victims and 49 suspects that are involved in domestic minor sex trafficking in the calendar year 2016. Year to date, only halfway through the year, we've identified 43 victims and 29 suspects, which is significantly higher at the halfway point than where we would have been for the same time, same period, last year. The majority of these cases involve technology, facilitated prostitution.

"Additionally, we have not only seen the advertisement of these crimes across the internet, but the perpetrators also are utilizing a lot of social media to recruit victims. Kansas ICAC will continue to build relationships and list new task force affiliates and partners to combat the issue of child exploitation. Again, I've brought before you for your consideration this grant. A little bit of detail on the grant, it again, covers the funding, which actually is a little bit different than what we have seen in previous years. There was a notification we received from the Department of Justice where they discontinued funding for about a three-month period. Then they went back now and picked that up in this new grant, which will cover the time period starting retroactively back to July 1st this year and through September 30th of next year.

"A portion of the funding that we are requesting your consideration on, will be passed through to the City of Wichita, which will be used to reimburse their Police Department for the costs associated with their personnel that fall under this agreement and this funding matter. I don't really have anything else to add to my presentations, but I would, again, respectfully request your consideration and subsequent approval and also stand for any questions you may have."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you, Colonel Powell. Commissioners, do you have any question or comment? I don't see anyone wishing to speak. I would just make the comment that I appreciate the intensive effort with the resources we have to try to address this disease that we have in our community, and it's regrettable that in our, the culture of our country and even our local community, that this type of remedial and corrective action is necessary to find perpetrators of crimes against children. It, you know, this boggles your mind, almost makes no sense, how can that happen. But it does, and so I appreciate your effort, and this is also, when we previously talked about cooperation with our counterparts at the City of Wichita, another good example of how we cooperate intensively together to try to address this issue in our community. So, I want to also offer my thanks that you all are committed to that effort. With that, Commissioners, what is the will of the Board?"

MOTION

Commissioner Ranzau moved to approve the application for the grant.

Commissioner O'Donnell seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

<i>Commissioner Dennis</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Ranzau</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Howell</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner O'Donnell II</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Chairman Unruh</i>	<i>Aye</i>

Col. Powell said, "Thank you all."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you, Colonel. Next item."

Approved

F [17-648](#)

**DR2017-02 - AMENDMENTS TO THE WICHITA-SEDGWICK
COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (ALL DISTRICTS).**

**Presented By: Dale Miller, Director Of the Metropolitan Area Planning
Department.**

**RECOMMENDED ACTION: Adopt the resolution amending the
Comprehensive Plan as recommended by the Metropolitan Area
Planning Commission.**

VISUAL PRESENTATION

Mr. Scott Knebel, Manager, Metropolitan Area Planning Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I am here to bring you a proposed amendment to the Wichita/Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan, the Community Investments Plan (CIP), the current Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 2015. It contains a strategy for annual monitoring, lays out the things that the Planning Department will review. One of those is an annual discussion with the cities in Sedgwick County regarding a map that's contained in the plan called the Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) map. This map is a policy document. It's not prescriptive in the extent that it exists in the Community Investments Plan, it makes a designation for all of the cities so that they can work better together.

"Those areas where each city is intending to extend municipal services over the next 20 or so years and where corporate annexations into those cities would occur. That map is also, then, tied through the zoning code to this Urban Area of Influence, which this Commission established in 2015, provides for a method of conversation and input into requests for zoning changes.

"In 2016, this Commission expanded the Urban Area of Influence for the city of Garden Plain from the, I would say, golden color, the darker color that's not gray, the gray is the current city limits, to the lighter tan color. That was an action that was taken. What Garden Plain is requesting, is that that Urban Area of Influence also be their Urban Growth Area, which is what the zoning code states the Urban Areas of

Influence should be, is the Urban Growth Areas established by the Comprehensive Plan. So this amendment of the Comprehensive Plan really is enacting something that the County Commission has already approved, just in another document.

"The second recommended change to this Urban Growth Area map actually involves the elimination of a couple of areas of Urban Growth Area for the city of Mount Hope, which are shown kind of in the brownish color on this map, and then the addition of a small area at the south end of their corporate limits for future commercial and industrial growth. They are requesting this change because this matches their recently adopted comprehensive plan and the area that their comprehensive plan covers. The [Metropolitan Area] Planning Commission recommended, voted to, recommends approval of both of these changes to the Urban Growth Area map and recommend that you adopt the resolution, adopting this amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. I'll stand for questions."

Chairman Unruh said, "Alright. Thank you, Scott. Commissioners, are there any comment or questions? Commissioner Ranzau."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a question. On the Mount Hope, did we approve this and the growth area expands, what happens to the Urban Area of Influence?"

Mr. Knebel said, "The Urban Area of Influence, according to the language of the zoning code, would automatically adjust to what this Urban Growth Area is. So the two areas in brown, the one in the northeast, the one in the southwest, would be removed. The area in light tan at the very south end would be added."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Thank you."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you, Commissioner. Any other comment or question? Seeing none, what's the will of the Board? Commissioner Dennis."

