

Sedgwick County

525 North Main Street 3rd Floor
Wichita, KS 67203



*Sedgwick County...
working for you*

Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, April 4, 2018

9:00 AM

BOCC Meeting Room

Board of Sedgwick County Commissioners

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

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

CALL MEETING TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Board of the County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kansas, was called to order at 9:08 a.m. on April 4, 2018 in the County Commission Meeting Room in the Courthouse in Wichita, Kansas, by Chairman David T. Dennis, with the following present: Chair Pro-Tem Commissioner David M. Unruh; Commissioner Michael B. O'Donnell II; Commissioner Richard Ranzau; Commissioner James M. Howell; Mr. Michael Scholes, County Manager; Mr. Thomas Stolz, Deputy County Manager; Mr. Eric Yost, County Counselor; Mr. David Spears, Assistant County Manager of Public Works, Facilities Maintenance, Project Services and County Engineer; Ms. Joan Tammany, Executive Director, COMCARE; Mr. Kelly Arnold, County Clerk; Mr. Dale Miller, Director, Metropolitan Area Planning Department; Ms. Lindsay Poe Rousseau, Chief Financial Officer; Mr. Joe Thomas, Director, Purchasing Department; Mr. Justin Waggoner, Assistant County Counselor; Mr. Will Deer, Assistant County Counselor; Ms. Eileen McNichols, Director, Human Resources; Mr. Tim Kaufman, Assistant County Manager; Ms. Kate Flavin, Public Information Officer; Ms. Heddie Page, Deputy County Clerk.

GUESTS

*Mr. Alan Trenary, 1461 North Burns Street, Wichita, Kansas
Ms. Becky Tuttle, Greater Wichita YMCA and Health & Wellness Coalition of Wichita
Ms. Peggy Johnson, Recipient
Ms. Vicky Roper, Director, Prevent Child Abuse Kansas at Kansas Children's Service League
Mr. Jeff Fluhr, President, Greater Wichita Partnership
Mr. Scott Schwindaman, Co-Chairman, Project Wichita
Mr. Stan McPhail, 6140 South 127th Street East, Derby
Mr. Curtis Holland, 6201 College Blvd. #500, Overland Park*

INVOCATION: Pastor Rick Just, Asbury United Methodist Church.

FLAG SALUTE

ROLL CALL

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

Chairman Dennis said, "Next item, please."

PUBLIC AGENDA

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you, we have two individuals on our, that signed up today. The first individual is Stan McPhail to talk about the cell tower."

Mr. Stan McPhail, 6140 South 127th Street East, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I want to wait until that's brought up, if that's..."

Chairman Dennis said, "You want to speak during the..."

Mr. McPhail said, "The agenda item."

Chairman Dennis said, "Okay, and Larry VanDyke the same thing?"

Mr. McPhail said, "He has not shown up, but yes he does."

Chairman Dennis said, "Very good. Would anyone else like to speak on Public Agenda this morning, then? Yes sir, please approach the podium. State your name please, and you have three minutes."

Mr. Alan Trenary, 1461 North Burns Street, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I struggle to provide community service. I attend my neighborhood association meetings. I deliver the neighborhood association newsletter. I go to the various other means of outreach, and one of my recent things I started to do is take the English as a Second Language (ESOL) as English support person in these classes."

"I often find myself quite dismayed at all the rhetoric around illegal immigrants. I feel that our Lord called upon us to honor the alien in our midst and not to persecute them. It's very difficult for me to hear like right now all the excitement about building a wall and the caravan of people that are coming up from Central America, that are a definite danger, to walk on the streets and have a different opinion."

"I come from Colorado. I moved here six years ago or so due to conditions that I experienced in the medical cannabis and now the legal cannabis trade that they have out there and troubles I had with a veteran who I was taking care of. Since I've been here, you know I used to be able to wear this suit, fit me really well. I struggle with my weight. I'm getting better now because I eat a lot of hemp seed. I eat a lot of hemp oil, and I'm cutting back on the meat. I haven't eaten as much meat as I used to."

"I just really wish that we could stop disrespecting people who aren't like us. It'd mean very much, it's very important to me that, especially today due to what happened in Memphis 50 years ago. I'm very concerned about the direction our nation is taking as far as the angry rhetoric that's coming out towards other people I want us to be able to get along. You know it's very important to me that we learn to share. Thank you for your service, God bless you, and I'll leave it at that."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you, sir. Appreciate your comments. Would anyone else in the audience like to speak that did not sign up? You still have an opportunity. Seeing none, thank you. Next item on the agenda, please."

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

- A** [18-240](#) REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 14, 2018.
All Commissioners were present.

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you."

MOTION

Commissioner Dennis moved to approve the meeting minutes of March 14, 2018.

Commissioner O'Donnell seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

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

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

Approved

PROCLAMATIONS

B [18-229](#) PROCLAMATION DECLARING NATIONAL PUBLIC HEALTH WEEK AND RECOGNIZING THE DR. DOREN FREDRICKSON AWARD RECIPIENT.

Read by: Chairman David Dennis or his designee.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Adopt the proclamation.

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. I understand that today it's going to be accepted by Becky Tuttle. Peggy Johnson is our award winner, and I have asked Commissioner Unruh to read the proclamation."

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

WHEREAS, during the first full week in April each year, the American Public Health Association brings together communities across the US to observe National Public Health Week; and

WHEREAS, this year's theme "Healthiest Nation 2030 – Changing our Future Together" encourages public health professionals, health care providers, decision makers and residents to partner together to spur the community to make the healthy choice the default; and

WHEREAS, National Public Health Week provides community members with an excellent opportunity to make small changes that will have big impacts in their health;

WHEREAS, communities can support behavior changes by creating environments that make healthy choices the easy choice through improved access to physical activity programs, fresh fruits and vegetables, healthcare and health education; and

WHEREAS, every day, public health professionals work tirelessly to reinforce these messages and do their part to influence change; and

WHEREAS, his legacy and that of many other public health champions, such as Peggy Johnson are commemorated through the Doren Fredrickson Lifetime Commitment to Public Health Award.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that I, David Dennis, Chairman of the Board of Sedgwick County Commissioners, do hereby recognize April 2 - 8, 2018 as

NATIONAL PUBLIC HEALTH WEEK

In Sedgwick County and invite Becky Tuttle from the Greater Wichita YMCA and the Health & Wellness Coalition of Wichita, to come forward for the presentation of this year's award.

Chairman Dennis said, "Would you like to make a motion?"

MOTION

Commissioner Unruh moved to adopt the Proclamation.

Commissioner Dennis seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

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

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. Well, welcome."

Ms. Becky Tuttle, Greater Wichita YMCA and Health & Wellness Coalition of Wichita, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Thank you Board of Health members for allowing us to be here today in celebration of not only National Public Health Week but also this year's [Dr.] Doren Frederickson Lifetime Commitment to Public Health Award. Public health is what we do every day as a society to ensure that conditions which everyone can be healthy, from education and safe environments to housing and transportation, economic development and access to healthy foods, public health scope is very vast.

"National Public Health Week allows us the opportunity to be able to celebrate not only public health in the work that's done but reminds us that public health is for everyone in the population. It's not just for a certain part of our population, and it's not just in times of natural disaster and emergencies. Public health is part of our lives every day. No one knew this or demonstrated it more robustly than Dr. Doren Frederickson. Dr. Frederickson served as the Health Officer for the Sedgwick County Health Department for many years, and his concerns for those less fortunate were well documented, and he was absolutely passionate about eliminating health disparities in our community.

"Those traits can be seen in this year's recipient. Peggy Johnson is this year's recipient of the Doren Frederickson Lifetime Commitment to Public Health Award.

Peggy [Johnson] is the epitome of doing for others first. Peggy brought the Susan G. Komen Race for the Cure event to Wichita in 1990 and it became the third race in the nation and the first co-ed race ever. Peggy then moved to form The Komen Kansas affiliate, became a volunteer at the national level for the Susan G. Komen and eventually became the Chairwoman of the national Susan G. Komen Board of Directors. She has testified before Congress, lobbied for more research funding, given thousands of speeches, done hundreds of TV (television) interviews, pleaded personally with Vice Presidents, Queens of foreign nations, Ambassadors, Senators and Congressmen for more cancer funding.

“Because of Peggy’s leadership, 45,000 men and women in Kansas have received no cost mammograms, and this is just her volunteer work. Peggy is the CEO (Chief Executive Officer) and Executive Director of the Medical Research and Education Foundation and has with full support of her Board of Directors taken this organization into the area of public health.

“In addition to her public health events, Peggy has begun the foundation’s work in providing free advanced direct documents to the general public and healthcare issues and especially for the elderly and terminally ill.

“She has also begun organizing the annual Healthcare Ethics Conference, which is now in the fourth year and was wildly successful last week and brings healthcare workers, social workers, chaplains, adult home care administrators and others together to learn more about ethical issues in public health and healthcare. Congratulations to Peggy, and she’s going to say a few words.”

Ms. Peggy Johnson, Recipient, Dr. Doren Fredrickson Lifetime Commitment to Public Health Award, greeted the Commissioners and said, “Okay, that was humbling. I am very humbled by this award and this recognition.

“You know, I believe that most people in their lives, in their public lives, in their private lives, strive to do good every day, and I think they do it without the want or the need for recognition. So I really share this with a whole lot of people, lots of people in this room who every day try to do good things for other people. I want to acknowledge my husband John, who is here, John in the back. My children Jake and Molly who are not here, because in doing this work, I spent a lot of time away from home. You know, I don’t think my kids ever cared that Mom was doing good. I think they just cared that Mom wasn’t home and when was she coming back. So I need to thank them for this, and I thank my organization now, Wichita Medical Research [and Education Foundation], for their support.

“When I started this adventure into public health, I didn’t really know that it was public health. I was a Junior League member and I heard a startling fact that during the 10-year Vietnam War, 58,000 men and women died, but at the same time in the United States 330,000 women died of breast cancer, and apparently nobody was paying attention. I was a young adult at the time of the Vietnam War, and I remember watching every day as we heard about the body count from Vietnam. But when I heard this fact later, it appeared, it occurred to me that nobody was paying attention to that body count of women in the United States dying from breast cancer. So that was really my first call to action was hearing those startling facts. Over the years, my call to action has changed, but it’s always taken new directions. So I don’t think, no one does this work alone, especially in public health.

“I met Dr. Frederickson years ago as he was appointed the Health Officer for Sedgwick

County, and he was an engaging man with convictions beyond most doctors for the underserved and for public health. He was a researcher dedicating his life to finding answers to provide healthcare more effectively and in a more effective way for those who needed it. My coworker, Terry Jones, used to work with him, and she has many stories about traveling the back roads of rural Kansas as they met with people in rural communities and wanted to include their needs in his research, as he did research for the county and as he did for the KU (Kansas University) School of Medicine.

“So I really am humbled by the comparison to Doren. He was an extraordinary man, a compassionate worker and apparently just a really pretty funny guy, so I’m sorry that I didn’t get to know him better. I’ve really come to appreciate the term public health. It includes so many things. My organization, Wichita Medical Research, we fund research products for residents as they’re starting their research. Often they need data in order to have their research be effective, and they need data from the county. So they need good data on the health and environment of our county residents. If they don’t have that, then their research is meaningless. So in order to have good data, we have to have good data to draw from.

“So the county support and the Board of Health support for the Community Health Improvement Plan or CHIP, which I know you’ve all heard of, and that was developed by the Sedgwick County Health Alliance is so important. It’s not important only to the county as you decide what’s important for your residents, but it’s also important for organizations like mine who then set the priorities for the programs that they’re going to support.

“Tobacco-free parks, fresh fruits and vegetables through access throughout the whole county. Better graduation rates, safe streets and parks. Those are all things that we learn through the CHIP (Community Health Improvement Plan) and things that you support as the Board of Health and that all of our organizations use throughout the county.

“So my point is, 30 years ago, when I started this adventure, I really didn’t know it was public health, but since I’ve learned that it goes beyond the body count, it goes to all those things that we know as public health. So I also have had teachers along the way, many of who are in this room, Becky Tuttle from the Y.M.C.A. (Young Men’s Christian Associations) [of North America], Carolyn Gaughan, who is a former winner of this award who is with the Kansas Academy of Public Health. I thank all of them, and I thank the Board of Health and the Commissioners for this humbling award. Thank you very much.”

Chairman Dennis said, *“Ms. Johnson, we have a comment from Commissioner Unruh.”*

Commissioner Unruh thanked the Chairman and said, *“Well Peggy, this is well deserved and well-earned recognition for you, and it’s clear that you’re not involved in this to gain recognition, but you have a heart for public health and you’ve committed yourself to it. I first became acquainted with Peggy back when I first became a Commissioner and my wife had an episode with breast cancer and through the Race for the Cure and those activities. I’ve been able to observe your steadfast dedication to improving public health.”*

Ms. Johnson said, *“Thank you.”*

Commissioner Unruh said, "It's wonderful to have someone in our community like yourself who has made that commitment and who is articulate and who has the energy to make a difference, and you certainly have. So we really appreciate your effort. I appreciate your reference to Dr. Doren Frederickson. He was a unique and outstanding individual, and we were you know, we were blessed to have him as the [Sedgwick] County Health Director for some time, and I'm saddened that his parents are not here today. Oftentimes typically, they are here to share in the celebration. So we're thankful for Doren, and we're thankful for you. We're thankful also for Becky and her leadership in the community and improving our community health. So great job. Congratulations."

Ms. Johnson said, "Thank you very much."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. On behalf of the entire County Commission and especially us serving as the Board of Health, I want to congratulate Peggy Johnson for the award today, and I want to thank Becky Tuttle for being here to help present that, and I think she has something else to give you."

Ms. Tuttle said, "Yes, thank you. Congratulations."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you, okay. Next item, please."

Adopted

C [18-230](#)

PROCLAMATION DECLARING CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION MONTH.
Read by: Chairman David Dennis or his designee.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Adopt the proclamation.

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. This one I have asked Commissioner Ranzau to read, and it will be accepted by Vicky Roper."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Thank you."

WHEREAS, children are key to the state's future success, prosperity and quality of life, and while children are our most valuable resource, they are also our most vulnerable; and

WHEREAS, children have a right to be safe and to be provided an opportunity to thrive, learn and grow; and

WHEREAS, child abuse and neglect can be prevented by supporting and strengthening Kansas' families, thus preventing the far-reaching effects of maltreatment, providing the opportunity for children to develop healthy, trusting family bonds; and consequently, building the foundations of communities; and

WHEREAS, we must come together as partners so that the voices of our children are heard by all and we are as a community extending a helping hand to children and families in need; and

WHEREAS, by providing safe, stable and nurturing relationships for our children, free of violence, abuse and neglect, we can ensure that Kansas' children will grow to their full potential as the next generation of leaders, helping to secure the future of this state and nation.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that I, David Dennis, Chairman of the Board of Sedgwick County Commissioners, do hereby proclaim April 2018 as

Child Abuse Prevention Month

In Sedgwick County and I call this observance to the attention of all our citizens.

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you, Commissioner Ranzau. Do we have a motion?"

MOTION

Commissioner Ranzau moved to adopt the Proclamation.

Commissioner Howell seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

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

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you."

Ms. Vicky Roper, Director, Prevent Child Abuse Kansas at Kansas Children's Service League, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Thank you so much for signing our proclamation recognizing that April is Child Abuse Prevention Month. I'm Vicky Roper. I'm the Prevent Child Abuse Kansas Director at the Kansas Children's League and I'm also the Chair[man] of the Wichita Coalition for Child Abuse Prevention (WCCAP), many of which our members are here today and I'll recognize them later.

"Although child abuse prevention takes place year-round, we know that during April we are able to shine a light on what works, what works to prevent child abuse, and those are strategies, like home visiting, parent education, mutual self-help support groups, mental health services, respite care, expanding availability of affordable childcare and substance abuse treatment, all play a role in strengthening families. We know that strengthening families is the best investment that the state and communities can make for the future. Every dollar we spend on prevention upstream on the front end saves \$7 in the back end on incarceration and child welfare and business productivity concerns, and you know, lots of different issues.

"We know that all children deserve great childhoods. Children who are raised in loving and supportive environments are more likely to grow up and help secure healthy communities and be more productive, prosperous workers. Children who are raised in stable families we know do better academically, are shown to be more financially successful and contribute more to society. In your packets, you should have some additional information about our April campaign, the blue pinwheel, and you should have those in your packets as the symbol for child abuse prevention month, and it

represents happy, healthy, great childhoods.

“Hopefully you will see gardens of pinwheels popping up across the city. We’ll be planting a garden at the Wichita State University (WSU) Child Development Center on Friday, April 6th. Information about ordering pinwheels or other materials can be found in your packet or reaching out to the Kansas Children Service League (KCSL) at www.kcsl.org. The tower lights on Meridian [Avenue] and McLean [Boulevard] will shine blue for the month of April to honor Child Abuse Prevention Month. The Governor [Jeff Colyer] signed the state proclamation yesterday and planted pinwheels at the Capital with children from a neighboring childcare center.

*“April 6th, which is Friday, is Wear Blue Day across the state. So we urge you to wear blue as well as your pinwheel lapel pin that can be found in your packets. Thanks to a generous donation from Westar Energy, we’re able to host families and enroll them in our healthy families program at the [Sedgwick County] Zoo on Saturday, April 7th. Many of these families have never been to the zoo. So this is really an exciting opportunity for them. Please join us on social media this month using the hashtag *great childhoods*. Our jobs continue beyond just this month, though, and it is our hope that April serves as a reminder that everyone has a role to play in child abuse prevention.*

“So, in the Wichita Coalition for Child Abuse Prevention there are 130 people representing 60 agencies who have come together. Members of our team are here today, and I would like them to stand to be recognized. So, do you want to introduce yourselves and your agencies, Kayla and Sarah and Pam and Diana? (Inaudible), Kayla (inaudible) Rainbow’s United, Sarah Robinson St. Francis Community Services, Diana Schunn, Child Advocacy Center of Sedgwick County. This group’s work was featured in the National Presidential Commission to eliminate child abuse fatalities final report as the child abuse prevention story. We are the child abuse prevention story.