Commissioner Dennis said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Both of these communities are in my district, and I served on the MAPC (Metropolitan Area Planning Commission) when we adopted the Comprehensive Plan, and it's designed to be a living document that changes with time."

MOTION

Commissioner Dennis moved to adopt the resolution amending the Comprehensive Plan as recommended by the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission.

Chairman Unruh seconded the motion.

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

Commissioner Ranzau said, "In the past I have been opposed to expanding the Urban Area of Influence. I believe that it adds redundant and unnecessary bureaucracy to property owners in that area. I continue to be opposed to that, and my vote will reflect that. Thank you."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you, Commissioner. Is there any other comment? I see

none, so Madam Clerk, please call the vote."

VOTE

Commissioner Dennis	Aye
Commissioner Ranzau	No
Commissioner Howell	Aye
Commissioner O'Donnell II	Aye
Chairman Unruh	Aye

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you, Scott. Next item, please."

Adopted

G [17-601](#)

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS' REGULAR
MEETING ON JULY 13, 2017.

Presented by: Joe Thomas, Director, Purchasing.

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

Mr. Joe Thomas, Director, Purchasing Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, "The July 13th meeting of the Board of Bids and Contracts results in three items for your consideration.

1. 4 EA. HYDROSTATIC DRIVE SIDE CAST SWEEPERS-FLEET
MANAGEMENT
FUNDING -HYDROSTATIC DRIVE SIDE CAST SWEEPERS

"The recommendation is to accept the low proposal from Berry Tractor and Equipment in the amount of \$199,864 and establish contract pricing for the labor, parts and freight at the rates listed above for three (3) years.

2. 3 EA. TANDEM AXLE DUMP TRUCKS W/ ATTACHMENTS – FLEET
MANAGEMENT
FUNDING – TANDEM AXLE DUMP TRUCK W/ LIQUID ANTI ICING

"The recommendation is to accept the low proposal from Roberts Truck Center of Kansas LLC dba Summit Truck Group in the amount of \$538,617 and also establish contract pricing for labor, parts and freight at the rates listed above for three (3) years.

3. PATIENT TRANSPORTATION – VARIOUS COUNTY DEPARTMENTS
FUNDING – VARIOUS COUNTY DEPARTMENTS

"The recommendation is to accept the overall low proposal from Apple Bus Company at the rates listed and establish contract pricing for one (1) year with four (4) one (1) year options to renew.

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

*Chairman Unruh said, "Alright Joe, thank you. We do have a comment.
Commissioner Ranzau."*

MOTION

Commissioner Ranzau moved to approve The Board of Bids and Contracts with the exception of Item 2.

Commissioner Dennis seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

<i>Commissioner Dennis</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Ranzau</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Howell</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner O'Donnell II</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Chairman Unruh</i>	<i>Aye</i>

Chairman Unruh said, "So now we have Item 2 for discussion. Commissioner Ranzau, would you like to make a comment?"

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Well I'll just say, we're going to replace three dump trucks that are about five years old, they run \$150,000. I had some questions for staff earlier. I asked for some maintenance information, I'm not sure I've received that yet. If I have, I missed it in the email. But, I have gotten some information as far as the mileage, etc. I know we looked at private sector entities, and they are using the trucks for 250 [thousand] to 300,000 miles, which is twice as long as what we are using. So, I have some concerns about going forward with this particular item."

Chairman Unruh said, "Alright, thank you, Commissioner. I noticed that Penny is here. Did you have a specific question for her on any of the information that you wanted?"

Commissioner Ranzau said, "No."

Ms. Penny Poland, Director, Fleet Management greeted the Commissioners and said, "The maintenance dollars were in the email I sent yesterday. I have the year, make and the miles and the dollar amounts right after the miles. That would be unscheduled maintenance for the past five years."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Okay. I thought that was the amount we were going to get back from Purple Wave because we'd asked that amount..."

Ms. Poland said, "True."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "...so that's the amount there?"

Ms. Poland said, "Yes, sir."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Okay, thank you."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you, Commissioner. Commissioner O'Donnell?"

Commissioner O'Donnell thanked the Chairman and said, "Penny, you might stay up there. I appreciate you getting back to me about the question about what does the private sector do. So historically, you were getting rid of dump trucks at around

100,000 miles, is that correct? We pushed these to 150,000 miles?"

Ms. Poland said, "Correct. Well, actually they were, I believe, before the directors before me, they were at 100,000. They got pushed to 130,000."

Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Okay. And then you pushed it up to 150 [thousand]."

Ms. Poland said, "No. These are just over the extended, the life mileage."

Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Okay, piggybacking on what Commissioner Ranzau said, so when you looked at the private sector companies and the two that have them here in town that responded to you, they both said they kept them between 250 [thousand] and 300,000 miles."

Ms. Poland said, "Yes, sir."