“This year, WTAE, the ABC affiliate from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, sent a documentary team to interview this group as Pittsburgh has been seeing an increase in child abuse fatalities, and they looked around to see what other communities were doing it the way they wanted to do it. They saw similarities in the two communities and we were featured on their award-winning documentary show. In addition to these people that are in the room, I’d also like to recognize Tom Stolz, who was one of the founders of the Wichita Coalition for Child Abuse Prevention, who we talked about a lot with the National Commission, because they were so interested in how law enforcement played a role in all of this. So thank you for your support of this work.”

Chairman Dennis said, “Ms. Roper, thank you very much for being here today. We sincerely appreciate it. We understand how vital that your program is to our youth that are coming up. As in a previous life, I was an educator. My both sons were educators, and we care deeply about the future of our children and anything we can do to help, we appreciate the opportunity. Thank you very much and thank you all for being here and representing your different organizations today.”

Ms. Roper said, “Thank you.”

Chairman Dennis said, “Madam Clerk, next item.”

Adopted

APPOINTMENTS

- D [18-270](#) ACCEPT THE RESIGNATION OF RANDALL OLIVER, CITY OF CHENEY REPRESENTATIVE (BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSION APPOINTMENT) TO THE SEDGWICK COUNTY STORM WATER ADVISORY BOARD.
Presented by: Eric Yost, County Counselor.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Accept the Resignation.

Mr. Eric Yost, County Counselor, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Items D and E can probably be taken together. Both of them pertain to the Sedgwick County Storm Water Management Advisory Board. Item D is the resignation of Randall Oliver from that board. He had been serving as the City of Cheney representative on that board as an employee of the City of Cheney. He has retired from that position, and the City of Cheney has nominated Ms. Danielle Young, and that's item E. She's been nominated by the City of Cheney as a board appointment because she is an employee, of course, of the City of Cheney. There is no expiration date for that position once you've approved it, and it's my understanding she's not here to be sworn, but the paperwork is in order, and I would urge adoption of both of these items. The resignation of Mr. Oliver and the appointment of Ms. Young, items D and E."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you, Mr. Yost."

MOTION

Commissioner Dennis moved to accept the resignation of Randall Oliver, City of Cheney Representative to the Sedgwick County Storm Water Advisory Board and appoint Danielle Young City of Cheney Representative to the Sedgwick County Storm Water Advisory Board

Commissioner O'Donnell seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

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

Chairman Dennis said, "Next item, please."

Approved

- E [18-277](#) RESOLUTION APPOINTING DANIELLE YOUNG (BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSION APPOINTMENT) CITY OF CHENEY NOMINATION TO

THE SEDGWICK COUNTY STORMWATER MANAGEMENT
ADVISORY BOARD.

Presented by: Eric Yost, County Counselor

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Adopt the Resolution

Action for this item was taken with Item D.

F [18-253](#)

RESOLUTION APPOINTING AARON HAMILTON TO THE DISTRICT 3
CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD AS RECOMMENDED BY
COMMISSIONER DAVID DENNIS.

Presented by: Eric Yost, County Counselor.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Adopt the Resolution.

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. Madam Clerk, this again is appointee. I'm sorry, Mr. Yost."

Mr. Yost said, "If you want to do it, Mr. Chairman, you're free to do that."

Chairman Dennis said, "No, go right ahead."

Mr. Yost said, "This is a resolution appointing Mr. Aaron Hamilton to the District Three Citizen's Advisory Board. He's being recommended by Commissioner Dennis for that appointment. He would replace Mr. Matt Byrum who has resigned. Mr. Hamilton's term would expire on March 21st of 2021, and I would urge adoption of the resolution."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you, Mr. Yost. Sorry, I was almost forgot you. Again, this is my Citizens Advisory Board. Matt [Byrum] served us very well, but he moved out of my district, and so he resigned. Aaron Hamilton has volunteered to become a representative."

MOTION

Commissioner Dennis moved to adopt the resolution.

Commissioner O'Donnell seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

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

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. Madam Clerk, next item."

Approved

NEW BUSINESS

G [18-235](#)

ACCEPTANCE OF DONATIONS TOTALING \$655 FOR THE SUICIDE PREVENTION COALITION.

Presented by: Joan M. Tammany, LMLP, COMCARE Executive Director.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Accept the donations and authorize the Chairman to sign the letters of appreciation.

Chairman Dennis said, "Good morning, Joan."

Ms. Joan Tammany, Executive Director, COMCARE greeted the Commissioners and said, "I'm here today because two individuals in our community sadly died as a result of suicide in January of this year. Families of Mattison Futhey and Abram Parks requested that any donations be designated for the Suicide Prevention Coalition in their memory. Mattison was not yet 20 years old when she took her own life and Abram was just 40 and a father and husband. Both were young adults in the prime of their life and saw no out other than suicide. We're really saddened by the loss of their lives, but I want to take this opportunity to educate everyone on the fact that suicide doesn't discriminate based on age or any other demographic and that mental illness impacts one-in-four Americans.

"We received six donations in Mattison's memory, totaling \$325 and eight in memory of Abram totaling \$330. I'm here today to ask you accept the donations totally \$655 and authorize the Chairman to sign letters of appreciation."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you, Joan. We appreciate the donations and the memory that they're intended for. Do I have a motion to accept the donations?"

MOTION

Commissioner O'Donnell moved to accept the donations totaling \$655 for the Suicide Prevention Coalition.

Commissioner Unruh seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

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

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you Joan for being here. Thank you for letting us know what the purpose of the donations were."

Ms. Tammany said, "Thank you."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you, Madam Clerk, next item."

Approved

H [18-234](#)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF A DONATION MADE BY MAGGIE BALLARD TO COMCARE'S COMMUNITY CRISIS CENTER.

Presented by: Joan M. Tammany, LMLP, COMCARE Executive Director.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Acknowledge the donation and authorize the Chairman to sign a letter of appreciation.

Ms. Tammany said, "I'm here because Maggie Ballard made the donation that we estimate to be about \$1,500 to the Community Crisis Center. She donated hygiene items, food items and over 500 pairs of socks. Maggie and her seven year old son Paxton founded Paxton's Blessing Box, and you may have see these around the community. They're the red boxes that you see as you drive through Riverside and other neighborhoods in our community.

"The concept is that neighbors place items in the box for people in need or who are struggling, and I think it's pretty remarkable that they keep adding boxes to our community, and it's a true testament that one person can make a difference in the lives of many.

"I don't know if Maggie is here today. I didn't see her. But we appreciate that Maggie thought about the persons in crisis here in Sedgwick County, and I'm here today to ask you to acknowledge the donation and authorize the Chairman to sign a letter of appreciation."

Chairman Dennis said, "Outstanding. Thank you, Joan. Again, we appreciate the hard work that folks go to to help support programs that we have here in Sedgwick County."

Ms. Tammany said, "Thank you."

Chairman Dennis said, "Do I have a motion?"

MOTION

Commissioner Howell moved to accept the donations made by Maggie Ballard to COMCARE'S Community Crisis Center.

Commissioner Unruh seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

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

Ms. Tammany said, "Thank you."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you for being here today. Madam Clerk, next item please."

Approved

I [18-207](#)

GRANT PROPERTY TAX RELIEF PURSUANT TO K.S.A. 79-1613 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$734.43.

Presented by Kelly Arnold, County Clerk.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Issue an order granting property tax relief.

Chairman Dennis said, "Good Morning, Mr. Clerk."

Mr. Kelly Arnold, County Clerk, thanked the Commissioners and said, "This item is a consideration of a request for property tax relief. Just to give you a little bit of background on this, the Kansas statute has a provision that provides for a property tax relief if a homestead is destroyed or substantially destroyed as a result of fire, flood, earthquake, tornado, storm or an event declared a disaster by the Governor. The owner may apply for a tax credit for abatement under statute subject to any budgetary constraints, excuse me. From the county or other taxing subdivisions.

"The Board of County Commissioners (BoCC) is tasked with making the following finding. First, that the property is a homestead. Second, if the assessed valuation, excuse me, if the assessed valuation of the property before damage or third if the property was destroyed or substantially destroyed. If the cost to restore the property to it's, excuse me. If the cost to restore the property to its before damaged condition is greater or equal to 50 percent of the market value prior to the event the property deemed destroyed or substantially destroyed, however, the cost. I'm sorry. I'm trying to catch my breath. Destroyed however if the cost of the property does not meet the 50 percent threshold, it is not considered substantially destroyed and does not qualify for relief.

"Sedgwick County adopted a resolution to establish the procedures to evaluate these applications. On the item, the application was filed for the property owner, Kevin Kimmel, requesting the property tax relief for damage sustained to the property located in 1732 North Burns in Wichita. He was notified of the agenda item this morning. Mr. Kimmel's application indicates the property suffered damage as a result of a fire on January 5th, 2017. The property's assessed valuation before damage was \$7,188. The damage was found to be 98 percent of the pre-damage value, so the property qualifies for the credit. The valuation damage was assessed by our Appraiser's Office. The recommendation is to issue an order granting the property tax relief in the amount of \$734.43 and authorize the Chairman to sign."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you, Mr. Arnold. Commissioner Ranzau."

MOTION

Commissioner Ranzau moved to approve property tax relief.

Commissioner Unruh seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

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

Mr. Arnold said, "Alright. Thank you."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you, Mr. Arnold. Next item, please."

Approved

J [18-242](#)

STATUS UPDATE REGARDING SEDGWICK COUNTY-ROBERT J. DOLE VA MEDICAL CENTER EMS CLAIM RECONCILIATION.
Presented by: Mike Scholes, County Manager, and Lindsay Poe Rousseau, Chief Financial Officer.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Receive and file the updated status report.

VISUAL PRESENTATION

Ms. Lindsay Poe Rousseau, Chief Financial Officer, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Good morning, Commissioners."

Chairman Dennis said, "Well good morning, Lindsay. This has been a process that's been going on since October."

Ms. Poe Rousseau said, "It has."

Chairman Dennis said, "I know there's been a number of meetings. We look forward to seeing your report today."

Ms. Poe Rousseau said, "Yes, sir. Before I get into any of the substance of today's presentation, I do want to extend a welcome to some of our guests here today from the VA (Veterans Affairs). We have Associate Director of the Robert J. Dole VA Medical Center, Dr. Dana Foley here. We have Jennifer Dowel, Chief of the Finance and Business Operations Management, and Akeem Ashford, the Public Affairs Officer. So I just want to welcome them to our meeting today and thank them for being here.

"I think we've had some great teamwork between the county staff and the VA folks we've worked with. I want to take a moment just to give a special thanks to Tracy Lolley and Tameka Tucker, in COMCARE, Cassondra Roland from the Manager's Office, and Scott Hadley, Dennis Mock and Sheila King from EMS (Emergency Medical Services) who have played a large role in making sure we had the information and details we needed to provide this information to you today.

"At your seats, you should have two handouts, one that looks like this, which is a 43 page detailed report. You also have a Powerpoint presentation, and that presentation is what we'll go through today, and it simply summarizes the information in the report. You'll see throughout the presentation, I'll jump ahead just for a second, that right underneath the title of each slide, there is a page number reference. So if anything catches your eye as we move through this, you're certainly able to go and read more details in that report. The Powerpoint and the presentation are both attached as

backup to this agenda item, so it's also available in that way.

"So we will stay at a fairly high level today. I don't want to go through all 43 pages in detail with you. But I want to walk through why we did what we did, some of the processes that we learned about and the recommendations that we have for both county and VA. The VA officials are here. I'll do most of the talking, but I'm sure that they'll be ready and willing to answer any questions at the end if necessary. So with that, we'll jump into it.

"So the first slide here outlines the objectives for the analysis, the exercise that we've been going through, as the Chairman said, since October. The objective was to perform a thorough reconciliation of those outstanding EMS claims where the VA was listed as the primary payer for the transport. We also wanted to understand and identify opportunities to improve processes, so that we did not come back to the same place that we were when we started this. For some background, the bulk of the initial review was conducted from October 20th 2017, through January 19th 2018. You'll hear as we go through today that there is still some work ongoing, but mostly the bulk of that initial preliminary identification of all claims and where we stand was with you completed then.

"We did focus on ambulance transports only from July 1st, 2014 through September 30th, 2017. We'll talk about why those dates are key in a minute. I want to emphasize that the focus of today's report is only related to county, Sedgwick County EMS transports and the Veteran's Administration. So there may be some other issues that we have going on. We heard about them in our 2016 audit. So this does not necessarily answer all of those questions. That would be a separate discussion we'll have at a later date.

"So for a little bit of introduction to the material that we'll talk about today for a reference point, EMS transports approximately 42,000 patients per year. Of those, 1,100 are those where the patient has the VA as the primary payer. The VA changed its process for how we submit claims in March of 2014, about the same time Sedgwick County opted to insource its billing operation for EMS, and so COMCARE took that over as they were already doing billing for COMCARE and Health Division functions. We added EMS billing to that. There were five positions added at that time.

"Since 2014, we have reported an issue with getting timely payment from the VA, and we weren't alone. Congressman Kevin Yoder actually received a copy of a Kansas EMS Association survey where they reached out and contacted all of the EMS agencies across the state.

"Of the respondents, 90 percent said they had experienced a slowdown in receiving payments from the VA since some of the changes went into place. So Congressman Kevin Yoder from the Third District sent a letter to the then secretary asking for some changes to be made, stressing the importance of local providers receiving timely payment because it is such a large portion of typically their revenues. Unfortunately, we still had some issues. Then Commissioner Dennis, now Chairman Dennis, made comments from the bench last October and basically identified that at that time we estimated there was an outstanding balance of \$1.5 million for that time period we had talked about, roughly July 1st, 2014 on.

"Based on that, the County Manager gave direction to staff for us to collaborate with our partners at the VA, again to try and understand what our processes were, how we

can improve those and try and get caught up. So we'll start walking through the process part first, then we'll get to what the findings are that we actually found as we move through this. So for EMS, obviously most if not all transports begin with a call to 911. 911 dispatchers are able to direct whether lights and sirens are sent to pick up a patient. That helps determine what level of care they'll receive, and of course, what type of charge then will be passed along. When paramedics are transporting patients, they're communicating with the hospital that they're taking patients to. At the end of the run, they're able to generate what's called a run report. They provide some additional information that's collected over actually at EMS Administration, where they do some quality assurance, before that gets submitted over to COMCARE for billing.

"When it gets to COMCARE, it is input into our billing software. There is some patient data validation that goes on at that point, as well as back at EMS, essentially verifying the patient name, date of service, date of birth, social security numbers, all of that type of information is correct and included. Again, that information is typically collected when someone is under some extreme stress, and so it's not always perfect information. What that leads to, though, is potential issues where if the county is unable to verify that the data matches with what the provider has, that that claim may be submitted back to us, so we've run into that issue with the VA, and we have made a request that we'll talk about a little bit later to get patient information or just some basic information so we can validate it so that the claim doesn't get rejected back to us causing delays in payment.

"At COMCARE, obviously, they generate different types of claims for the VA. Paper claims are generated and mailed to one of two addresses depending on where the transport actually occurred. So if a transport is to the actual VA facility, it's handled under what's called beneficiary travel or benny travel, and those claims are actually handled here locally. We'll talk about that process here in a moment. If it is to another entity in the community, a medical provider that is not the VA, then that falls under what's called mill bill or care in the community, and that actually will be routed to a slightly different place. So we'll talk through both of those processes.

"So for beneficiary travel, again, that is handled here locally. Before we started this reconciliation effort, what we found is that there is a pretty manual process in place. A claim was mailed.

"It was opened by one individual, input into a spreadsheet for tracking and payment, and if that transport was eligible for reimbursement by the VA, a purchase order would be identified by that individual, and that information communicated to COMCARE actually via fax. COMCARE staff would enter that information into the VA's invoicing system line by line, so every single transport would get entered. If everything balanced and that purchase order had funding, payment would be processed actually out of the Treasury in Texas. If it's not balanced or if that PO (purchase order) didn't have enough funds to cover the cost of the claims, the COMCARE staff and VA staff would work together to resolve that issue.

"Based on that process and the opportunity for errors to occur, I think there were a number of changes made on the VA side to improve that process. For example, one person is no longer responsible for those beneficiary claims management. A team will be handling that going forward. In addition, a centralized access database was developed that will track patients from the moment they arrive all the way through the process so that at that point the VA knows to expect a claim from Sedgwick County at some point. And PO information, instead of being faxed, which, of course, leaves opportunities for misplacement, that information is now e-mailed instead, and

COMCARE staff are now authorized to enter only one line instead of a line for every single transport. So that's been a significant improvement.

"At the meeting between VA and county leadership a few weeks ago, the leadership set a goal of providing feedback to the county within one business day regarding whether beneficiary travel claims could be eligible for reimbursement. Likewise, they set a goal of resolving claims within 45 days, and of course, these are process changes, and so we'll monitor those and make sure they are effective and useful and make additional changes down the road, if necessary. So again, beneficiary travel, what we just talked about, is only related to those transports that occurred to a VA medical facility.

"Now, we'll talk about mill bill. Again, this is if a patient is transported to a non-VA healthcare facility, maybe a Wesley [Medical Center] or something like that. On this side, since those non-VA service providers are providing care, the claim is handled differently. Generally a transport claim won't be processed until the facility actually providing care is paid. So if that facility winds up writing off the claim as charity, then the county would not be reimbursed for that transport. In addition, we found that historically payment was made either by check or EFT (Electronic Funds Transfer), and in that case, it would require COMCARE staff when an electronic payment was made to actually go in and manually trace back which claims were being paid with that electronic fund transfer (EFT).