Commissioner O'Donnell said, "What do you feel comfortable pushing these machines to? Like I told you, I just, I sold my car last month with 363,000 miles on it. So, I know, I know that, and it sold in one day, but I know cars and vehicles and things can go longer. What type of a plan are we going to put in place to match what the private sector is doing? Because they are doing that without a fleet management system as robust as ours. Some of them might have a fleet management company they work with, but we have staff on hand to take care of these machines. I would contend you do better with maintenance than most private companies do. So, why can't we get closer to that, Penny?"

Ms. Poland said, "I don't know that we can't. I just do not have any historical data to back it up. I am merely, I'm following the replacement policy. I would like to do more research and perhaps keep one of the trucks to do a test and continue to use it and see how many more miles we can get out of it."

Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Can, in this contract that we would agree today, are we agreeing to sell these trucks in this contract, if we approve it?"

Ms. Poland said, "No."

Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Or will come later? How can we use one of these trucks that you are going to potentially be selling on Purple Wave, how would we keep one in the system?"

Ms. Poland said, "Well the two will go to Purple Wave, we'll just keep one at one of the yards and have one of them use it according to how we are using it now."

Commissioner O'Donnell said, "I do not feel comfortable moving forward today with this, unless I have assurance that we can do that. So thank you."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you, Commissioner. For my clarification, Commissioner, unless we have assurance that we will keep one of the vehicles for test case."

Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Yes."

Chairman Unruh said, "Alright. We can include that in a motion if it comes to that point. Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I didn't actually know what my

colleagues were thinking, and some of the questions they may have had as they continue to think about this. But, I had discussion with Penny as well. I also have concerns about, I guess, what I would call the triggers to make choices to sell these trucks and to buy new trucks. Just for my own information, please remind me, how many of these trucks do we currently have in our fleet?"

Ms. Poland said, "We have 22."

Commissioner Howell said, "Twenty-two trucks, okay. If we sold them on Purple Wave, they typically would go for around [\$]50,000?"

Ms. Poland said, "Correct."

Commissioner Howell said, "[S]50,000, so if we sold all three trucks we get about \$150,000. I see that these trucks, the unit cost is \$179,000. I guess as I continue to think about our discussion about this, I think it'd be, rather than using triggers that have not been proven, I guess I would almost feel better if we could use, not just one truck, but all three trucks for our test. What I would like to do potentially is just, I'll probably make a motion in just a minute to approve two of the three, if that's acceptable to do so and keep three trucks, or just let them park the new trucks somewhere, try not to use the new ones, continue to use the old trucks as much as possible as they have been in the past, and should we have a breakdown, we have a backup vehicle.

"So we're not going to be in a situation where we can't provide the work or a service because of lack of a vehicle because we did buy two of the three. They're not all three going to break at one time. That would allow us to get some data regarding how many miles these can go, what kind of breakdowns would happen. I mean, the worst things probably would be something like a transmission or an engine would fail. That, my guess, is probably a hundred thousand miles more on these trucks before something like that would happen. Even if it did happen, these trucks still have a value, they can still be repaired. So we would basically forego \$150,000 of revenue at this time. We would get data that's very, very valuable, because I think our entire program needs to be, I guess, challenged and based on data rather than someone's ideas. We have not actually ever done a study like this. So, I do know we have different kinds of trucks. We have different manufacturers. I know they may perform differently, but I guess getting some data would be very helpful. If these three trucks are all the same, it would be less ideal. If they were different than each other, that would be better.

"But I guess I would like to make a motion we would approve two of the three vehicles, and along with that, I would like to see us keep three vehicles and continue to use those as primary vehicles and try to not use the newer vehicles so that we can get data on them. Then based on what happens in the future, we can continue to refine and hone our policy to something as actually as efficient as possible.

"Because I think what is going to end up happening is, we will sell these vehicles, and we will see somebody in the private sector will probably buy them for \$50,000 and drive them another 150,000 miles at least. I have no doubt that's likely to happen."

MOTION

Commissioner Howell moved to approve the purchase of two of the three new vehicles and retain the three older vehicles to collect data for a study to define the county's policy.

Commissioner O'Donnell seconded the motion.

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you. That's all my comments. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you, may I ask a question for clarification? We're going to buy two as back-ups, is that the intent?"

Commissioner Howell said, "Mr. Chairman, the concern was, excuse me. Apologize for the frog in my throat. If we didn't buy any vehicles at all, that they felt like it would be, it would put us in a situation where we may not be able to rely on these vehicles to actually make all of our commitments in terms of maintenance and work that has to be done around the county. If one of those were to break, it would cause a burden potentially on our Public Works. They would not have the ability to do their job. So to that extent, I think that the point is I would like to, it's about the same amount of money. We would forego \$150,000 of revenue at this time but not spend \$179,000 at this time. So it's roughly equivalent, and then let's us do the greatest amount of study possible on three vehicles.