"Another issue that we ran into with mill bill type claims is when a payment or when a claim is denied. There are many reasons that a claim could be denied, and what we have found through this is that sometimes it's really denied, and sometimes it's not so much denied as being referred to somewhere else in the VA for review or maybe they're waiting for the facility that's providing the care to be paid before they'll pay us.

"So this will create issues for COMCARE because in order for them to be eligible for repayment from a secondary insurance, they need to make sure that they are getting that claim submitted in a timely fashion, and if they're not, then they lose eligibility to be paid for the claim in some fashion. So we have addressed that with VA leadership, and I think we'll continue to work through that as possible process improvements going forward.

"So switching gears a little bit on you, we'll talk about the reconciliation process itself over the next couple slides. We've summarized numerous steps that are outlined for you in your report starting on page 13. There were weeks of data compilation. It did take us some time to put together a master data file that we could work with. It also included a site visit. We did some preliminary process improvements, a number of meetings and phone calls were had between various staff involved on both sides, and we were able to identify those initial issues and address them fairly quickly early on. We have had a number of payments processed since the beginning of this reconciliation effort. We identified some findings along with recommendations when the reconciliation was complete. We did wrap up the data review, and now we're into the details where we're literally talking with the VA on a claim by claim basis to try and understand why a claim may have been denied or what its status may be.

"So finding one is probably the most interesting slide for the folks in this room. Finding one essentially talks about where we stand with the outstanding balance. Again, when Chairman Dennis last October brought the issue up, we believe that we had an outstanding balance of about \$1.5 million since 2014. What we found through this

reconciliation was that from that time period we talked about earlier, July 1st, 2014, through September 30th, 2017, there were a total of about 4,200 claims worth about \$3.1 million over that time period. We have continued to work throughout this reconciliation, and where we stand today is that we have slightly less than 1,000 claims that we still need to work through and resolve with the VA. Your report actually outlines those in much greater detail about what the status is of all of those claims and the worth.

“You can see that we have about 23 percent total of the claims that we still need to work through. This is as of about a week and a half ago. So I will tell you that I would say almost literally every day we’re making progress. This slide, this findings table has been updated several times. I think the last time we talked about a draft with you all it was at \$1.5 million and about 1,800 claims that were still unresolved. So we are making good progress, but it’s still something that we are working through.

“For the reconciliation results themselves, we also found a couple of interesting pieces of information. What this slide is trying to tell you is the amount of time associated with each of the type of claims we’re talking about on a prior slide. So for the VA, you can see that in 2014 or for claims with a date of service in 2014, the average number of days from the date the claim actually was mailed over to the date we were paid was about 675 days. That is down to 157 in 2017. Again, I stated before the VA has expressed the goal of getting those resolved within 45 days going forward. On the COMCARE side, you can also see improvement.

We started in 2014, excuse me, with the average number of days from the date of service to the date a claim was actually mailed to the VA of 123 days. That has gotten down to 55 in 2017. So this is still areas that I think everyone has identified that we have opportunities to improve. But certainly these numbers are trending in the right direction, and we’ll talk about how to address that here in a later finding. On the quality assurance side, Sedgwick County and the VA each have limited controls to prevent errors. Staff are diligent in trying to do their best, but we found that there are many opportunities for improvement. We found that both entities would improve or would benefit from increased quality assurance. For example, for the VA, we talked about how there is an access database that is unique to the Robert J. Dole VA Medical Center. There is not a system-wide software for the VA that allows them to capture these emergency transports, and so from our perspective, we believe that that would be very beneficial to have something like that, and then even potentially to make that available to providers so that we’re able to access claims and see status over time.

“We also think on the county side that we have little opportunity for quality assurance based on the current structure of the EMS billing office. As I said, when the program when the EMS billing first moved in, there were five positions. The board authorized three additional positions as a part of the 2017 budget, and so that certainly has helped, but we’ll talk about some industry standards later where they’re simply not able to have a supervisor who is only dedicated to supervising quality assurance. That person actually needs to be a working supervisor. So one of the things we would suggest would be to potentially add a quality assurance position to that staffing table just to provide that with the ultimate goal of improving processes, making sure claims are correct when they go out to speed payment up.

“We also found that if we could have patient data verification access, again, what we talked about before, where if we could get some basic patient data information from the VA, which we’re currently able to do from Wesley and Via Christi, to verify names spelling, date of birth, correct social security numbers, make sure numbers didn’t get

transposed somewhere, that would be really beneficial for us as well. Finally, staff from both the county and VA would benefit from having documentation of internal processes and procedures along with checklists to assist with verification that all steps in the established processes and procedures have been adhered to.

“For communication, we do know there have been some historical communication issues, that was something that the Chairman addressed last October. We believe that going forward we have a good process in place to ensure regular communication, not just between the staff who are actually handling the claims but up to management and up to the board and to VA leadership as well. There will be long-term quarterly meetings. In the short-term, those are actually occurring monthly. There are some reports that the County Manager has requested that we deliver and the VA Director actually had some additional information he had requested we’ll make sure we’ll provide. So communication has broadened and improved, but certainly we’ll keep an eye on that to make sure it continues going forward to avoid getting where we were.

“For finding number four, on the VA claim process as we talked about initially, processes have changed over time, and that has created confusion for county staff. While ongoing and monthly quarterly communications should help, I just wanted to give a couple of examples. So we talked about the requirement that we send different types of claims to different mailing addresses. That’s a very manual process on the part of COMCARE staff. They actually have to separately print off and assign labels to get those to the right place. Likewise, we talked about those denial claims where sometimes staff don’t actually know the claim has been denied and we need to reach out to a secondary insurer, or if it simply means that the claim is pending and we will receive payment eventually, and so again we’ve collaborated with the VA to seek some additional assistance with that. Finally, we talked about some of those faxes, changing over to e-mail. We think that’s a good step. We want to make sure that there are some redundancies in place to make sure that we don’t fail to get some of that information.

“For finding five, related to software issues, both entities face the claim software issues. I’m not going to belabor the point because we’ve talked about the central beneficiary travel claim tracking tool that isn’t currently available at the VA that we think would be beneficial. We know that COMCARE’s system has some limitations primarily. I can illustrate it better with an example. So if you have a patient who has VA as the primary insurer and maybe who also has Blue Cross[and Blue Shield], let’s say we hear back that a claim is denied, we go ahead and issue a claim to Blue Cross Blue Shield. Blue Cross Blue Shield pays it, we post it to the system but we still have the VA listed as the primary payer. The software system isn’t smart enough on its own to know to produce a claim to mail to the VA, that we still have that outstanding. So staff has to be diligent and be aware enough to go in and print that and send it over to the VA. So that would be an opportunity for improvement that we could talk with our software vendor, and I believe we have an opportunity to do that later this year. We do know that staff training can absolutely limit the opportunity for error, and so some efforts will be done for that, but we also think there is good opportunities through software to make some of these things more automatic.

“For finding six, on the county side, again, we started EMS billing in-house in 2014. Since then, we’ve had some turnover, and just like with any turnover, that can lead to inconsistency, and so one of the recommendations we have actually for COMCARE that you’ll hear about in a bit is having stronger written procedures, more detailed, and then have an external review or audit done of the processes themselves to ensure they’re correct, good, efficient, and then to actually look and make sure that we’re

adhering to those good, strong processes that we have put into place.

“For finding seven, staffing and process improvement resources, we believe that we have identified a lack of resources in depth for those sides. Although, the VA did address that by having these claims go out to a team instead of being handled by one person on the beneficiary travel side. We also know that the VA does have the OIG (Office of Inspector General) come in and do the audit for it for improper payments every year. We think that with changing it over to the staff with some of the other improvements that have been made, we’re probably down the right track with the VA, but we would ask their leadership continue monitoring that and consider adding resources if necessary.

“On the COMCARE side, what we have found through this study, is that for EMS billing, we are not staffed to what is considered the industry standard. This is outlined in more detail in your report. But again, if you recall earlier, I told you COMCARE handles about 42,000 EMS transports per year. Industry standard says that for every 4,500 to 5,000 claims, we would want at least one FTE (full time equivalent). So that equates to eight to nine FTE and again, they have a working supervisor, so there may be some reason to evaluate whether additional staff need to be added or again, the reason that the billing function was insourced before was to save money. If we find that we are not saving money because we are adding all of these staff, if we’re able to generate payments and claims, then outsourcing may be something that needs to be considered by the board as a part of its budget process.

“So moving into the recommendations, and finally wrapping up. For county management, we want to make sure that county management, including you, get quarterly feedback on the status of how things are going and that we want to make sure we’re communicating with you any needs that need to be addressed so that can be done in a timely fashion, potentially even outside of the budget process, if necessary. As a parts of that, we want to evaluate the need for staff and outsourcing from an objective neutral study. We want to consider those external audits, make sure that we’re communicating that to you and that you are taking that seriously and understand what the ramifications could be if we don’t do that. We do have two internal financial auditors that were added to the Manager’s staffing table in the 2018 budget process, and this could be an ideal project for them to ensure that procedures are being adhered to and that things are going as you all would expect.

“For COMCARE, we did have an issue where the VA identified that sometimes duplicate payments are made because we send duplicate claims, and so the VA had asked that we start marking those claims when they’re duplicate, and so that has already started. We want them to establish procedures, written processes and procedures, and then enforce those and ensure that all staff are adhering to them. We know that over in our Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) group, we have a tremendous business intelligence toolkit where reports from available on an automated basis, and we want to make sure that resource is available to them and utilized and we want them to continue fostering communications with the VA, so that we can continue moving and making progress.

“For EMS, another item that the VA had indicated would be useful is to understand how our process works. So while I think this record helps with that, I think there is still opportunities for improvement there. So we want EMS to collaborate with COMCARE to develop that process and provide that information to the VA. With regard to finance, on our side, we need to make sure we are monitoring collection, advocating for

COMCARE or EMS to county management as necessary when it looks like resources are needed, and again, because we are so good at audits, we want to make sure that we're advocating for those external audit reviews when necessary.

"Finally, for the VA, most of these, you've already heard throughout the discussion today. We want to ensure ongoing communication with providers, definitely Sedgwick County but others as well, again, because that EMS a survey found there were some delays.

"We want to ask them to ensure that the anticipated process improvements that they've already put into place and that they're monitoring those and open-minded about correcting those as we go forward, if necessary. We've talked about having access to additional data and claim information so we would ask that they would maybe work with us towards that end goal. Having written processes and procedures for providers, again, we talk about checklists. There's a lot of opportunity for confusion, so just providing additional information to providers to help us to understand what is expected of us so we can try and ensure as timely payment it's a possible.

"Again, we talked about excuse me, denials. We would like an opportunity to learn more about what all the denial codes mean and have some standardized denial language so we understand whether it's a true denial or simply a matter of pending for the moment and there's some additional work we may need to do. So with that, I'm done. Like I said, we do have the VA officials in the room. I'm sure they'd be delighted to come answer any questions you might have. Otherwise, I'll turn it over to you, and then ultimately recommend you receive and file."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you, Lindsay. Well first of all, I want to thank Rick Ament and his entire staff that is here today for the support that they gave during this entire process. We have a 43 page report that is a result of all the work that was done by both the VA staff and by our Finance and COMCARE and EMS folks here in Sedgwick County. I appreciate the support that was given by Senator Roberts, Senator Moran and Representative Estes. They represented, they had representatives in the major meetings at the beginning and end of this entire process.

"The one thing that I want to make sure that everyone understands is that we and EMS, is going to transport our veterans no matter what. They are our primary concern. They are some people that are very near and dear to my heart, being a veteran myself, and we have two other veterans on the bench with me today that care deeply about the care and welfare of our veterans, and we appreciate everything that the VA does. The only thing I can say about the VA, though, is Akeem who happens to be in the audience today, was being hired by Sedgwick County, and when he reported on this on our first meeting, they stole him for us. So that's probably the major downside that I can see to everything that happened."

Mr. Mike Scholes, County Manager, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Not better at all."

Chairman Dennis said, "But we've gone a long way from where we started on this process. We've learned a lot from each other on what it takes to be able to bill properly, to process the bills so they can come back to us and support our EMS. I do appreciate everything and everyone that was involved in this entire process. Did we get everything we hoped we'd get from Sedgwick County? No.

"But what we did get was that these claims are going to be processed in a very timely manner so that we know immediately, or as close to immediately as we can, whether or not that they're going to be denied for some reason or whether or not they need additional information.

"So that we can either provide the additional information or if they're denied if the veteran has additional insurance that we could go to that we could claim there. We have other things that we can do. We're not going to end up a year and a half from the time that a claim was submitted until we're finding out that it was denied. So we've moved a long way, and the reason we moved a long way was truly because of the staff and the work at the VA and the staff and work here in Sedgwick County.

"I just want to tell everyone thank you very much for all of that. I think we've got some processes in place that we're going to be using in the future. We do have a large report. That report is also part of the things that we've given to our national representatives, and they can take a look at. But that's my only community's right now. We do have some other comments from the bench. Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell thanked the Chairman and said, "I do want to say, first of all, thank you to Lindsay for all you've done to bring this great report to us and explain it the way you did. You did a great job, and I know there are a lot of people behind the scenes you worked with to do this. This is a tremendous amount of work. It took a lot of time to get it together. I think your level of understanding is very, very deep and you've done a great job. So appreciate all you've done to do this. I also want to commend Chairman Dennis for you know, he's been I guess, our BoCC leader on this issue, and he's also taken a deeper understanding of this. I think, he's participated in a lot of the meetings and articulated where needed to ensure this issue got the attention it needed and to drive towards the solutions. I want to say thank you to Mr. Chairman for that it's as well.

"A couple of comments, my take-a-ways right now, I think that especially the status quo before changes, was extremely complex and kind of frustrating to watch how government gets complexity built into our processes. I know, you've identified a lot of them this morning. I know there are already some solutions in place streamlining and some efficiencies have already been input. But however, I know there's more to go. So I just want to say let us know how we can help with that, continue to drive towards efficiency and accuracy and timeliness. I think those are great goals, and you've done a great job so far, but obviously there is still some work to do.

"I think a summary for the BoCC would be helpful I know, I've heard external audits would be something we probably need to support through our budget as well as another FTE. I want to make a point on page I think, it's on page 24 of the report, it talks about overtime, over 1,000 hours of overtime by our staff. So essentially, if you were to eliminate the overtime, would you essentially pay for the FTE. So, I think that's low hanging fruit that we ought to certainly put into that our budget. I would be glad to support that. I know we did make a change in I guess, it was 2014, we made a change in how we do collections. Can you answer a question?

"How are we doing on the non-VA collections? Is there issues on that side as well that we need to, I guess, review and consider improvements on the other side that are non-VA claims?"

Ms. Poe Rousseau said, "Not that I am aware of. We can dig into that a bit and send you maybe some follow-up information."

Commissioner Howell said, "It sounds like this is kind of a double whammy. The VA changed their side and we changed our side almost at the same time, and some of this I think is just a matter of timing. Perhaps we didn't catch some of this when we should have. So I want to make sure that we're doing all we can to do right by our agency, when people receive services that, this is a funded agency. So we want to make sure the right people are paying the right fees, whether that be insurance or personal or whatever. So if there's opportunities there, we want to make sure we don't miss that."

"Then I would like to just to summarize I guess, we have you said we have around 800,000 of the original money that still has not been collected. Is that about right?"

Ms. Poe Rousseau said, "Yes, sir. Those are unresolved. So there may be actually some that are denied where we won't receive payment. But that's the amount of claims that we still need to work through and get a clear understanding of the outcome."

Commissioner Howell said, "Of those claims, you said there are about 1,000 of those that still need processed?"

Ms. Poe Rousseau said, "Yes, 980."

Commissioner Howell said, "Alright, good. One of the things I'm wondering, if it is done by the VA, and we did provide a service do you continue, I heard you say you don't look for insurance opportunities, but if that doesn't pan out, do we just at that point write that off or what do we do?"

Ms. Poe Rousseau said, "Yes. That's essentially what we do when we plan for the budget each year. We know that for some things our rates may not be paid by the full amount, particularly by Medicare and Medicaid. They cap how much they'll pay. That amount is less typically what we charge for the mileage rate or transport fee. So we essentially build that into the budget and that's where the property tax support that comes into play comes in EMS..."

Commissioner Howell said, "Alright, good."

Ms. Poe Rousseau said, "...would factor in."

Commissioner Howell said, "I don't want to put pressure on you, but just want to create a performance measure here."

"Do you anticipate the time when you think we'll be done with the 800,000 claims? Do we have like another 12 months to resolve that you think? When do you think we're going to be able to say we're done with this exercise?"

Ms. Poe Rousseau said, "I am very optimistic that within 60 days at the most."

Commissioner Howell said, "Okay."

Ms. Poe Rousseau said, "Will be resolved, but for those claims where the hospital may not have yet been paid, and we're waiting on payment."

Commissioner Howell said, "That's great. Again, so I will put this on the calendar of things, we'll talk about that down the road and see how we do on that, but that's a

great, great goal. I appreciate you sharing in that. I don't know, I don't see any lights on."

MOTION

Commissioner Howell moved to receive and file.

Commissioner O'Donnell seconded the motion.

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. There's a motion and a second. Is there any further discussion? Before we vote on that, receive and file is one of the comments I wanted to make. We're not going to totally receive and file this, because there's a number of recommendations in this report that we're going to want feedback on periodically. So I know the motion is to receive and file, but we truly do want to continue to work this process and follow up on the recommendations that are in the report. So maybe a little misnomer on doing that, but again, I appreciate all of the recommendations that have been made. I think that they are improving the process.

"The bottom line is the service that Sedgwick County is providing to our veterans, and we're not going to degrade any of the service we provide to our veterans, just as the VA is not going to do anything to degrade their service to our veterans. So they are our prime concern in this entire process. I don't see any other comments that to be made right now. So Madam Clerk, I know it's to receive and file, but we'll receive and file, and I'll amend that a little bit. We'll follow up. Thank you."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Agreed."