"It also prepares us to do the work, if necessary, on vehicles that are dependable and roadworthy should these three vehicles prove to be a problem. Again, the theory is, these are not going to be trustworthy vehicles. To that extent, if they do break down, they're going to break down somewhere in Sedgwick County. All they have to do is get on the radio or cell phone, call, get a ride back to another vehicle, and we can deal with that in terms of a tow and a repair as a side issue. It will not cause undue burden to the county to keep these vehicles and let that study happen.

"This was a big discussion at the state level. Some of the people at the state level were driving across the State of Kansas, and some of these people were traveling and were very vulnerable people, and they are far away from home and they would break down, it would be of great concern. That's not really true in this case. They are going to be within our county. We have a standby vehicle ready to go, I think, if we do this, do what I have asked for in this motion. So, again, my motion would be based on the fact that I try to get the most amount of data out of these three vehicles and not cause an undue burden to Public Works by not having vehicles ready to go should they actually break down. I guess that's possible, so, I hope that makes sense. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you for that explanation, Commissioner. Commissioner Dennis."

Commissioner Dennis said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I got a question for Joe. The contract that you, or the bid that you put out, was for three vehicles. So, whoever was bidding on that, bid on the fact that they were going to have a contract to procure three vehicles and sell them to us. So their pricing is based on that."

Mr. Thomas said, "Yes, sir."

Commissioner Dennis said, "If we cut it back to two, what does that do to that?"

Mr. Thomas said, "It would be at the discretion of the vendor. We would contact them and let them know the will of the Commission, and ask them if it would be okay to proceed with the same pricing. That's what we'd like to do, but it would be at the decision of the vendor."

Commissioner Dennis said, "So, what we don't know right now is what the impact of that would be, because our next bid was like 180 almost \$185,000 per vehicle."

Mr. Thomas said, "Right."

Commissioner Dennis said, "So, it could end up costing us more by not purchasing that third vehicle."

Mr. Thomas said, "That is a possibility."

Commissioner Dennis said, "That presents a little bit of an uncertainty to me that I am concerned about, but I am not really different than the comments that have been made from several of the other Commissioners on this, and Penny will tell you that I was concerned when she came in and briefed me. Actually, Commissioner Ranzau was with us when we were briefed on this. I spent a lot of my life in logistics. I am not going to second-guess you on this by any means, but these are Peterbilt trucks, and if you take a look at this truck, these things are designed to go a long ways, 130[thousand], 150,000 miles, they are just starting to get warmed up. I am not convinced that we're doing the best thing that we can do at 130,000 miles on a great big Peterbilt truck. What does that thing turn over to zero at, what's the odometer? Is it a million miles before it goes back to zero?"

Ms. Poland said, "I don't have the answer to that."

Commissioner Dennis said, "I would bet that it's a million miles before it goes to zero. So, I really think that there's data out there. There was a comment made that maybe we ought to keep a couple of these to develop our own data. I can't believe that as large as the United States is, and as many people that are running fleets of trucks, that there's not data out there that can tell you how that long a Peterbilt truck is going to be able to run before that you are going to need to start thinking about replacement in a major fleet. A major fleet is completely different than somebody that's got one or two trucks.

"We've got people out there that are running major fleets of trucks, we've got hundreds of them. So, there's data out there already. So, maintaining these trucks to try and get our own data on two trucks, I don't know if it's going to be a valid test of what it takes. You really need a big fleet and a number of big fleets across the country, in order to be able to decide what the mileage needs to be, what the usage needs to be. It's not just mileage on these trucks. There's an hour meter on these things, too, I am certain, that tell how long that engine has been running. So it is not only miles, it's also hours. So coming in telling me how many miles it's got on it and it's time to replace it. If this truck is used for a certain task that requires high engine hours, it could be time to replace. But I can't tell, because we are not even using that as a metric. So, I am not sure that I will support the motion as it is, because I don't know that keeping two trucks is valuable to us. If we are going to buy some new trucks, we might as well recover some of the cost for the taxpayers for the ones we have got right now.

"But in the future, I am probably not going to be as amiable to accepting what you are telling me, unless we've got some strict data that tells us this is where, actually, we need to develop a policy. This is where we need to replace these vehicles based on mileage and hours on the vehicle. Or if there's significant damage to it, you know, somebody runs it off the road, and obviously we're going probably have to replace it. But I don't know that we've got a good policy right now that's based on mileage and

hours, and I don't think that keeping two trucks is going to be valuable to us. I don't think we'll get the data that we need. I appreciate the other Commissioners talking about trying to do this, to gather the data, but I think there is a better way of doing this than trying to maintain a couple trucks that may or may not prove out what we need to know. Thank you."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you, Commissioner. Our County Engineer, may I ask you for comment on this discussion?"

Mr. David Spears, Director, Public Works, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Just want to say, I am not sure I understood Commissioner Howell exactly, but if you keep, say you kept the three trucks to study them and you bought two more, but you bought two trucks, that is called an addition to the fleet. So, we would have to have a resolution, so instead of having 22 trucks, we would have 24 trucks. The other thing is, we pay rental, a type of rental. We pay budget, we pay money into fleet for every truck every month, so that when the fund builds up, we can replace those trucks. So, it's, there's a few more complications here than what meets the eye.

"The other thing I want to say is, so you can take these Peterbilt trucks and study them, but who is to say on the next bid that comes in, if it's going to be a Peterbilt truck that low. It could be a Ford, could be any other kind of truck. So, you're really only studying this. I really think there's got to be data out in the field about studies like this, but, I mean, it can be done what you want to do. I know Penny is following the policy as it is now. If you want to change the policy, I am sure she will follow it then, and so will we. Just have to remember, when a truck is down, I mean, that affects us as far as getting our work done. Trucks are a premium thing with us. It's one of the bigger, they're always busy, they're always hauling something at one yard or another.

"These trucks, we have even a truck foreman who delegates out the trucks to different places depending on what's going on. We might have some cold mix going on, might be needing to send some gravel or some rocks somewhere. So, just, we will live with whatever you decide to do, but I just wanted to throw that all into the mix there. It can get, you are going to add to the fleet if you buy some, but don't trade any others."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you, Mr. Spears. That's one of the comments I was going to make, that do we, does it violate policy if we just start adding vehicles. But, I'm trying to figure out now whether I think it's better to not buy any of these and just keep using these and collect the data, and then if we see that we got to make a change, we will have to make a change. But, we have Commissioners here that want to speak, and I'll try to go with folks who haven't spoken recently. Commissioner Ranzau."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Thank you. Couple questions. How long do we have to make a decision on this particular bid?"

Mr. Thomas said, "This was treated as a proposal, according to the record, it will be 120 days."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Okay. As far as those maintenance costs, I'd like to have each of those itemized out as well."

Ms. Poland said, "Okay. How would you like them sorted? You want them itemized out by..."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "By truck. I mean, you have a total amount..."

Ms. Poland said, "I have the total for each truck."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Right. Do you have, can you itemize that out as far as what the repairs were that added up to that?"

Ms. Poland said, "I can, yes."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Okay. And just some history, I believe it was 2011, when we revisited this policy. We had some data back then, and my understanding was we had some data, like you said, policy was 100,000 [miles]. I thought the data then said that we could go further than what we actually did on perhaps dump trucks, some others and, my memory could be failing me, but I'm going to go back and check. I remember having that discussion. We made some leeway, but we didn't go for some reason, we couldn't get enough votes to extend it out as far as what we thought the data showed. You know how things work, kind of, sometimes.

"But, I'm confident that this is too soon for these particular vehicles, given this data, the history. So I am not prepared to support purchasing any trucks at this time, even though I understand the intent. I think we have 22 trucks. There should be data on fleets out there. We have 22 trucks. The more you have, you can keep all that data, and I'm just, the fact that the private sector has incentive to do things in a cost-effective manner, they're using them twice as long as what we are. That means we could be spending half the amount of money over time on these particular type of trucks. That's where I am at today."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you, Commissioner. Commissioner O'Donnell."

Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to make a substitute motion that we delay the decision on this until we gather more information. Like Commissioner Dennis was talking about, there has to be data, national data that we can get before we make this decision, so that'd be my motion to delay."

SUBSTITUTE MOTION

Commissioner O'Donnell moved to defer Item 2 of The Board of Bids and Contracts in order for the Commission to gather more information.

Commissioner Ranzau seconded the motion.

Chairman Unruh said, "We have a substitute motion and a second. Is that all Commissioner?"

Commissioner O'Donnell said, "That's all, sir."

Ms. Poland said, "Can I make a comment?"

Chairman Unruh said, "Yes, please."

Ms. Poland said, "One of the reasons that we have the replacement policy is so that you can forecast your budget, operational and your vehicle equipment replacement. One thing I would like to add, although I don't have historical data to give you. In the past 25 years, since I've been at Fleet [Management], they have reduced, we've reduced technicians by five in the heavy equipment shop because we have improved

the average vehicle equipment age. So, there was more maintenance because the equipment was older. So we've reduced our staff by five because the equipment has, they're newer, they're working more efficient."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you. That's important information, appreciate it. Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just for clarity on the motion. Is this a motion to table this decision for, we have some time to think about this and get some more data. So, this is a motion to table this item for a little while and bring it back up if we need to."

Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Yes."

Commissioner Howell said, "Okay. I understand that, and I'm glad to support that. I would just simply just make a couple of comments based on, Commissioner Dennis made some point, a couple of points here about the money. But let me just ask, make a point that we have \$4 million worth of vehicles. You take 22 times this cost, it's roughly \$4 million worth of vehicles that we're replacing roughly every five years. If we, again, these are roughly five years old. Maybe that's not typical. I know that Commissioner Ranzau said that. That's not true? She's giving me some head-nods back there."

Ms. Poland said, "I'd have to do some more research to validate that number. I don't believe we're buying \$4 million..."