VOTE

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

Ms. Poe Rousseau said, "Thank you."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you, Lindsay. Thank you all from the VA and please pass on to Rick Ament that we appreciate all the support. Thank you. Next item, please."

Received and Filed

K [18-232](#)

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF \$300,000 TO THE GREATER WICHITA PARTNERSHIP.

Presented by: Tom Stolz, Deputy County Manager.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approve the resolution and authorize the Chairman to sign.

VISUAL PRESENTATION

Chairman Dennis said, "Good morning, Tom."

Mr. Tom Stolz, Deputy County Manager, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Here this morning to discuss the 2018 funding agreement between Sedgwick County and the Greater Wichita Partnership (GWP). As you are aware of, Sedgwick County has enjoyed a long-standing relationship with the Greater Wichita Partnership for many years as GWEDC (Greater Wichita Economic Development Coalition), and since 2015 as the (Greater Wichita) Partnership we know today. The Greater Wichita Partnership is a 501C entity funded by private and public dollars with a defined mission which centers around the promotion of economic growth along with six main tenants. Growing primary jobs, diversification through entrepreneurship, education and workforce development, improving perceptions of the area, talent retention and recruitment and enhancement of downtown core vitality.

"In short, the Greater Wichita Partnership serves as a hub for collaboration and communication between both public and private sectors within the region. For businesses wishing to expand or for those wanting to move to our region, the amounts of communication and coordination needed can be cumbersome and time consuming. One of the main goals of the Partnership is to make this process as easy and as efficient as possible. With the partnership in place, this coordination can happen within a single shop, saving phone calls, meetings, and time for potential clients and for those of us who are stakeholders.

"Additionally, the Greater Wichita Partnership has a staffing and expertise to operate in a proactive manner by maintaining constant contact with site selectors, trade shows, marketing components and community partners. The Partnership is also actively engaged with local and prospective businesses regarding workforce needs including education and training components. Since 2015, the Partnership has enjoyed many successes summarized in this slide and in a document that they have provided you in the past, including the addition of new jobs, total capital investments. We have companies attracted attracted to our region now, and we have had some internal company expansions, and we are on the site selector visit list now they are very aggressive and proactive on how we maintain contact with site selectors.

"In sum, the current funding agreement requested by the Greater Wichita Partnership is \$300,000, which is the same amount Sedgwick County has funded since 2009. The private dollars that go into the Partnership exceed the current public funding by a 5 to 1 ratio. Funding for this expense within the county budget has come from the community development budget and it is recommended we continue this funding from the same source. I know there are others here today that would like to comment and answer any questions that the Commissioners have, and I think Jeff, do you want to come up and start?"

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. Welcome. Mr. Fluhr."

Mr. Jeff Fluhr, President, Greater Wichita Partnership, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Thank you, sir. Thank you, Tom. First of all, thank you, Commissioners for the partnership we have with you and have had for a number of years. Your staff working with them almost on a daily basis on projects, we appreciate that cooperative endeavor, and what we've seen happen even more so, even in the last few years is how that's grown into even more of a regional partnership. I know you have an interest in that as well. So thank you for that.

"I do want to note we have several members of our executive board here today. Mr. Chandler is the Co-Chair of the Partnership. Mr. Chandler is here. We also have several members of the executive board, Mr. Allen, Mr. Schwindaman, Mr. Bashton. I know that the Chairman is also a part of that work as well. We're very pleased with what's going on with the Partnership. It will be three years old as of April 15th, so in a few short days. What we've been doing as a group is really working on how is it that we have a very cohesive collaborative effort to develop Wichita and the ten county region. We have been working to build relationships in the private sector along with the public sector. We're pleased to tell you that when the Partnership initiated in April of [20]15, there was about [\$]1.2 million invested by the private sector. That number will reach approximately [\$]1.7 [million] this year.

"So the private sector sees, I think, a great resource in the Partnership. They see an alignment of their resources and a leveraging, if you will, of their investment to maximize opportunity of growth. As Mr. Stoltz mentioned, we have six areas that we focus on every day.

"That's working with jobs, entrepreneurship, workforce development, and that's really how is it that we tie business to education. How is it that we make sure that what companies are needing not only today but the future, that the education K (kindergarten) through 12 but also postgraduate degrees all working in that fashion.

"Also with perceptions. We just came off the heels of NCAA (National Collegiate Athletic Association). I know many of ya'll were able to be there in the [Intrust Bank] Arena and just to see the transformation I think, of our community and be able to host an event like that is tremendous for the perceptions. There were a lot of people involved with that. Visit Wichita being one of the main ones and WSU (Wichita State University). But again, tremendous opportunity to really sell our community, not only to local communities but also beyond.

Then downtown vitality is a huge area that has been really underway in the most recent years. How we do things at the Partnership is through deliberate strategies for intended outcomes. We purposely have strategies for how we want to development downtown. That was announced with Project Downtown back in 2010. That was adopted. Great results have been there, and again, it's because we had deliberate strategies for intended outcomes. We're also working with BREG (Blueprint for Regional Economic Growth). You're a partner with us in that as well. We're a partner with you with Market Street [Services] to really proactively look at what's the progress today, where is it we want to take that continually, how is that we utilize our resources even to a greater degree. So that is a big part of what we do as well.

"So great activity as the Assistant County Manager noted. There is great interest in our community both locally and nationally and even globally with some of the conversations we're having. So with that, sir, I would be certainly glad to answer any questions you may have. I know we sit down with you on a quarterly basis purposefully so that you receive information about the progress in those six areas, what are the opportunities we see, where is it that we're going forward, and we appreciate your time to be able to do that on a quarterly basis to make sure you're informed of the opportunities within the partnership as well."

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

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Jeff, for the presentation this morning. Thank you for, you do give us these quarterly reports, and

we look forward to finding out what's going on and getting those successes. I don't know how long you've been doing that, but you've done that most of the years I've been here, and I think that we expect a lot, and you deliver pretty good reports. So I appreciate you allowing us to understand that deeply.

"I just want to say that just kind of a general statement. I have many friends that are very conservative, and they believe government ought not to be involved in economic development, they feel like this is a free market type issue that the government should not be involved.

"We have a long history of trying to do economic development, as well as I think every other government around us. I don't think there's any exception to that. Every government has efforts for economic development. So we actually budget for this. In fact, Mr. Manager, do you know what the budget is for 2017 for eco devo (economic development)? I should have asked that question."

Mr. Mike Scholes, County Manager, greeted the Commissioners and said, "We have a budget of \$1.9 million for economic development. We typically don't spend it all \$1.9 million."

Commissioner Howell said, "Right. I guess my point was I think, was I think this was actually earmarked within our budget. So we had planned..."

Mr. Scholes said, "Right."

Commissioner Howell said, "...even last year when we approved our budget that it would be [\$]300,000 would be set aside for Greater Wichita Partnership. I do believe it works. There is no way to know what would've been had we not done that over the last 10 years. This will be our 10th year since 2009. So we don't know where we would've been, there is no way to know that, but I do believe that this effort has led to more prosperity for our community, more jobs, more opportunities, and so I think overall this has been something that the people that I represent, they do support that. Of course, we do want to have you know, effective effort whatever we do for economic development. I want to make sure it's effective and that it's actually making a difference.

"You know, those quarterly reports I think you do a good job you know, making that case. We're trying to increase the return on the investment making sure that whatever dollars are invested there's a greater return to the community and many ways. I think, you done a good job of developing that thought and proving that case. With that I want to say I do, I'm aware of many of the jobs. I don't think I know about all of them but the 4,000 new jobs, [\$]1.8 million in capital investment, seven new companies, 17 expansions. That's very impressive. So I am pleased to say that we ought to do this again. Thank you."

MOTION

Commissioner Howell moved to approve the resolution.

Commissioner Unruh seconded the motion.

Chairman Dennis said, "We have a motion and two seconds. Anyway Mr. Fluhr, I do want to thank you very much for being here today.

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

Chairman Dennis said, "Especially bringing your staff and bring members of the board with us. Mr. Chandler, thank you very much for being here with us. Before I say anything else, Commissioner Ranzau."

Commissioner Ranzau thanked the Chairman and said, "Yeah, I have several questions. First, I'll say, personally I am not aware of any conservative that I know of here in the county that doesn't believe county government doesn't have a role in economic development. The question is what role, what works, what does not work. Certainly keeping taxes low and regulatory burden low is an important role that (inaudible) play. We all, most of us I think support that. Not all, I guess. But the question is do the policies that we are using, have used in the past actually work. Particularly I mean, let's be honest, the disagreements about incentives, and academic research shows those type of incentives have a failure rate about 90 percent. They don't actually effect the outcome.

"Nevertheless, I have several questions for you. Some of which I have talked about before, I have people ask me this all the time. I will ask you these questions."

Mr. Fluhr said, "Sure."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "I guess you can answer them, okay. That I can ask them, you can answer them. First, I've had the question with respect to some of these shows that we are going to. There's concern that people are going, spending money, you know, on hotels and food, this, that and the other. It's just kind of a fun thing, but there's not much return on investment, and I have asked in the past, I would like to get an itemized accounting of who goes to each meeting and how much is spent on lodging and food and how many jobs are created by that. I think in the past and I don't know if you are willing to provide any of that information, or answer that question, so that people understand what the position is on the Partnership disclosing that information."

Mr. Fluhr said, "Well, certainly with public invest. We feel there should, and must be transparency. That's one of the things that the investment that the county makes, those dollars really go, they go into initiative base. They do not support the personnel that the partnership has or the overhead, per se, of the Partnership. What it does do is help us like, as you mentioned, Mr. Commissioner, NBAA (National Business Aviation Association) a huge event for our community, that's the national business jet convention that's held every year. It is important, aviation is who we are. So to be there in a large presence and taking companies is extremely important. We also participate in international shows, and mainly we work as a state in partner with that.

"But your dollars really go toward how is it that we do those events, those are not inexpensive events, but, again, very important ones to be. So we can very easily be able to show you exactly, you know, how much was invested by the county in, let's say, Farm Bureau, or if we are going to NBAA. That's where those dollars are and that they are invested.

"How they are working, one of the things that we have challenged Market Street to help us be able to do very effectively, is how is it that you measure the successes coming out of these types of events that we are going to and attending. I will tell you that part of it, I would examine would be the private sector's participation as far as companies wanting to go, because part of this, what we are working on is how is it that we

continue to diversify their book of work, if you will.

“Certainly we want them to be very strong with local OEM’s (original equipment manufacturer) here, but how is it that we can diversify their book of work, not only nationally, but internationally. So, for instance, when we have gone into the Partnership about three years ago, when we would travel to NBAA, which is here in North America, we were having about 12 to 13 companies go. That number now is almost 20, if not a little bit greater. So what’s happening is that by us being able to provide that platform with your investment, and others as well, companies that normally could not be in the presence as far as they couldn’t have a physical presence at a show, they can now.

“So that’s really important to people like Cox Machine, HM Dunn [Aerospace], Harlow Aerospace (Aerostructures LLC). There is a whole list of them that they can have a physical presence because of the investment you are making. They continue to go back, and we continue to hear from them that they are getting additional work. Now, what we want to be able to do is work with them to be able to quantify, so talk to us more about that so we can give even more information beyond the fact that I think, the demand of them both going and being able to participate financially, too, is willingness to being there.

“One of the shows that we’re getting ready to work with the state on, already working on, is with Farm Bureau. We have eight company slots that we have as far as the size of the booth, we have nine companies that have signed up. The ninth company is like, we will figure it out. Because they understand they were last in. So those are indicators, I think, from the private sector they see value in these different types of events. The other thing that you have really encouraged us to do is MRO, the maintenance repair operation, the after-market care, if you will, on aviation. Through your urging, three years ago we made the first step for Wichita to be at that show. Since then we have been there consecutively, and we are seeing activity with people coming in, in to look at Wichita as opportunity. So all of those are key indicators.

“Now what I think what we want to do, because I will tell you that just as you are asking questions, sir, Mr. Chandler and that board asked questions as well. Because of their investment. I mean, they are investors in the Partnership. So we want to continue to work on our matrix. That’s why you have seen that matrix grow since the Partnership’s creation, beyond just job numbers, we are now looking at how are we engaging site selectors. You know, it’s really interesting, one of the things I learned last week, with retention and recruitment of talent. You also have site selectors with talent. So one of the things we’re going to be expanding is how we do that. So a long answer, sir. But one I want you to know, we are thorough in trying to make sure that a, with public investment that is known how that’s being done, and then secondly, what those results are coming forth.”

Commissioner Ranzau said, “Okay. So bottom-line right now we don’t have any analysis of the jobs retained or attracted as a result of these, we’re looking to the this strategic plan to help us or whatever the name of that company is to help us (inaudible).”

Mr. Fluhr said, “Working with Market Street to really get even more detail. Other than the fact that companies conveying back to us that they are seeing results. We want to be able to work with the private sector. Private sector, there’s information they can share, and maybe not be willing to share because they are competitors. We want to work and make sure we are able to get that information, but also work within the

guidelines of them, too.”

Commissioner Ranzau said, “At this time we don’t have any objective data we can share with constituents related to that.”

Mr. Fluhr said, “Other than the fact I think, of demonstration of what these companies are getting as far as value out of it, as far as their participation.”

Commissioner Ranzau said, “I am talking the number of jobs retained.”

Mr. Fluhr said, “No, I don’t, I cannot give that as far as, specific, this job was created because of that.”

Commissioner Ranzau said, “With respect to the Partnership spending on these trips, we are not going to get additional information or an itemizing of that.”

Mr. Fluhr said, “Anything dealing with the public sector investment are we are more than happy to provide that information, as far as what we utilize for the show services or travel. Anything that your dollars went into, we would be more than happy to give you that detailed information.”

Commissioner Ranzau said, “I think the desire is, we are giving money into a partnership, okay. Our money is used to help facilitate these trips, so we want to know...”

Mr. Fluhr said, “The hard cost yes, sir.”

Commissioner Ranzau said, “...so the constituents, I mean do the taxpayers not have a right to know how that money is being used, who is going, how much is being spent on room and board? Because I know, you can play the shell game and say our money is not this, it goes to transparency. At least in some people’s minds, not willing to share that information it makes it seem like the Partnership is wanting to hide something.”

Mr. Fluhr said, “No, sir. In fact, again, we would be more than happy to, your dollars, we actually have...”

Commissioner Ranzau said, “I want the amount of money that is spent, an itemized, on all these trips that we are helping subsidize. I think the answer is no, I just need you to say that. You have told me that in the past, so that the people who ask me this will know that’s the position. I can’t change anything about it. The answer is no.”

Mr. Fluhr said, “We are happy to share the public investment, yes, sir.”

Commissioner Ranzau said, “No, that’s not what I asked. I want all expenditures for the trips that we’re helping to subsidize. The answer is no, we are not going to give that. Okay, I just, I have several questions.”

Mr. Fluhr said, “Sure.”

Commissioner Ranzau said, “I need straightforward questions so we can get through this. Okay. Next question is, so companies do give money into your partnership, and you make recommendations to city and county at times for incentives to help retain or

bring jobs.”

Mr. Fluhr said, “You have at any conversation on a project, you have representation. In fact, we work with the Manager and Assistant County Manager, the City Manager, you have staff at those tables. So anything that’s brought forward is going to be brought forward to you through working with your team on what is and again, that’s working with your team. So part of what we do with the Partnership is as people have to have a place to start when they come into the community, or if you are working with an expansion. So as Mr. Stolz noted, is that we are that convener, if you will. So on business, there will be moments where there may be public investment that is sought, so what our group will do is help bring all the parties to the table so that you can have a very constructive conversation about what a community may be willing to offer, and that by being, these are programs you already have established, and you have guidelines around these programs.

“So what is done is, we bring projects to your team to say here is the opportunity, where is it and how is it that you see where the programs that you have authorized, whether through policy or guidelines, how is it that you see those could be applied to this project. Sometimes it’s a very direct connection, sometimes there’s not one. So that’s conveyed to the business, that that tool may not work or cannot work for what they want to do. So we actually we are not the ones bringing you that recommendation, that’s usually coming through now, we may provide support testimony to understand the process, how we went through all that to work through to get to the decision or the proposal being made, but we as an entity do not authorize incentives. We can’t do that.”

Commissioner Ranzau said, “Please, I know you don’t authorize it. But...”

Mr. Fluhr said, “Sure.”

Commissioner Ranzau said, “...but you use incentives, they are on your website. You use them to promote, and you involve, you facilitate conversations, and you make recommendations. You are involved in recommendations with respect to incentives. That’s basic yes answer, I just need, not even the main question I asking. But that’s just a given. We know that happens. I mean, let’s just be honest about it.”

Mr. Fluhr said, “We work with the programs that you all have established.”

Commissioner Ranzau said, “I understand.”

Mr. Fluhr said, “Yes, sir.”

Commissioner Ranzau said, “But you all facilitate that, you make the recommendation. You say this is what we need. I mean, I hope you are not trying to say that’s not what happens. But nevertheless. Okay, but the question is this. So you have, can we have a list of people who have donated to your partnership who have subsequently been recommended or received a taxpayer incentive.”

Mr. Fluhr said, “We have a list of companies, sir that you have in our quarterly in fact, we just gave you a list of all the companies. I don’t know that list as far as...”

Commissioner Ranzau said, “Can you put together that list, there’s interest in knowing, you know, for some, that looks problematic, you give money to an organization and

they recommend you know, tax incentives. I think as a matter of transparency, I'm just telling you it would be nice to have a list of businesses that put money in the Partnership and subsequently got, you know, some sort of incentive. I am just putting it out there, okay?"

Mr. Fluhr said, "Yeah."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "I'm sorry some of these questions may be difficult, but I have to ask these on behalf of my constituents. I get questions asked, so I am going to ask them, okay? Now, when we do incentives, how do we make sure that we're getting return on investment?"