Commissioner Howell said, "Okay..."

Mr. Poland said, "...for 22 trucks."

Commissioner Howell said, "Well anyway, 22 trucks times that unit cost is roughly \$4 million. If we did not accept this bid today, and we had to change the bid to the more expensive bid, there's three other bids on the sheet about the same price, [\$]185 [thousand]. That's \$10,000 more, I'm sorry, \$5,000 more per vehicle. But we're spending \$36,000 a year on running these vehicles. So if we were able to extend the vehicle by a year, we would save, comparing those two things, \$30,000. I think we would be, we ought to be eager to get this data, and I'm not sure what it is based on right now. When I asked you the question in my office, we didn't really have books. We weren't looking at books trying to figure out, you know, what the national standards were for these trucks. It's just more of like, here's what we normally do in Sedgwick County.

"You know, it wasn't really based on any data that I could put my thumb on. So, would it be hours on the engine or miles driven or age, those are, we're using certain triggers right now, but I'm not sure that those triggers are correct. If we were able to extend the life of these vehicles by a year, it would be absolutely worth the effort to get there. By the way, if we did make the purchase of two vehicles today, and I understand there's some complications with that, I get that, I think those could be resolved. But nevertheless, if we make the purchase today, there is going to be a short time we would have more than 22 vehicles. We would receive the new ones, we would sell the olds ones. So, obviously we can keep more than 22 for at least a, for a time before they go to auction. So that's obviously, so we'd obviously would do, but I think those complications could be resolved. I think that the likely outcome of this, hopefully, my opinion is, is we ought to develop this data collection, try to get that data on these three vehicles. I hate to see us give these up.

"My opinion is we're not going to purchase these vehicles today. I'm not sure we're going to come back to this and visit this at any time in the future. I think keeping these three vehicles to get that data is probably the most important thing we have to decide on. So, to me that's, buying two vehicles, in my opinion, was a way for us to be sensitive to the needs of Public Works. If we're not willing to do that today, I'm not sure we come back to this in the future. But I think keeping the three vehicles is absolutely, critically important. We have got to get that data. If there's data available nationally, that should have been presented to us previously. I asked the question earlier and was not able to get the answer, so, I'll support the substitute motion. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you, Commissioner. Commissioner Dennis."

Commissioner Dennis said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think we're about ready to vote, but I wanted to let you know that I do support the substitute motion. I wouldn't have supported the original motion that was made, because I think now we're trying to make policies from the bench on the fly and I don't think that that's a good way of making policy. So, I think we've got a little bit of time. We can go back and take a look at the policy and make a wise decision, and we can move forward, so I'll vote in favor of the substitute motion. Thank you."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you Commissioner. Mr. Manager, did you want to make a comment on this discussion?"

Mr. Scholes said, "Yep, please, Chairman. I'd like to just, I like that opportunity. I think it's more than kind of just dump trucks. It kind of goes, it transcends to the entire major equipment fleet policy decision, because what affects this decision is the same thing that affects fire trucks or tractors or whatever that is. So I would like to have the ability to take this back and let me analyze this and let the staff chew on it, and then we come back to you with probably an update to our major equipment life cycle process in policy and bring that back to you. So, we owe you that. That's my recommendation."

Chairman Unruh said, "Alright. Thank you, Mr. Manager. So as I understand it, the substitute motion is that we just defer this. Is that correct? Alright. Now we're assuming that we'll get some information back before this bid expires so that we can still capture this bid, and you said we had 120 days."

Mr. Thomas said, "I wanted to clarify, it's 120 days from the date of the bid proposal opening, which was May 30th, so we have until September 30th to give us the four months..."

Chairman Unruh said, "Alright."

Mr. Thomas said, "...just to give you the accurate timeline."

Chairman Unruh said, "Well, I don't want to lose what we have, but I want to make a good decision, and I think this will allow us that opportunity. So, Commissioners, are there any other comment on a motion to defer? Seeing none, Madam Clerk, please call the vote."

VOTE

Commissioner Dennis	Aye
Commissioner Ranzau	Aye
Commissioner Howell	Aye

Commissioner O'Donnell II Aye
Chairman Unruh Aye

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you, Joe."

Mr. Thomas said, "Thank you, Commissioners."

Chairman Unruh said, "We all understand and have marching orders, I guess, so we can go do that. Next item please."

Approved As Amended

[17-669](#)

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS' REGULAR
MEETING ON JULY 13, 2017 - ITEM 2.

Presented by: Joe Thomas, Director, Purchasing.

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

All discussion within item G text.

Deferred

CONSENT

Mr. Scholes said, "I recommend you approve consent agenda items hotel (H) through romeo (R)."

MOTION

Commissioner Ranzau moved to approve the consent agenda with the exception of Item L.

Commissioner Dennis seconded the motion.

VOTE

Commissioner Dennis Aye
Commissioner Ranzau Aye
Commissioner Howell Aye
Commissioner O'Donnell II Aye
Chairman Unruh Aye

Chairman Unruh said, "Now, Item L. Commissioner Ranzau, would you like to make a comment?"