Mr. Fluhr said, "There are financial models run on, that actually WSU will run, it is 1.3-1 return. I know that that is a model that is run on a number of projects that we will bring to you all. Or actually work with your team on."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Okay."

Mr. Fluhr said, "So there are measures to look at that, and there are, Andrew Nave actually on our team could give you more information. But there are, I mean, when there are agreements with companies, there are criteria by which those tools may be used, and then there's a review process at benchmark moments in a project's life to determine is it measuring up to those expectations that we're set out before. That is actually something that is worked through the governmental process, not the Partnership process. So that's the way that that structure is set up."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "You're not involved in the return on investment or you don't look at that?"

Mr. Fluhr said, "That's done through a third-party. That third-party is WSU."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Okay. I thought third-party, you bring everyone together to work this..."

Mr. Fluhr said, "WSU is an instrument that is used as part of the process, so we believe in making sure, I mean, we deliberately do not do those calculations, because we want a third-party to do those. That's done through WSU."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "That's fair enough I guess there's some issues with this that you need to be aware of, maybe Andrew is the main one, I guess, I think needs to be and I am asking you because the Partnership was let's bring everyone together, and one go place, right? To take care of this economic development, and then we do get these analysis. There's two issues I would like to bring up. One of which is sometimes the analysis period is like for 20 years, but the claw-back is only for 10. So I would encourage you, if you want to be, be sure the return on investment, you know, if we are going to analyze something for 20 years, but the claw-back ends at 10, I think those time periods should match."

"Second thing is, we should include all incentives the businesses are getting in our calculations, one of which is machinery and equipment, which is huge. I'm sure you are aware of. That's not being included in these ROI's (Return on Investments). I mean, that's the mother of all incentives, and I mean, I think it's kind of skews the numbers to not include that. It is significant, okay? I don't know if you are aware, but I have

been told that the machinery and equipment incentive, when it was put in at the state it effects, it reduced our revenue by about 10 percent. So this is a very powerful incentive that needs to be included in the calculation, because it affects our revenues by 10 percent. Well that means either we have to reduce services by 10 percent or everyone else has to pay 10 percent more, okay? I have had a discussion with somebody, I think it might have been you guys that there was a reason why it is not included. I think it should have had be included. That's very important, so I would like, if Andrew is the guy that's in charge, or knows more about this at some point, I would like to have a further discussion about that, or some answers back on that.

"The last thing I want it talk about, I continue to be concerned about this strategic plan, that we're having to do now for an extra \$45,000 we talked about, I'm still waiting on some sort of something about why this is necessary. I think we need some accountability from the Partnership as to why, after three years, we are having to hire someone to do some basic things that should have already been done. This is very problematic. We've given \$900,000 to this organization, and prepared to give another \$300,000, yet there appears to be some issues and problems, at least for this behind the scenes and now we are doing the strategic plan. This plan is supposed to bring more focus to the Partnership. It's supposed to help develop a strategic plan, establish organizational structure, bring clarity and innovative ways to BREG and strategies to work together. All of these things are things that should have already been happening, okay. Can you tell me what's the problem, where is the failure in the system and where is the accountability? Why hasn't this already been done?"

Mr. Fluhr said, "I would be glad..."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "If we have the expertise here, there is a problem."

Mr. Fluhr said, "I would be glad to provide some clarity. BREG was prepared and laid out and launched. It is a blueprint for development, very much like the Project Downtown initiative. It has a regional base to it. In that document it sets forth strategies to work within the eight clusters that we have that comprise the industry in our region. Certain clusters are positioned for growth today. A lot of that being determined by what's going on in global markets, or even North American markets. Markets, what's happening in the marketplace itself. So what we have been doing the last three years is working in those cluster areas, aerospace being one of them, that is really positioned for growth. So that's what we've been really focusing on, along with some other cluster development as well.

"I think it's prudent as you get into a long-term initiative, which this is, you know, what we are working on here is ten years out in some cases on some things. With economic development, yes, you will have some things that you will see immediate gain. There are a lot of things that we work on, are going to be long-term that can fall into that ten-year framework. So it is very prudent, I think, for a community, and I appreciate your all's partnership with this, because it is important that at critical junctures we take health of the situation, are we seeing everything that we can in these strategic areas. Because that helps us understand if we are, fantastic, how can we accelerate, then. If we're not, then why not. I think through analysis that's where you have benefit. So three years into this, and we are seeing progress, I mean, just look at the job numbers, the capital numbers. What we want to be able to do, how is it that we accelerate what we are seeing that, if we are not seeing the opportunity, then why not.

"Then, too, which one of the clusters could be, you know, at this moment it is not that

you don't accelerate it, but you maintain it and position it for growth when that moment happens.

"So what we want to make sure that we are doing as an entity, just as a corporation does, a corporation will take moments and examine how it's doing things. Do you continue to do them in that fashion, do you continue to hit other areas? Is there a resource you need to bring so that you increase the opportunity for success. That's what we are really that's the purpose of what we are doing with Market Street. The other thing with Market Street is that they are, they have a pedigree of cities, of really helping cities grow. So we see that, we know that. So we know they can bring expertise three years in that can help us fine-tune who we are even as an entity, and it may even be some policy things we might want to look at.

"So the strategic, there are strategic steps in place. There's execution tactically on those. This is a moment to look at how is it doing, is it measuring everything that we want to measure, is it hitting everything we want it to, and, if so, fantastic. If we can accelerate, let's do it. If not, then let's figure out why. I think that's the value that Market Street brings into the conversation as well."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Jeff, they're going to help you establish organizational structure, They're going to help you develop strategies to work together to maintain growth, aerospace clusters and attract and grow businesses through the region. These are things that you've been telling me for the last three years you are doing, and I know behind the scenes people aren't happy with how things are going, and you can say the numbers are all this, I know, we make the numbers look good. But what I'm hearing, I don't think things are as good as what we want to say publicly, and we're having to hire someone to do the basic stuff. There's no accountability from this organization on what the failures were, you know, and I appreciate your response, and you said a lot of things, but still, there's not, it didn't really address the fact that the Partnership has failed to do some basic core things and no one is being held accountable for it.

"We are just going to throw more money. I am disappointed. For the last few years I have been patient, I supported some funding, not all funding because I don't think everything you do is effective, as we spoke before. But as we move further and further along, I think there are problems with accountability and transparency that are problematic. I would hope that on behalf of the taxpayers, we would just pause for a moment and make sure we get some true accountability and transparency before we give more money to the Partnership. You remember harken back to GW[ED]C (Greater Wichita Economic Development Coalition) . For years we were told how who great GWEDC was doing. We got all these numbers. Then all of a sudden, boom, we said no well really wasn't doing all that good, because we do this public face and say all these things. We got to be honest, there are issues, problems, and we are passing accountability before we throw more money at it. That's all I am asking.

"I may be the only one that wants that, but I am not going to be supportive of any more funding of GWP until we have that in place and there's more of an effort to be transparent and accountable, and with respect to these return on investment calculations, I would hope that the Partnership would take the lead to make sure they are accurate and they're straightforward.

"Accurately represent what's going on, and they are based on, they have good policies and principles, you know, behind them as far as how we do the calculation. I know WSU does it, but you're the center point, you start the conversation, you initiate it, promote it, you're supposed to be the one you know, place for everybody to go to coordinate everything. So let's make sure these return on investments are better than

what they are, I guess. There is a variety of issues. I just sense that there's not willingness to make those changes, because we are just going to go forward and do what we do."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you, Commissioner Ranzau. We appreciate your time. Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well Jeff, thanks for being here today, and to the executive members of the Partnership, we appreciate you all being here. I think that first of all, I want to say that I appreciate the structure that we have put together for this private/public relationship, and I think that the private sector has shown their support of this by the amount of funding that they have provided, which now I understand is nearly \$1.7 million annually.

"So to me that's a significant indication that the business leaders in our community are behind this effort, and are behind the structure and they participate in it, and that's a strong, strong reason for me also to be for supportive. The public sector investment between Wichita and Sedgwick County is a total about \$600,000 on an annual basis, and I want to be a partner with you all. I want to be involved. I want to have our representatives at the table when we are talking to the prospects. So I think this is a workable structure, trying to accomplish something that is difficult to accomplish, I mean, competition for economic development between cities and state, I think some of the things that are offered have been described as obscene by some of the other states. I mean, just so much it doesn't even make sense.

"So we need to play in an arena as best we can with the resources we have to accomplish the best we can. I believe that you and your staff are absolutely committed to it, and I'm proud of the fact that our business leaders in our community are also committed to it, as evidenced by their very generous investments that they've made. I understand the principle that the private investment is not open for total public transparency and scrutiny, and I also am convinced that the money that's invested from the public sector is clearly accounted for and we can have an accounting for that anytime that we want to.

"So I'm just wanting to, I guess, refute some of the statements and innuendos of my colleague, it's been clear the last several years that my colleague has is not supported this. He has a philosophic position against it, and much of what we've heard today, we've heard before. So I understand and appreciate that, and everyone has a right to their opinion. My opinion is, is that we need to do what we can for our community to advance it in terms of economic development, and so I appreciate your efforts, and I will be supportive of the motion that's on the table."

Approved

Mr. Fluhr said, "Thank you."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you, Commissioner Unruh. Commissioner Ranzau, we don't want to get back into a back and forth disagreement between Commissioners. So I hope your comments are along that line."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Thank you for the opportunity to speak. As a Commissioner, I feel like I have the right to speak for as long as I want to speak on an

issue. This is an important issue and I'm not going to be silent, Mr. Chairman. But my question is this, going back my, I have supported, I have made motions to support some funding for this organization in the past. I voted for some of the BREG stuff, there is a couple other, \$50,000 grants I have supported. But philosophically, I believe we should spend taxpayer money on things that work and there should be accountability and transparency. If we don't have those things, then I have to be a good steward and be willing to stand up and say no sometimes.

"With that being said, just a question as far as, you know, taxes and regulation, most people agree, you know, if you control taxes, control regulation, that helps a lot of people in a wide area, and that's another way to promote economic development. What sorts of initiative do you have with respect to controlling taxes here locally and regulation at the local, state or federal level? Do you have anything to target those two things specifically?"

Mr. Fluhr said, "We work continually with the city government, county government, state government on items that can affect economic development. I think that our role should be, and is, is that you continue to work with all those entities to create the most workable environment you can to foster economic development. A lot of what happens, too, goes beyond the state boundaries, as Commissioner Unruh states, is that this is not the work that we encompass is not just in the boundaries of our state. So there's constant awareness of what happens beyond our state boundaries as well.

"To give you an example, one of the things we have done, because we are involved, is that when particularly we were working with economic development in downtown, is that that plan is built on economics. It is to understand what the market dynamics are, what the pent up opportunities, what are things from policy that could hinder development, and how is it that you continue, it is a continued work in progress, because that's the thing that we have seen. So as we did that plan, we actually came in and we had analysis done on how is it that we do X, Y, and Z programs so we can be competitive. So it is something that we pay very close attention to. It is something that we will be involved in to try to help provide information about impacts things can have on economic development.

"So, yes, I mean, we are continually involved in that process and it's a very broad one. I mean, you all have experience beyond today's, what we are talking about today. "You do, you work on other things continuous. So we are involved and try to make sure we continually work in an environment to foster economic development."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Well, I guess I am looking for examples or initiatives. Maybe you don't have any. If you don't, I would encourage you to look at this. I mean, regulation and taxes, at least I'm told in the past are the two biggest things a business complains about when it comes to economic development. You see this is one of my fundamental problems, I don't think we actually attempt to address that through the Partnership or GWEDC, it focused on incentives. I think that's a problem. Nevertheless, I will continue to say as we go forward, I tried to get this going a couple years ago, we need to focus on controlling government spending and doing something about regulation. They are doing it at the federal level and it is helping. I think we could do it at the state and local level as well, and let's just not dismiss that. I mean, I will give you an example. I mean, recently, you know, we decided to give cash incentive on a particular deal that's going to cost us \$800,000 a year out of our budget.

“So that means going forward we are going to have \$800,000 less to spend on our roads and bridges, police and fire, all that sort of stuff. I guess from an economic development point of view I would ask what the Partnership recommend. Either we have to reduce services or increase taxes. So when we use cash incentives from an economic development point of view, what would you recommend we do. Should we lower services, or increase taxes to offset that expenditure? I want to make sure I say that right. Should we reduce services or increase taxes to offset the expenditure. What would be the best approach?”

Mr. Fluhr said, “Commissioner, I would be more than happy to talk to you beyond today about how we work with the economic development. I think there is a lot of factors that you have to look into, and the purpose of today is to talk to you about the potential opportunity to fund, be a partner continued. So that’s a much larger conversation. So I would defer back to the Chairman that I’m not prepared to go into that conversation without, that’s a conversation for a later date.”

Commissioner Ranzau said, “You are not prepared as the head of the Partnership to talk about whether or not increasing or lowering taxes is better for economic development one way or the other. Okay. Is it important to know the policy, some of the things you bring to us affect our ability to do that. I am just telling you, you have got to be focused on things that work. Taxes and regulation are important, and I don’t think we are addressing that, so.”

Chairman Dennis said, “Thank you, Commissioner O’Donnell.”

Commissioner O’Donnell thanked the Chairman and said, “Jeff, thank you for being here today.”

Mr. Fluhr said, “Thank you, sir.”

Commissioner O’Donnell said, “Frankly, my answer would be in regards to the Spirit [Aerosystems] deal, is that economic development is about bringing jobs here...”

Mr. Fluhr said, “Yes, sir.”

Commissioner O’Donnell said, “...which produces taxpayers...”

Mr. Fluhr said, “Yes, sir.”

Commissioner O’Donnell said, “...which own homes, pay property taxes on their cars, their homes, they pay sales taxes on purchases, they pay income taxes to the state, which support our local schools, our infrastructure, our Medicaid, all kinds of important programs. What I would say to you is, you and your team are doing a great job. I hear accolades from across the state. I think team with you and Andrew, you are, its all-star team, and I am excited about a lot of the momentum that we are seeing.

“I know with our economic development being so limited here at the county compared to what the city does or what the state does, it definitely, I think, allows our \$300,000 to be maximized instead of having an office similar to what the City of Wichita has when it comes to economic development.”

Mr. Fluhr said, “Yes, sir.”

Commissioner O'Donnell said, "I see that is a benefit for us that we are able to particularly because we have to work twice as hard, because we are half the size of most of the metros in the midwest. The major metropolitan areas that are fighting for the same jobs that we are. I think you and your team are up to that task."

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

Commissioner O'Donnell said, "So thank you for your service, and willingness to stay with Wichita, because I know that you in particular are a, headhunters contact you quite often. So thank you, Jeff."

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

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you, sir. Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to say I agree with Commissioner Unruh on the private sector investment."

"Thinking about that, in fact, I was going to make the point earlier, I failed to do so, if I remember correctly, when I first became a Commissioner, I think the private investment was around \$900,000 a year. It's grown to [\$]1.7 [million]. Is my memory correct? That number was about [\$]900,000?"

Mr. Fluhr said, "When my engagement started in '15, it was [\$]1.2 [million]"

Commissioner Howell said, "It was [\$]1.2 [million]."

Mr. Fluhr said, "But it has grown as we have gone. I think what is, I think, really dynamic to see, how it's grown in less than three years, almost \$500 million annually from the private sector to leverage the dollars that the public sector is investing as well."

Commissioner Howell said, "Well, thanks for clarifying that. Again, my memory wasn't exactly right. But I do see this as increasing. Again, that makes the point that I think these people on the communities that have money to spend on economic development, they also have skin in the game, and they must believe it works, otherwise they wouldn't do that. So I do think that that is a very strong argument to fund this. Second, thing I would like to ask, just for clarification, but machine equipment exemption, that is a statewide..."

Mr. Fluhr said, "Correct."

Commissioner Howell said, "...uniform law. We're not picking, we don't have a decision to make necessarily on, whether or not on abate machine equipment and property taxes; is that correct?"

Mr. Fluhr said, "Correct. I believe that went into effect back in '7, maybe '6 or '7 it went into effect. That's been a sun setting provision. It's pretty much zeroed out at this point."

Commissioner Howell said, "In fact, I think when I was in the Legislature we actually tweaked that law. We actually had things like an air compressor attached to a building with a hose, and they wanted to make the argue that was part of the building. It was just silly. So although, I might be the one amongst my colleagues here, I think that if

you take a piece of equipment that is portable, happens to be bolted to the floor, and you treat that as real estate and start taxing it at that way, certainly that's an disincentive to invest in those types of equipment and have an impact on economic development in terms of jobs, competitiveness and overhead costs that they have.

"So I think that was the right policy. I understand it may be hard to accept such a change in our tax laws, but I think it had great impact statewide. We don't have to make a decision on who we want to abate, simply statewide uniform law that all of our businesses can take advantage of that change in policy. So, again, I actually agree with the idea that that should not be included in the ROI calculation. I think the ROI ought to be based on our decisions, things that we invest tax dollars into. The ROI should be based on decisions we make locally here, but not on statewide policy.

"So I just want to make that point. That's my opinion, and Mr. Chairman, I am ready to vote. But thank you for the chance to speak again."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. Again, thank you for being here, and thank everyone else for being here. I think it is about time to vote. Commissioner Ranzau. Do you have a short comment?"

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Yes. We need to have continued discussion about this machinery and equipment, because it should be included. We include state incentives, we include school districts, all these other things, and it affects us locally, 10 percent. Everyone else is paying 10 percent more to cover that, or you're getting 10 percent less. That's what I have been told, you know that's how it effects our revenue, so it is significant. It is on the website, we talk about machine and equipment on the calculation, but it is not included. It is a contribution to this community we are giving. Yes it's in state law but it is significant, it needs to be included, otherwise you are kind of dismissing this as unimportant, when it is bigger than most of this other stuff we are giving. It is very significant. It needs to be included so we can show the whole picture. I understand the reason we want to hide it, because it is going to skew the numbers then, and make some of the other things that we are doing a little less defensible. But it is important because other taxpayers are either getting lesser services or picking up that extra 10 percent. So, thank you."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. Well, there's no other comments, I am going to make the final comment before I call the vote. I've spoken a number of times from the bench in the past about economic development, and one of the biggest worries I have, is we've got a number of organizations that come to us, and they ask for a different kind of incentive, different support and so forth. When I look at GWP as far as strategic umbrella, and that's the term that I've used all along is we need one organization that we can go to that we rely on to work our economic development for this area rather than all these little organizations that come and have many times great ideas. I don't dispute that.

"But it doesn't work into a way that we can look at what our strategic plan is for economic development, and I look to GWP to do that. Today from the bench we've heard a number of other issues that aren't related to whether or not we fund \$300,000 to GWP for economic development as our tool. That's what we are looking at today, whether or not we fund \$300,000 to the GWP to be the economic tool, to be our strategic umbrella for economic development for not only Sedgwick County, but this entire region. So therefore I do support this, and Madam Clerk, call the roll."

VOTE

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

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you all very much for being here. We have been in session now for two hours 15 minutes. If we could take like a five-minute break before we come back, I know there are three items still on the regular part of the agenda that are all three going to be fairly lengthy. So let's take a little short break. Thank you."

The Board of County Commission recessed at 11:12 a.m. and returned at 11:19 a.m.

Chairman Dennis said, "Madam Clerk, next item."

L [18-236](#)

REQUEST FOR FUNDING BY PROJECT WICHITA IN THE AMOUNT OF \$45,000.

Presented by: Tom Stolz, Deputy County Manager.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Take action as deemed appropriate.

VISUAL PRESENTATION

Mr. Stolz said, "Here to present request for funding from an entity, a newly formed entity known as Project Wichita. Project Wichita, through a 501C non-profit entity seeks a one-time funding request of \$45,000 from Sedgwick County to help fund a community engagement and visioning initiative, designed to determine a ten-year vision and action plan for our region.

"County funding support would be used excuse me, I should've flipped this slide. County funding support would be used by Wichita State University's Public Policy and Management Center to facilitate the public listing and engagement process with a series of focus groups, surveys and interviews. As a result of the citizen listening process, an action plan will be created to identify strategic steps to accomplish the ten-year vision.

"Project Wichita's co-chairs are Aaron Bastian, the Fidelity Bank President, Debbie Gann, Vice President of Communications and Public Affairs at Spirit Aerosystems, Scott Schwindaman, who's Lubrication Engineer, Inc. President and CEO (Chief Executive Officer) and Justin White, Executive Director of the Boys and Girls Club of South Central Kansas. Everybody is here but Debbie [Gann], she got a pass because she knew how long the meeting was going to be. But the other guys have been here since 9:00.

"This request from Project Wichita comes at a time when there are many proactive initiatives taking place within the community. This quick graphic will help summarize those initiatives, starting from the left, at the 60,000 foot level, this Project Wichita, which we just described, an initiative designed to determine a ten-year vision, an action plan for our region. It represents analysis and study over the next several months to help us guide us forward. To the right is Greater Wichita Partnership, which we just discussed, the public/private economic hub for the south central region.

“GWP is currently overseeing two consultant initiatives mentioned, and our down in the weeds at the street level. Market Street analysis, which will help us develop a cohesive and regional economic development strategy, an update the Blueprint for Regional Economic Growth or BREG. They also have a consultant called Development Counselors International or DCI, which will help us enhance recruitment, retention efforts within the region. We are not, county is not funding any piece of Development Counselors [International], but we are funding as we just discussed as Jeff covered, we are funding some of the piece of the Market Street analysis.

“Then finally on the right is a, what is called the Century II Citizen Advisory Committee. That is a group of citizens reviewing existing research and recent data in order to provide recommendations for the future of Century II, and that initiative is called together by the Mayor and thus far the county has no involvement in that process. Project Wichita currently has a budget and funding commitments of over \$300,000 from the private sector, local governments and non-profit organizations. Private sector contributions account for more than 80 percent of their current funding. The City of Wichita has committed \$45,000 to this effort, and they have further public commitment from the cities of El Dorado and Newton, Wichita and Maize and Andover School Districts and Wichita State University.

“There are other financial sponsors can be found on the Project Wichita.org website. In addition to financial support, these contributors are also volunteering time to a vision team it provide oversight and guidance. I believe, as I mentioned, there are three of the board members here today.

“I know Scott Schwindaman wants to get up and talk. I’m sure he can answer questions and after that, staff recommends you take appropriate action you see necessary. Scott.”

Chairman Dennis said, “Good morning, Scott.”

Mr. Scott Schwindaman, Co-Chairman, Project Wichita, greeted the Commissioners and said, “Thanks, appreciate it. I’m pleased to be with you today, Commissioners, and go over the Project Wichita with you to answer any questions you may have. I thought in opening I will try to give you an overview of what Project Wichita is. Tom gave you some basic information as far as, you know, who is doing it, what it is, and stuff, but I want to give it to you from me, my personal perspective. As you know, I am President of Lubrication Engineers. I am also very active in a joint venture with a Japanese firm to build manufacturing plants on the west side of Wichita and Maize, Kansas right now. We have one plant coming up. We have three others in the planning phase to put out there.

“So I have a lot of things to do, but I felt very compelled to come and be a part and be a co-chair when I was asked to do this. Along with of the other co-chairs I recognize with us. Tom kind of did that. Justin White is with us today, and Aaron Bastian. Debbie, as Tom said, is unavailable or she would have been here also. So we are the four co-chairs, and this project is being ran by private individuals. We are getting support out of Greater Wichita Partnership, we’re getting support out of WSU to do some of the data analysis.

“Let me kind of go through the background content for you here, kind of give you some reactions we’ve been seeing from the public on this and why I feel, and I believe the co-chairs feel this is an important thing for the County Commission to maybe look at

funding going forward there and stuff.

“Again, you know I have been involved with the regional economic development in this area for some time. I just finished my tenure last year as Chairman of the Regional Chamber of Commerce. I also was instrumental in setting up the Entrepreneur to Entrepreneur Task Force and getting the entrepreneurialism effort moving forward again in Wichita. So I like to do things that I have passion about, and this is the thing that I also have passion about. We’ve been on city to city visits that the Chamber of Commerce sponsors, and we go on, most of the Chairmen, and I believe the Commission has been on those visits. I know Commissioner Howell, you were with us two times on those.

“When we’re out there on city to city visits, we are trying to learn, to Commissioner Ranzau, you know, how they do that. Maybe it is not an incentive base, is how they get their economic growth to occur out there and stuff. So, you know, we are looking at those things. Certainly it seems like every time we take a city to city visit, we go and they show us, they built a new convention center, and I don’t know why that’s a reoccurring theme, it just seems to be. So we listen to that. But the ultimate goal of what we are seeing out there on those city to city visits is they were able to canvas the citizens and their region. Just not their city, just not their county, but their region and really look at what do the citizens want. What they think needs to be done to move that community forward in the next ten years and have visioning process.

“So we have been hearing that, and there have been conversations. But it was always what I will call things, Century II, Northwest Bypass, you know, 235, and the 1-35, and 254 exchange and stuff. They were things. They weren’t this all-encompassing vision what the region needed to have good growth. So last fall Greater Wichita Partnership brought in a gentleman, Steve Lacy, from Des Moines who really was the person who really helped get them moving honestly, 20 years ago and looking at a regional effort, and what that community wanted to grow, and Des Moines has really grown well underneath that plan, and project.

“It got us all to talking about, you know, maybe we need to get above, and kind of back to our graph of the 60,000 foot level. Maybe we need to get above all the things and we need to get up to a vision. What is the vision? What do our citizens feel that are most important to move this region forward. We talked economic development, we talk about recruiting people, and having people who are employable and everything. But really, what is that? So with that, we started asking some business owners in the group, you know business owners, what do you think? Do you think we need to do a visioning process? Certainly I heard, and I wasn’t involved with the visioning came up very rapidly. We did that. That was visioning. I dug around in my files, and my predecessor was involved with visioning. I found the report, which took them four years to do, and really was economic development-based. It is now 15 years old and when you look, there is really not been anything done in this region to look at vision going forward, and what it is we really need.

“So the business owners said, yes, we would fund that. We think that there’s enough momentum in this community today with all much the things that are happening. Jeff mentioned the NCAA basketball tournament, but you look at Spirit AeroSystems, you look at everybody else who is doing expansion of their businesses and stuff. Me personally seeing the foreign entities that are contacting me, wanting to move their locations here. We need to really look at what that vision is. So the concept of Project Wichita is really only about 60 days old right now. It came together on February 1st,

Chamber of Commerce, Chairmen's luncheon, Ben Hutton talked about his vision, and then there was a discussion group. Really, that's when we said, you know, we probably need to move forward and try to do a visioning process. It needs to have a time frame and it has to have deliverables, and you know, it is going to be done in this time frame.

"On a personal note, that is what I told the group when they came to me and asked me to be one of the co-chairs, because quite frankly, I have businesses to run, and I said, look, if you want me to help on this, we are going to have definitive time frame. So this project is a one-year project that has outcomes and actions at the end of it that can be delivered to all parties that will need that information to make decisions on how to move forward in our region there and stuff. Today we have over 75 private businesses that have funded into the Project Wichita. So this work is going to happen irregardless, it is going to move forward. Quite frankly, my phone has been ringing off the hook from businesses who want to participate in this project. It's not the usual suspects.

"Just yesterday I had the local president of RCB Bank, a new bank that's moved into Wichita, that they called and they are located in Oklahoma City, and they said, if you are doing a vision for the region, we want to be a part of that, because that's going to give us great insight into what people are looking for, what their desires are, and how we can be a part of that region. Saturday evening, I am at a wedding, and I have the President, CEO of BG products there in Darin Greseth. He says Scott, what is this Project Wichita thing, nobody has come and you talk to me about it? It sounds like it's something we should be involved with, because we are in El Dorado and also we're also in Wichita. We know our El Dorado Mayor is involved with it, and also they have a group over there, I think some El Dorado Association, I can't remember exact name, they are also involved.

"So we are starting to get that outreach to the region, not just Wichita, and not just Sedgwick County. So if there wasn't a flavor, there wasn't an interest in this, I wouldn't be hearing that. It is not me going out and asking for it, it is them calling me. Every one of the co-chairs, Aaron, Justin, Debbie, they can tell you similar stories where they've got these calls. I still have four more people that have said they want to participate, just give me a call, and I need to get those things done this week. Every person is going to have an opportunity for input, and that's been a core theme. Of the co-chairs as we move forward with it, and Justin has provided us great insight into an area that I believe in the past maybe was an unheard group when we were looking at what is the bigger vision for the region, and what we need to do.

"Our Asian community, when I was at e2e [Accelerator], we were doing a task force, we've always wanted to get the Asian community involved with us for entrepreneurship. It's very hard to get them to come to the table and tell you what their desires are. We now have two Asian groups that have said they want a person at the table of the vision team to give us input as to what their vision is for our region. So we're really moving out and trying to make sure we touch everybody in the region and what their desires and what their wants are. Just on Monday, we had our co-chair meeting, and Aaron Bastion brought up a very good thing. We need to look at our working poor. Where are those communities at, and make sure they are represented at the table. So this vision team is going to be about 70 to 80 people that are going to look at all this data as it comes in and give us direction to actually get to the end result, which is some actionable items there and stuff.

"Eighty percent of the funding is coming from the private sector. I think today if we

looked at it, it would be more close to 90 percent of the funding is came from private sector. Then we also have non-for-profits are represented, and we have a list and we can show you who those people are. As of today, I will tell you, though, by the end of the week, it will change, because there's quite a few more that are coming on board. This excitement shows to me that this region is ready for us it do a project of this nature, to go out and find what it is our citizens want us to do, and we really hope that the Sedgwick County Commission will look to be a part of that. I think it will be valuable information to you, and again, it has a timeline, it has deliverables. What we're going to do at the end of it, and as Tom said, you know, if you vote today to fund your piece, it will go to WSU because we are having to pay them to do the analysis work when we gather all this data.

"One other thing in closing I would add is, we've never been able to do a process like this because we didn't have the technology ten years ago. Today we will be able to reach out and you will touch your millennials through that type of survey work, and you will touch others through other types of media, which ten years ago we didn't have that media to gather that group. So that'll really (inaudible) show up at a town hall or show up at a meeting and maybe you would get up and give your voice. Sometimes those were intimidating places for people, and they don't get up and speak. So we feel like we're going to get a lot better canvassing of the group. We'll share those numbers with you, and how many people participated, and demographics, we're studying that because we want to make sure it is not skewed one way or another. So with that, that was a real quick rambling of what we're trying to do here, and I'll stand for any questions from the Commission. Thank you for your attention."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you Mr. Schwindaman. Just to demonstrate I think briefly on how important this is to the private sector, we still have Charlie Chandler sitting in the audience and his sixth grandchild is going to be born in the next 30, 40 minutes. So want to congratulate him on that. We have leaders in our community standing before us, Scott Schwindaman, President and CEO (Chief Financial Officer), Aaron Bastion, Justin White, just a few of the people that are deeply involved in this in the community. Eighty to ninety percent of this is going to be funded by the private community, but this gives Sedgwick County an opportunity to be a partner, and I mean a partner in something that is region, it is significant.

"This entire region is involved in what's going on. So I think that this is a great opportunity for us to say that we are partners in what's going on, to recognize the business leaders that took time out to come and speak with us today, and the other business leaders and leaders in our community that believe that this is a critical thing that needs to be happening. So I will definitely support the project. I think it's a great idea. I think that the folks that came up with this are visionaries themselves, and the ones that are working this are visionaries, and I really look forward and I think it's important, it's just a six months or so long project. We're going to get results immediately to find out what direction that we need to go on a number of subjects. This isn't geared to one specific project, it's geared to find out what the people in the region want and which direction they want us to go."

MOTION

Commissioner Dennis moved to fund Project Wichita.

Commissioner O'Donnell seconded the motion.

Chairman Dennis said, "Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to say, again, thank you for coming out today and presenting the opportunity for us to consider this. I just wanted to understand a little bit, is there going to be like a strategic plan or process that we can try to understand early in this, so we understand exactly how the data is going to be collected. I'd like to understand that aspect of this a little bit deeper."

Mr. Schwindaman said, "Sure. Wichita State is going to help in facilitating that for us. Right now we're going out and the survey questions are three survey questions. They're pretty broad based. What do you see Wichita ten years from now, they are very broad based. With that, Wichita State is going to take that information and then try to drill down and put what we'll call survey questions out, that will happen in the May timeframe, where it's more specific to do you think this, or do you think that. Do you think this, or do you think that. Certainly if you are funding the project, you will have a seat, and I believe multiple seats at the vision team, so your people will be here, and whoever you would assign to come and listen to that. So we'll start to kind of define what those areas are."

"But really at the end, which will happen in the November-December timeframe, that's when we'll come out and say here's what your community thinks are the actionable items that need to be worked on. We're not going to say, hey, well you need to fund this this way or do that or whatever. It will just be a report that says here's what your constituency across the region thinks are most important to them to look at staying in this locale for the next 10 years going forward. So that's what makes it different than economic development. I've told some of you as I have talked to you and others in the community, I don't know what will come out of this."

"It may be that homelessness becomes the number one topic that the community feels needs to be addressed. Or maybe it's the K-3 (Kindergarten) reading program, and how we need to do better at that. You know, I just don't know. I don't even want to make any projections on that, so that'd be my response."

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you for that explanation. Again, my background in the real world is I'm a data guy, I love data and I love to see how data is collected and you know some data collection is done better than, some efforts are done more purely scientifically than others."

Mr. Schwindaman said, "You're right in line be with me, Commissioner. I am an engineer by degree. You know, the data speaks. I want to see the data. I also know when you do listening sessions, if you just take down what was said, that may not be the real meaning of what the community wanted. That's why I'm so thrilled that WSU is going to do the algorithms and do the data study. Yeah, I'll geek out for just a minute here with you. I want to see that data, because I'll trust the data then. That's what we need to see."

Commissioner Howell said, "Well I think that's important. I mean for this to be, again, I think having a seat at the table when this is being, that type of thing is being discussed and developed, so we have a deep understanding of that."

Mr. Schwindaman said, "Absolutely."

Commissioner Howell said, "That to me adds confidence in the data that we can it, it makes it more usable and useful for policymakers. Again I have to restate what you

just said, make sure I understand..."

Mr. Schwindaman said, "Okay."

Commissioner Howell said, "...your earlier comments. We've never really done this type of a poll of our community. This is kind of a fresh thing, we have never done this before, have we?"

Mr. Schwindaman said, "I don't think we've ever done it. I think we've done similar things in times of crisis when maybe, and I'll go back and use my father who was here, and I remember the layoffs of Boeing in the late '60s, early '70s, he helped in building Century II. You know, those were still more economic development driven tasks. I don't think we've ever really went out in my life, I'm 57, went out and just asked the public, what do you think are our big topics over the next ten years. What do we really need to do? Now I think some of those economic development and other things will bubble up in this work we do, but I don't think we've ever done that. So no, no Commissioner Howell, I think you're right on that one."

Commissioner Howell said, "I'm not sure that person would want to say anything at the podium, but I did see someone in the audience that was kind of giving me a different indication. So I don't know if we will open this up to public comment or not, but I would love to know if there's anybody that would disagree with that comment. But from my understanding, as I talked to some of you all about this and researched this, I don't have any awareness that this was done like this at any time in our past. I guess I would like to know from our constituents, what our taxpayers and community members want us to do. What is their idea in terms of how we should tailor our government to meet their desires. I think that's important for us to know that. So to the extent that this study will get to that result, to me, this is a reason we should support the idea."