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Yeah, I have some questions. Alright, you gonna help me out?"

Mr. Steve Stonehouse, Deputy Director, Department of Corrections, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I'm going to try, Commissioner."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Okay, first of all, I think I know what this is for, what areas we're using this, but tell me what areas we are using this for. I noticed that in 2016, we got \$150,000 and 2017, it says out of 40 percent, [\$]63,000. Tell me what that, why you're saying at 40 percent? Has something changed about this? I guess

that's what I'm interested in finding out."

Mr. Stonehouse said, "That's 40 percent of the year. At 40 percent of the year, we have collected \$63,384."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Okay."

Mr. Stonehouse said, "So that's what that is."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "We expect to get close to the same amount? Okay."

Mr. Stonehouse said, "Yes, sir. So these are, you know, our juvenile facilities in the Juvenile Detention Facility (JDF) and Juvenile Residential Facility (JRF). We operate kitchens to feed the residents, and these are reimbursed meals for breakfast, lunch and snacks, if we follow the guidelines as put forth by the Kansas Department of Education (KSDE)."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Well, and that was the, I'd had some discussion in the past with Mark Masterson about this program. I know there's a lot of requirements for this and requirements that he'd like to, would have liked to eliminate. So the question is, is the amount we're getting back cost-effective as far as all the time and effort we put into, and I think at that time we thought it was. But when I saw this 40 percent, [\$]63,000, I thought maybe they were now reimbursing at a lower amount or bringing a lot less and maybe it would be closer to where it wouldn't be cost-effective anymore, you know, because of the time, I know there's lots of things."

Mr. Stonehouse said, "Right. There are requirements, such as content of the meals and some of the food that we have to purchase. There's requirements of the vendors have to be, buy American first, and if something gets slipped in from another country, then that gets a bit messy, but we've got it pretty much down to a science now about how we do our ordering with our vendor. But, we are monitored, we have audits by KSDE as far as the food goes. Our reimbursements are going down, because our population is going down, and we just reimburse by actual meals served."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "So, there's a lot of documentation..."

Mr. Stonehouse said, "Yes, sir."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "...that goes along, that's really why I kind of, all the time it takes to keep track of everything and all the requirements you have to do beyond just getting the food..."

Mr. Stonehouse said, "Right."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "...and serving it. I'll make the assumption that we still feel like the amount of money we're getting back still compensates us enough for the extra work that we have to do, but if we ever get to that point that we think it's not, then please let us know. That may for, you know..."

Mr. Stonehouse said, "We do consider that every year when we go through this process, because it is, it's arduous, and we still feel like it's worthwhile."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Alright, well, like I said, basically it was this 40 percent. I wanted to clarify and hadn't had time to talk to anyone beforehand, so I'll be supportive."

MOTION

Commissioner Ranzau moved to approve Item L of the consent agenda.

Commissioner Dennis seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

Commissioner Dennis	Aye
Commissioner Ranzau	Aye
Commissioner Howell	Aye
Commissioner O'Donnell II	Aye
Chairman Unruh	Aye

Chairman Unruh said, "Next item."

- H** [17-642](#) CIP Amendment for Project B-484: Bridge on 95th St. South between Broadway and the KTA. District 2.

Discussion for this item will be added after the official minutes are approved.

Approved on the Consent Agenda

- I** [17-643](#) CIP Amendment for Project B-492: Bridge on 103rd St. South between 103rd St. West and 119th St. West. District 2.

Discussion for this item will be added after the official minutes are approved.

Approved on the Consent Agenda

- J** [17-644](#) CIP Amendment for Project R-343: Multi-use Path on Rock Road from Derby to Mulvane. District 5.

Discussion for this item will be added after the official minutes are approved.

Approved on the Consent Agenda

- K** [17-615](#) One (1) Easement for Right-of-Way for Sedgwick County Project on 87th Street South between 167th & 183rd Streets West. District 2.

Discussion for this item will be added after the official minutes are approved.

Approved on the Consent Agenda

- L** [17-647](#) Agreement between Division of Corrections and Kansas State Department of Education for reimbursement of meals under the requirements of the National School Programs and Child Nutrition and Wellness

Discussion for this item will be added after the official minutes are approved.

Approved

- M** [17-628](#) Agreement with the Butler County Department on Aging (BCDoA) to provide case management services to Butler County Residents for the

Senior Care Act Program (SCA) FY 2018.

Discussion for this item will be added after the official minutes are approved.

Approved on the Consent Agenda

N [17-649](#) A Resolution Appointing Jaime Oeberst, M.D., as a Deputy District Coroner.

Discussion for this item will be added after the official minutes are approved.

Approved on the Consent Agenda

O [17-627](#) Changes to the Division of Corrections staffing table.

Discussion for this item will be added after the official minutes are approved.

Approved on the Consent Agenda

P **17-612** Order dated 6/21/2017 to correct tax roll for change of assessment.