"But I will also say, I enjoyed the trip to North Carolina, but mostly it was useful, I learned a lot. There are some thriving communities around the country, and they're doing things differently than we are. We can learn from them. I went to Nashville the year before that, went to North Carolina, Raleigh, North Carolina, Durham there. We learned a lot. There is a lot of good ideas out there, and I know that people kind of solve the problems ahead of us, and we ought to reflect on what they've done to create, I guess, thriving communities. I know that we struggled with trying to find ways to make this an attractive place to live, work and play and pray as Commissioner Dennis always says. I think that's important for us to understand what their perspective is and how we want to, I guess, tailor the government to match what their expectations and desires are. So with that, at this time, unless something else comes up and convinces me otherwise, I think I'll be supportive of the motion this morning. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

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

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Scott, thanks for coming today."

Mr. Schwindaman said, "No problem."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Despite everything I have heard, I am still having some..."

Mr. Schwindaman said, "Sure."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "...questions about why are we doing this and what we're trying to do. I looked at the website. There weren't any specifics on the website. This is the first I've heard from anyone from Project Wichita talk about this. What problem are we trying to solve?"

Mr. Schwindaman said, "I don't think you are really trying to solve a problem, Commissioner. I think what you are trying to do is canvass your contingency, not only Sedgwick County and Wichita, but the region, and see what they tell you are the big items that they think we need to try and address over the next ten years. I don't know, some of them may be a problem, I don't know if they will or won't. "But I don't think we know, really, what our citizens want, certainly people talk to me, as well as they talk to you, and they give you their opinions, but what we are trying to do is reach out to those citizens who maybe are not as willing to step up and tell us what they think and make sure that we are providing what it is they need in this region in a long-term vision. So I don't think it is a, I wouldn't call it a problem. Did I make any sense?"

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Well, but I'm still having problems understanding why we are doing this. I mean, we are elected here presumably we understand people in the district, we talk to them, we know there's a lot I mean, what you want in ten years. Now first, I just don't understand what the impetus is, if we don't have a problem, we don't have an objective, and what types of, I have heard different things. First of all, we did do a comprehensive plan a few years ago, I was involved in that. We went out into the community and asked very similar questions, what they wanted, what they wanted to do, this, that and the other. That's I am not sure why we have to replicate that. I've had some, we've tried visioning in the past. That kind of died a slow death. There were somethings that happened but, you know, I don't see this as having a specific goal here. But I read this it talks about projects and initiatives. I mean, what types of project will be looking at?"

Mr. Schwindaman said, "Until we do the survey work and we do the questioning, we will not know that. I would offer up on your community planning that you have done, certainly you went out and talked to your contingents. Every one of you talks to people every day in your districts here and stuff. But that's a probably small percentage of your total group that you are talking to. I would highly doubt a 20-year-old is going to walk up and start talking to you about something mainly because they might be intimidated or whatever. So we are trying to use social media, trying to use other methods to gather that information in so we get a more holistic view of what they believe the region needs as a vision. This is Scott talking here, so just put this on me.

"I believe what you are looking at here is you want to really talk to your age 40 and on down. You want to know, because they are the next generation that are going to be leaders of this community. I'm starting to be probably a little old, I am getting gray up here. So whatever happens and how I can help move this forward, I am sure the co-chairs agree, will benefit generations after us. Not necessarily what we believe today needs to be done. Did that help you any?"

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Well, still, I mean, so why are we deciding I guess, you know, I mean, why are we asking them now, why don't we ask them a few years ago. I'll tell you that in this comprehensive plan I mean, what you are doing is similar to what we did in the comprehensive plan. It is problematic, because there's 500,000 people

here. If you are able to ask 500,000 people, you would get 500,000 different answers. But nevertheless, WSU was involved, and they did a lot of questions for us. I really didn't think their approaches were all that effective, and there were problems with it. I didn't trust the data, okay. I mean, you have got to be very careful with these sort of things, and I just, we don't have a stated problem or objective.

"I am concerned about duplication of effort that we've already done ongoing, at one time I was told this was related to, you know, economic development. That's why it is in the Partnership stuff. Now you are saying it is not economic development.

"I mean, I don't see a clear reason for this, to be honest. I just need more information, now. You know, I have also been told that this is, you know, and I am just going to put this out there, I've had multiple people told me this, a lot of this is related to Century II, okay? You know, we had to deal with Century II, Bill Warren put money in, they decided we wanted to just renovate it and people weren't happy, now we want a committee to look at this, and maybe some other projects or whatever, and the end goal is to build a new Century II with a county wide sales tax and we're going to use WSU and have these meetings to make it look like that's what everybody wants. I have had people tell me that that are familiar with this. That's kind of where this got started. This is at least a part of it and I guess I need you to address that. Because I don't see any specifics, and it talks about projects and initiatives, and I am concerned about that, because people have told me this who I respect and are familiar with this process."

Mr. Schwindaman said, "Okay. Yeah, I would be glad to address that for you there. First of all, that is not the purpose of Project Wichita, to work on Century II, or any of those projects that are current. As you saw in the graphic that was presented, the Mayor has his Century II committee he's working on that. This is strictly to see what the regional, and outside of Sedgwick County, what the region believes is they needed for the next ten years, what processes, what concerns they have, what initiatives need to be done. I can't answer that for you today, because I don't have the data. But at the end of the year we will have a definitive set of these are the issues and the things that need to be done that we can deliver to whoever is wanting to work on various project with. We are not about Century II, or any of that."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "So the people that told me this aren't telling me the truth? Is that the deal?"

Mr. Schwindaman said, "I mean, Century II, will it bubble up when we do the survey work and stuff, Commissioner? I believe it probably will. Will it be a significant piece of it? I don't know. I don't know until I get the data. If Century II becomes, you know, the hot-button, per se, of the community there and stuff. As a business person, I think it is a very important thing, but I am not sure that the community believes it is so important to us is there. So that's what we are trying to find out."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Well, I guess I am a little, put everything together, I am not quite sure why we are asking this question now, when we just asked a similar question a few years ago. City and county spent a few hundred thousand dollars doing this."

Mr. Schwindaman said, "I understand."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "We're saying, you know, granted I have doubts about how effective it was, I would have those same doubts about this. You are going to use the same people moving forward. We don't have a clear, this talks about projects and

initiatives. I don't know, are you talking about things like a baseball stadium or anything like that?"

Mr. Schwindaman said, "Projects and initiative is just that. Out of the outcome of this, you will probably have, not probably, you will have projects and initiatives. I can't address those today until we get the survey work done so we know what those projects and those initiatives are."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "What makes this think we need to have a list of projects and initiatives to do?"

Mr. Schwindaman said, "Well, when we done the city to city visits, and I am been on them since we have been going to Des Moines, I've been on probably five or six. I know Commissioner Unruh has been with me on some. Every city has a list of about ten priorities that they believe in the next ten years they need to be working on. Some of them will prioritize and say these are two to three-year priorities, you know, five to six, and then ten-year priorities. You know, I think that's what our citizens are looking for, is maybe some kind of frame up of that."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Well to be honest with you, I thought that's what the comprehensive plan was for. We spent several hundred thousand dollars doing that. Now you are saying it doesn't fit the need. Then I have, you know, problems with what some other people are telling me. Somebody is not telling me a straight answer somewhere then. You are saying one thing, other people are telling me something other. That puts me in a predicament there."

Mr. Schwindaman said, "I would be more than happy to sit down and have that discussion, you know."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Well, that it would be nice. That would be nice to have, this is the first I've heard from anyone from Project Wichita, so."

Mr. Schwindaman said, "I apologize for not reaching out to you before for this time here."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "I am just a little confused and concerned that about what I have been told and what I am hearing, and if some people are but, I'm concerned there is an agenda that's behind the thing that we are not actually sharing with people. But nevertheless, when you talk about projects, when you go forward, and ask this, and this issue came up in the comprehensive plan, people are going to say I want, A, B, C, and D. But the next question, how are you going to pay for it, and how much are you willing to pay for it."

Approved

"I mean, are you, I mean, I think those questions, I mean, need to be asked along the way, because when you ask someone, hey, would you like this, they will say yeah. Well, they say would you like this, but it will cost you this much more in property taxes the answer might be different."

Mr. Schwindaman said, "You're absolutely correct."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Very, we had a lot of discussions about that in the comprehensive plan, and how to deal with that, et cetera, because otherwise you end up with a big old long wish list and nobody actually really wants to pay for or they're going to complain about it every time that you try to raise taxes. That's problematic. So that's just something I throw out there. I'm still don't have a lot, I'm still not sure about the necessity of this, or the specific goal of this. I am concerned about the hidden agenda that may be here. But I have been told by multiple people is here. So I'm not prepared, I would prefer to actually table this for a while and get more information, more investigation. But if you are going to proceed, I am going to have to vote no. I just can't in good conscience say that I think this is, I don't have enough answers right now, as far as I am concerned."

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

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well Scott, thanks for being here today, and thanks to your co-chairs are here appreciate your being here to support this initiative. I do think that I am convinced that the focus of this as we've come to understand it is regional, trying to get input, and I think this is the right time to capitalize on what I see as some real strong momentum here in South Central Kansas for just public attitude and the things going on. I think, now is the time to do this. I think as far as a community, one of the good things that is going to come out of this is as we get some answers and some, what do the people in region desire, that we have an opportunity to avoid confusion and duplication and conflict going forward, because we are all going to be, I hope, the goal of this is to be focused on the same thing.

"Frankly, that results in the fact that we will accomplish some goals that emerge out of this and we will do it probably in the most efficient and financially conservative way we can. So I am going to be supportive, and appreciate the work that you all have done. You and the rest of the people that have kind of, been working behind the scenes and so forth. Thank you all for your effort."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. Commissioner Ranzau"

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Yeah just one other question. So you are going to ask people what they want, and you are going to get lots of answers, okay? How do you determine out of, and some people will say I want this, I want that. Some people will oppose this, some people, you know, you will have people all over. What is the threshold, what is the mechanism to try and figure out, I mean, you are going to make recommendations for projects or initiatives, I mean, they are not going to be everyone a agreeing, okay."

Mr. Schwindaman said, "Sure, no they won't."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "As you know, right?"

Mr. Schwindaman said, "They won't, they won't."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Let's take Century II, for example. You know, You know how that is, right?"

Mr. Schwindaman said, "Yep."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "How do you, what's the mechanism or algorithm that

you're going to use to determine which ones, presumably that's going to be presented, well this is what the community wants. Well, not everyone is going to want it. Okay."

Mr. Schwindaman said, "Sure"

Commissioner Ranzau said, "So, what's the threshold? Is it 10 percent of people support it, 15? Do you have any idea what, how do you weed through that?"

Mr. Schwindaman said, "I am not prepared to answer that for you today. I would have to consult with WSU, who is running the algorithms on it and what that margin of error and percentage and all that. We haven't got to that point yet. They, I know they have a model they are going to use on it, but I haven't been debriefed on that in total yet. Remember, this is an initiative that's only been in existence for 60 days, and we want to be done by the end of the year.

"So we are moving really rapidly along, and, you know, you have to have a little bit of trust up front that WSU and the quality of the university that it is, that they have got those kind of models already built that they can help correlate that. But you are absolutely right, every one of these items will have people who don't support it. That's just human nature."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "So the problem is, I was in the comprehensive plan process, I've seen how it work, and you ask a lot of people a lot of things, you can talk to a lot of people, but at some point, somebody has to narrow that down, that ends up to be in a relatively small people in the room. Sometimes it is a matter of, some of the mechanisms that I've seen is, you know, just, you know, just personal opinion, one way or the other, or some people call it dotacracy(not sure what he's saying) or putting pins on a board of what people think. It isn't exactly scientific and data-driven as what you might think. That's problematic. I have been through it."

Mr. Schwindaman said, "Every project has a margin of error in it. But what we are trying to do is reduce that amount of error to give you the best possible outcome in it there."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Thank you."

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

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to say I appreciate the previous comments. I think that when people advocate for, say, quality of life, you know, things that might be added to our community, obviously they are going to have to understand the cost of that that has to be a part of the discussion. I anticipate the data will include that as part of the data that we will see down the road. If I could design it, I'm sure I could find a way to do it, I mean, these folks are smarter than me, no doubt. So I know they can do this, and I can imagine ways that I would do it if I was in charge of this project. I think it can be done, certainly. But I do have one question, I don't think anybody covered this yet, I am not sure you are the right person for this answer, question. But if it was presented, then I apologize for repeating something that has already been presented. Maybe the Manager can answer this. In terms of the funding source for this, is this going be economic development fund once again?"

Mr. Scholes said, "Correct. Out of the same fund I mentioned earlier, [\$]1.9 economic development line item that we have already included in the budget."

Commissioner Howell said, "So this wasn't specifically earmarked in this case or budgeted for specifically expenditure, but we have money set aside for this, correct?"

Mr. Scholes said, "The GWP was \$300,000 that the Commission had already voted on last summer. It was a part of that [\$]1.9 (million). This particular \$45,000 is new economic development project was not included, but it will be a part of that \$1.9 million."

Commissioner Howell said, "I know we made some end of the year decisions to spend some of that money last year. Typically, say last year or two, can you remember about how much money was left in the budget that we basically, either rolled over or made decisions to spend or whatever at the end of the year?"

Mr. Scholes said, "In the end we had close to about, I would say, around \$650,000 or so."

Ms. Poe Rousseau said, "About a million, because of Doc."

Mr. Scholes said, "Oh, Doc."

Commissioner Howell said, "Okay. So about a million dollars last year. That's maybe somewhat typical I would guess, going back a couple years. So again, I think that we have money set aside for this type of investigation, or this type of use. I think it is, to the extent it is done well, and we have high confidence in the data and it can be trusted, we understand, you know, how it came together, I think this has value to policymakers. So I think this is reasonable for us to do this. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. I don't see any other comments. I have made my comments at the beginning. Madam Clerk, call the roll."

VOTE

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

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you for being here today. We appreciate it."

Mr. Schwindaman said, "Yeah, thank you."

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

M [18-239](#)

CON2018-00002 - A COUNTY CONDITIONAL USE FOR A 150-FOOT TELECOMMUNICATION TOWER 1,200 FEET NORTH OF EAST 63RD STREET AND 700 FEET EAST OF THE EAST SIDE OF SOUTH 127TH STREET. (NO ADDRESS YET ASSIGNED).

Presented by: Dale Miller, Director of Planning.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approve the Conditional Use, subject to the

conditions recommended by the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission (MAPC), adopt the findings of the MAPC, and authorize the Chairman to sign the prepared resolution.

VISUAL PRESENTATION

Chairman Dennis said, "Mr. Miller, how are you doing?"

Mr. Dale Miller, Director, Metropolitan Area Planning Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Doing well, thank you."

Chairman Dennis said, "Before we get started, I think most of all of us had ex parte contact at some point. I think that we can generally state that all five of us had ex parte contact before we start this."

Mr. Miller said, "Well, given the fact that it was sports season, baseball just started, it might be appropriate to quote Yogi Berra. This is deja vu all over again.

"A few meetings ago you saw a request for a tower located about 140 feet east of 127th (Street). The request for today is a substitute for that, at least for the time being. They have moved the location approximately 700 feet east of 127th Street. It is a request for a 150-foot tall wireless communication facility. The request includes reduction of the compatibility setback standard from the north property line from 395 feet to 152 feet. As you can see here on the zoning map, all of the properties in the area are zoned RR, Rural Residential.

"The aerial shows that there are large lot homes developed to the north here, and up to here, and then to the west of 127th Street, down to 63rd Street. The remainder of the properties to the south and to the east are developed with agricultural uses. This particular area here is land that is also owned by the same property owner that the application area sits on. There has been protests filed, 37.34 percent. The protest triggers a four out of five voting requirement to approve. At the [Metropolitan Area] Planning Commission (MAPC), the two specifically expressed objections centered on the perception that there had been a deal from the neighbor's folks perception that there had been a deal struck with the tower company that the facility would be located 800 feet east, and that they was a concern that the property owner, let me go back here. The property owner here, roughly, that's where their house is.

"The tower that provides the internet service for that house is located here to the southeast, and he expressed concern that the proposed facility might interrupt his ability to get wireless internet service at his house. However, I need to remind the Commission that under state law, that is not something that can be used as a basis for denial. There were questions and comments at Planning Commission, but according to state law and FCC (Federal Communications Commission) regulations, that's not something that can be used as a basis for denial, that if there is an issue, the carrier is supposed to work to modify that, and I believe in your packet there's quite a number of emails and attachments where the carrier has indicated that they will do everything reasonable to mitigate the issue if that occurs."

Chairman Dennis said, "Excuse me, Mr. Miller, real briefly, we are going to lose KPTS in about one minute. So anyone that's watching us on KPTS, if they want to continue, we're going to have to go online and pick up anything that we've got available there because we won't have live coverage for the rest of this. Thank you. I'm sorry to interrupt."

Mr. Miller said, "No problem."

Chairman Dennis said, "I wanted to make sure that the audience knew."

Mr. Miller said, "I think I'm getting really near the end of at least my presentation. We'll let you know that Curtis Holland, agent for the applicant is here. The Planning Commission did recommend approval of the request, and with that, I try and answer questions, or as I said, Mr. Holland is here, if you have specific questions about the details of the proposal."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you, Mr. Miller. Do I have questions for Mr. Miller? Commissioner Howell?"

Commissioner Howell said, "Well thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a number of questions both for Director Miller and maybe even Mr. Holland, if that's acceptable. Well thank you again for the presentation, Director Miller. Thank you for being here."