Discussion for this item will be added after the official minutes are approved.

Approved on the Consent Agenda

Q [17-542](#) General Bill Check Register for July 12, 2017 - July 18, 2017.

Discussion for this item will be added after the official minutes are approved.

Approved on the Consent Agenda

R [17-543](#) Payroll Check Register for the July 8, 2017, payroll certification.

Discussion for this item will be added after the official minutes are approved.

Approved on the Consent Agenda

LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

Chairman Unruh said, "I think we have nothing to discuss today. Is that correct? Alright, I know, Commissioners, we have a Fire District meeting that we need to take."

The Board of County Commissioners recessed into Fire District Number One from 10:43 a.m. and returned at 10:46 a.m.

OTHER

Chairman Unruh said, "At this time, I believe we are ready for other. Commissioners, are there any other comments that you would like to make during this portion of the meeting? Commissioner Ranzau."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "I just wanted to give a quick update as far as, initially I've been working with Judge Riddel's Boy's Ranch (JRBR) and Lake Afton as far as the encumbrance. We'd originally been told by the Kansas Department of Wildlife and

Parks (KDWP) that the JRBR facility should not have been included in the boundary. Now I believe that, and they were going to do the paperwork, now I believe that's been stopped, but I haven't been able to get a straight answer from them as to who's made that decision up the chain. I will continue to try and find out. I think it may have been at the federal level. I'm a little confused as to why I can't get a direct answer to that. But I'll continue to, I know the Chairman will want me to continue to be persistent in this endeavor, and so I'll do so. I just want a straight answer so that I can tell the people, you know, why we're not doing this. We had a wonderful solution, or at least it would have been a wonderful, regardless of what we would have done anyway, we had stepped in the right direction. Now that's being stopped. I just want to know why and who did it so I can talk to the right person. I don't think that's too much to ask."

Chairman Unruh said, "Nor do I. Thank you, Commissioner. Is that all?"

Commissioner Ranzau said, "That's all."

Chairman Unruh said, "Okay, Commissioner Howell, I believe you were next."

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to congratulate Brigadier General Albert Miller on his promotion yesterday. He is in the process of leaving the 22nd Air Refueling Wing at McConnell Air Force Base. He's served with honor, he's a tremendous individual, he's been totally engaged in our community. Everyone has been seeing him around in the community, he's very engaged. Three of us, Commissioner Dennis, Commissioner Unruh and myself, we attended that ceremony yesterday where the Changing of Command happened between, at that time, was Colonel Miller, and was handed over to Colonel Olson. I want to congratulate him as well. I don't know how old Colonel Olson is, but he is obviously one that is very fast moving in his career to take command at McConnell Air Force Base. He's done a tremendous job in advancing his career. I think he'll be a Four-Star [General] before he's done."

"But Colonel Olson, I think, is going to be great for our community. I'm looking forward to get to know him a little bit, and I got to meet his family yesterday. I just wanted to congratulate both of those gentlemen for their respective positions in our community. McConnell Air Force Base, which we, we get to know them so much in our community. Of course, it's in my district, and so I just wanted to make that point that General Miller is on his way out, and I want to thank him for his service, and welcome Colonel Olson to the lead position as Command of the 22nd Air-Refueling Wing. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Unruh said, "Thank you, Commissioner. Commissioner O'Donnell."

Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chair. Today at noon we are dedicating the Meridian Street project. I will be joining Councilmember Jeff Blubaugh at the corner of Harry and Meridian. It's a, like I mentioned last week, it's a project that's been going on almost six years that I initiated when I was on the Wichita City Council, so I'm very proud of it. It was very necessary, and it's a beautiful street. If everyone hasn't had the opportunity to get down on Meridian, but most importantly aside from the street being nice and not patch worked, the flooding issue has been resolved, and that was the major, major source of frustration for many of the residents in south Wichita. So, it's a good milestone for the city of Wichita, and I'm excited to be there today. Thank you, Mr. Chair."

Chairman Unruh said, "Very good. Thank you, Commissioner. I'll just comment that last weekend on Saturday, my wife and I were able to go down and bring greetings to the Wichita/Sedgwick County Historical Museum. The folks that were there for the opening of an exhibit that was really quite fascinating and interesting. For those of you that aren't familiar with that, Sedgwick County has been an annual funder of the museum, and we gave special funds to get this exhibit started that they opened.

"I think we made that decision back in 2014, but it is a refurbishing of the original mayor's office in that historic building. But it's a fascinating place to visit. There's a lot of artifacts and pictures that take you back to the beginning of the city of Wichita and Sedgwick County, and it's worth your visit. It's really an interesting building. So Commissioners, with that, I don't see anyone else asking to speak, and I think we have no more items on the agenda and no Executive Session. That being the case, we will stand adjourned."

EXECUTIVE SESSION

ADJOURNMENT

There being no other business to come before the Board, the Meeting was adjourned at 10:51 a.m.