"You did a good job explaining everything. I just wanted to, and you mentioned ex parte communication. I do want to go through that real quickly. I did receive a packet which I think you all have a copy of that now from Stan McPhail a couple days ago, and had a number of emails in that. I did have a meeting with Mr. McPhail as well as I think Mr. Underwood in my office, I think, since the last time this was brought to us, a previous time this came up. I have had a brief discussion with Greg Thomas at Cook Airfield about this, and I also received a letter from, I guess, Dale Miller regarding some of the questions on the line of sight issues that I have asked previously, and I appreciate those answers. I think that's been transmitted as well to Mr. Holland, I hope, at least I hope it has. There was a KORA (Kansas Open Records Act) request, I think, that was provided."

"So anyway, I have had extensive ex parte communication. I apologize for that, but by the way, there is one more thing I did. I actually did do a site visit. I wanted to go and see where the tower was going to be and see what was around that. So I did go to the site to take a look at that myself personally. So having said that, I have had extensive ex parte communication. But I will tell you, I'm not going to allow any of that to directly influence anything I do here today. I will let the data today speak for itself. But based on what I have been given, I do have a question for Mr. Holland, I guess, first. That is, if that's okay, Mr. Holland? You know, one of my questions would be regarding this discrepancy of 700 versus 800 feet that seems like a basic part of this whole protest is whether or not there was a verbal agreement on 800 feet versus what you're proposing now is 700 feet. Can you please tell me what you can about that? I would sure appreciate hearing your perspective on that."

Mr. Curtis Holland, 6201 College Blvd. #500, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Yes. If I could, I'd like to put something up on the screen to help focus this conversation. I do have just to start, I do have representatives from Verizon Wireless who are here with us today. I would like to introduce Hank Madden as well as Emanuel Castro, both of these gentlemen are Radiofrequency Engineers, engineers with Verizon Wireless. They are the group, the team with Verizon that helps design the location, the facilities, helps to actually design the overall network to allow for their wireless service to be provided in order for us to all be able to utilize our devices that we use. So I do have them here in the audience to talk about some of this issue, in particular with respect to the interference question or issue."

"But Commissioner Howell, with respect to your particular question on the 7 [00] to 800 feet, I guess the way I would characterize that is there's maybe a slight misunderstanding between ourselves and the residents as to what was said or conveyed or represented to them. So on the screen I have before you a document that really is the basis for this entire discussion. This was a document that was distributed or handed out by the residents at a meeting that we had, or actually hearing that we had with the MAPC on this issue. The information came really the day of the hearing, so I wasn't able to even, I was driving down from Kansas City when I first saw it, but on the day of the hearing is when I first got this, but I do want to point you to the, this document that was submitted and directed into the record by the neighbors.

"In particular, what this document tried to do, I think, was to establish an area, a range, a position on the property, if you will, that they would find acceptable, as opposed to where we were with our first original application. Our first original application was about 200 feet east of the road, and again that, as I indicated during the hearings on that matter, that location was directed and determined by the land owner, who would be our landlord. The current application before you today is also a result of the landlord's decision as to where to locate it. But back to this document. On the document it says that, again, I got it that day, it says there's a rectangular box with some language in it that I'll read to you. There is an arrow pointing to the octagonal shape. It says approximate location proposed by neighbors and airport, approximately 700 to 800 feet from the property line, owner's west property line.

"So our understanding at this meeting, at this hearing, was that there was this location that would be 7 [00] to 800 feet from the property line, and during the hearing, I represented that we would work with our landlord. We would go talk with them because we hadn't talked to them. This was, they had made the initiative, they had talked to this landlord our property owner, and I hadn't had any conversations. Our team hadn't had any conversations with them about this particular location. I said at the meeting we would, you know, go meet with the land owner and see what we could do as far as moving it to a location that would be in this range, and that's what we did, and in fact that's what happened.

"The landlord did agree that they would be able or would allow us to move it to the 700-foot distance. Again from their perspective, from the beginning of this project, they've always indicated to us that we don't want to have it located so far interior that we think it might hinder or impact our development potential for the property. That was the way they stated it, and that's why the first application had that tower closer to the road, and originally they weren't willing to move it at all. Then after some discussion, they did say we'll look at this location, and they agreed to 700 feet. That's really where we are. We went to 700 feet, and we feel that that's met the criteria that was set before us in terms of the neighbors."

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you for the answer. Just as I was really focused on what you were saying, but I wanted to make sure I heard it again. They were concerned about the original location would have hindered, what was the sentence you said?"

Mr. Holland said, "The development potential for the property."

Commissioner Howell said, "So at 700 feet, they feel like that's a better situation in terms of development of the property."

Mr. Holland said, "They actually felt like the original location was the better location for the property, and now they're saying we're willing to go to 700 feet with it."

Commissioner Howell said, "Okay."

Mr. Holland said, "They were trying to minimize the depth that it would go into the property. They felt like 700 feet, that's what the neighbor said would be okay. So that's where they selected it and chose to have it be put, placed, rather."

Chairman Dennis said, "Commissioner Howell, I was notified that we do have KPTS until 1:00 [p.m.]. They are giving us some time that we didn't have..."

Commissioner Howell said, "That is awesome."

Chairman Dennis said, "...previously. So welcome back to the audience."

Commissioner Howell said, "Well thank you. I appreciate that answer. I have a question for Director Miller, actually, if that's okay. I'm not sure if this is relevant or not, but the previous proposal that had this closer to the road, is that still a living proposal, or is that gone and dead now?"

Mr. Miller said, "No. What the arrangement that we have is it's been suspended while they file this application. It is our understanding that if this application is approved, they will then withdraw the first one. However, if this application is denied, then they would like to have the Commission consider a final recommendation on the first application."

Commissioner Howell said, "Okay. So it's suspended but it can come back."

Mr. Miller said, "Yes."

Commissioner Howell said, "Okay. Mr. Chairman, I don't know if you are willing to do this or if you plan to do this, but Mr. McPhail is in the audience. I don't know if he wants to say anything or not. Are you willing to allow him say something if he wants to?"

Chairman Dennis said, "They deferred their until this period, so first of all, I need to know if the applicant has any other comments that they'd like to make before we open it up to anyone else."

Mr. Holland said, "I would like to make a comment, I'll try to be brief. I know that you've had a couple items that went pretty long. Hopefully this won't have to go that long. I did want to talk just briefly about the other issue that was raised at the last meeting, and that is potential interference with his, with their wireless internet service provided apparently by Pixius. That was, again, the last meeting we were just at, first time we'd heard some concern about that. But in any event, when we were at that last meeting, the question was asked, there was some concern expressed by Mr. McPhail in particular that that might interfere, cause interference with his their wireless internet service there."

"Of course just hearing that for the first time and standing at the podium there, I couldn't give a full answer to that question. I said that we would be happy to look into it, and to get back with him on that particular question, and see if we could give an

answer that's satisfactory to them on that issue. So in the interim, between the last MAPC meeting, or the MAPC meeting and today, we have done some due diligence on our part in that regard, and in particular we have had a direct discussions with Pixius, the wireless service provider. Mr. Hank Madden, who is again, a Radiofrequency Engineer with Verizon Wireless, had direct conversations with the engineer for Pixius on this particular issue. They talked about the licenses, the bandwidths, what our licenses were, also where their specific tower was that Pixius had that would transmit their frequencies to the residents and where that was in relation to our tower, where that would be, to see if there might be some sort of impact.

"We had in those discussions, and I had relayed those to the Planning staff, and maybe you have some emails from me on that particular issue, and then subsequently there was a letter that Verizon Wireless submitted to you on that issue, and just to follow up on Mr. Miller's comments earlier, that's an FCC issue, not one for the local governments to resolve, but we are subject to the FCC's rules. There are very stringent penalties for interfering and not correcting interference with other carrier services. We've committed to following and abiding by the FCC rules and correcting any of those issues if there happen to be any of those issues. But back to the conversations that we had with Pixius, it was represented to us, and Mr. Madden can speak for himself if you'd like to ask him questions, I'll say what I recall or understand of that conversation, is that there's not a belief that there's likely to be any interference with our signal and the Pixius service.

"We co-exist already in Sedgwick County, and we haven't had any issues with our service throughout the county in the area. In this particular case, our tower is close, it's not in the line of the service, but it's close, if you will, it's a microwave technology, so it's line of sight, and if you put our tower smack dab in the middle of the line of sight, you could potentially have an issue, but they didn't think even in that case that it would be a real issue, and that if there was any issue in that particular case, it could be remedied pretty easily by simply adjusting the receptive dish on the McPhail property one foot here or there, not significantly but just slightly moving it.

"I know that in the correspondence that you referenced earlier from Mr. Miller today, it's not on the screen, but you can see where that line of sight is approximately, and you can see that our tower is not in that beam or, you know, area where it's not directly in the line of sight of the Pixius service.

"We have a 50 by 50 foot lease area, our pole is right in the middle of it. Judging from the exhibit, it looks like we're 30 or so feet away from wherever that line of sight would be, and I know, again, in an effort to try to minimize any potential interference, we have some ability to move the facility or the tower facility within our lease box. We'd be willing to look at that and do that, if necessary. We'd also commit to you that we would correct what is required of us to do in terms of correcting an interference, we would do. If that means we have to financially pay for or assist in the relocation or any adjustment costs, cost for adjustment as to the Dish, we'd be willing and happy to do that.

"We don't think it's an issue, and you know, Mr. Madden is here to talk to you about that, if you'd like to hear from him, but again, it's an FCC issue for us, and we're willing to do whatever we need to do to take care of that if it becomes an issue."

Chairman Dennis said, "Okay, thank you. Anything else?"

Mr. Holland said, "No. I mean, other than, I mean, I appreciate everybody's

consideration on this. It's very difficult. This is the second application. Verizon Wireless moved and agreed to talk with the landlord, to talk about moving this to a point where we thought would be acceptable, and 700 feet was what we were told was acceptable and what our landlord would agree to. So that's the result, that's where we are with the application. We do meet, you know, the compatibility, height standard from the west property line in that regard. So we have made compromise, and we've tried to do what we can to mitigate their concerns, and I wish everybody was happy.

"I think somebody said something earlier on an earlier case that nothing is ever perfect, and that's why you guys have to make the hard decision, but we're hopeful that we think this is appropriate. We know the Planning staff recommended approval of it, and your MAPC, your Planning Commission overwhelmingly recommended approval of it. So we're hopeful that you would agree and also make, or at least approve the application, and if there's any questions, we're happy to take those. If after Mr. McPhail has his comments, if there's any questions back, we'd like to address those, too."

Chairman Dennis said, "Okay, thank you. Mr. McPhail, would you like to make a statement?"

Mr. Stan McPhail, 6140 S. 127th Street East, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Sure."

Chairman Dennis said, "Please approach the podium, and state your name for the record."

Mr. McPhail said, "I'm trying to catch my breath here. I'm the property owner directly to the north of where this proposed site is.

"I'm kind of blown away from some respects, because every time Mr. Holland speaks, he makes it sound like Verizon is the neighbor you've always wanted, and we've dealt with this for about a year now off and on, and I guarantee you that is not the situation. So I kind of feel like that right now I have become the Paul Harvey of this situation, because I want to give you the rest of the story that you have been given this timeline that I'd like to kind of go through. Mr. Van Dyke got called away for a business phone call that he can't get off of, a conference call, so he's not going to be here, so the information will have to come strictly just from me.

"On that timeline that we're looking at, I have on before, on December 7th prior to the meeting, we received an email back from the property owners that Mr. Holland was referring to, and said that, yes, they would agree to move the tower. So the 700 to 800 feet was in play there. Based on that information, Mr. Holland agreed to table that, the first site, and discuss looking at this new location proposal.

"After the meeting, Mr. Holland met with all five of us, meaning the four landowners and Tim Austin, who is from Kaw Valley Engineering, he's a surveyor and so forth that evidently I think Mr. Austin and Mr. Holland have had some kind of working relationships in the past. So Mr. Holland is out there discussing the situation with us, and he told us that he knew or felt like that first location was never going to fly through the county, so they would be willing to move that tower site any place we wanted it, as long as we would agree not to protest it, not to slow anything down so that they could get their site location. We told him we would not even worry about the waiver off of my property line if it was at least 150 feet south of my property line and 800 feet to the east. Mr. Holland said we can do it. Not a problem. Looked us all in the eye, shook our hands. We walked away from that meeting assuming that we weren't going to be here

today.

"After that meeting, Larry Van Dyke and I put together an email that you have a copy of that went to the property owner that basically said exactly that, that Verizon was willing to put it anywhere that they felt like the FAA (Federal Aviation Administration) report, Cook Airfield was not going to come into play whatsoever in the decision. So, and we told him you have a lot of different opportunities here, where would you like to put it and everything, but we're good with 800 feet. We assumed that was the end of the discussion, so Mr. Van Dyke and I, we went out and temporarily staked a location at 800 feet. Shortly thereafter the Wildeman's that live right across the road from us, they actually paid Tim Austin to come out and do an actual survey and stake 800 feet. So based on his reputation, he knew in that conversation that 800 feet was the designated distance that we all agreed on.

"So once again, we assumed, and you have an email from Kaw Valley later on, we see about December 22nd, that there's an email correspondence between Mr. Holland and Mr. Austin, and he tells, Mr. Austin tells him I have surveyed it, staked it, and I am going to send you the coordinates of that location, that 800 feet that we had agreed upon. Therefore he got an email back, and Mr. Holland said, no, basically we're doing 700 feet. What happened to our agreement that was done on a handshake?

"Now, somebody looks me in the eyes and shakes my hand, I assume that I don't have to worry about what's going on. But evidently we did. So now there is a conversation, and he says he wants the land owners or the neighbors to agree to 700 feet, and Mr. Austin says no, that's not what they agreed to, they agreed to 800 feet.

"So we go to the next step, and you've got that email, that conversation there also. The February 15th meeting, and Mr. Holland is presenting the 700 feet, and we decided at that point in time that they were going to try to go through with that. Well that's when it dawned on us that the internet service very likely could be interfered with. So that's why we brought up the idea of interference with our internet service. You know and after that meeting, Mr. Van Dyke and I were out in the parking lot leaving, and Mr. Holland passes us, and there was a slight discussion goes on, and Mr. Holland completely denies ever saying 800 feet. He said I never said that. I said wait a minute, there was five of us. You shook our hands, you looked us in the eye and you said it could be done. Well he said I must have misspoke. Well, he gathered the 150 feet that was part of our original agreement, but he didn't go the 800 feet. So this is just a matter of Verizon trying to short-change the neighbors.

"Now, we're the ones that got them the secondary site. It wasn't anything that they did. We were trying to work with the neighbors, work with the land owner, work with Verizon to find a location that everybody is going to be happy with. For our leg work and our effort, we just feel like that Verizon stabbed us in the back and went around us. We're basically asking you based on the way that Verizon has dealt with us, and the fact that they are not meeting the setback requirements whatsoever, that you deny the application, because we feel like also, guys, that if you waive this setback requirement, that you've kicked the door open for any cell phone tower that's going to come into this county, that is going to set a precedent and they are going to say, hey you did it for Verizon, we expect you to do it for us. I think that could cause big problems for the County Commissioners. So based on those two items, we would like for you to deny this application. I guess that's about all I have to say unless you, if you have questions, I would be glad to answer any questions."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you, Mr. McPhail. I don't see any questions at this time.

I appreciate it."

Mr. McPhail said, "Okay. Thank you, sir."

Chairman Dennis said, "I'm sorry, Commissioner Ranzau, maybe there are some."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "I just want to clarify."

Mr. McPhail said, "Yes, sir."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "This chart that is up on here, who provided that?"

Mr. McPhail said, "Mr. Van Dyke."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Okay."

Mr. McPhail said, "I sat down and we looked at that and we said, you know, the location closest to the road is not to their advantage because of future development possibilities. So we felt like if we offered them something and gave them a pictorial of what the possibilities were available to them, that they would reconsider and look at it and realize that maybe they could move that tower out there, and still get their tower, still get their income and everything else, and still not interfere with the neighbors and their properties and still satisfy everybody. So we did develop that, and Mr. Van Dyke sent that to the property owners around, somewhere I'm guessing the 29th of November, something prior to that December 7th meeting."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Okay. So I understand the issue, you think you had an agreement for 800 feet."

Mr. McPhail said, "Yes, sir."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "If on this you were okay with 7[00], 800 feet, I mean, why, I mean, it says right here, 7[00] to 800 feet that you guys presented. I got to have a reason, I mean, I'm going to talk to my attorneys later about this."

Mr. McPhail said, "No, that's alright."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Why are you opposing that? I understand you prefer 800, but you put 7[00] to 800, so what's the..."

Mr. McPhail said, "Our big objection to this is, is that if Verizon were to sit down and talk to us about it, we might have been able to work out something. But when Mr. Holland shook our hands and said we will put it anywhere you want to, he was talking about the far corner. We said 800 feet. We had an agreement there with him at 800 feet. We expected them to uphold that agreement that he had with us. So that's why we're saying, if that's the case, then I don't know, it's just been a very difficult situation to deal with Verizon because they haven't been up front and honest with us through this whole ordeal."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Okay."

Mr. McPhail said, "Now I do have to admit they did not ask, they did go through some steps to find out about our internet service. Yes, they did that. That's the only

communication, and I felt like that was a last-ditch attempt effort to show that they could be the good neighbors and get this passed."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Okay. So I have some questions for our attorneys then. Okay, so first of all, today we received, well some emails, and this and this, all this stuff now in the record then?"

Mr. Justin Waggoner, Assistant County Counselor, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Yes, that should all be in the record, Commissioner Ranzau."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "It'll be in the record, okay, so before we go any further I'd say, in one of these things I received prior to it, but it's in the record now anyway, I say I did have ex parte conversations with Stan McPhail and Larry Van Dyke on 2/21/18, but I will make my decision based upon the stuff that's presented here today and in the record. Okay, so if, I mean, we're basically you know, the citizens there have this here, they said 7[00] to 800, they think they had an arrangement for 800. From a legal basis, we got to have a reason to reject or whatever is, I mean, where are we at legally if we make a decision and then that gets appealed or, you know, we get taken to court or something. Do you have any thoughts or advice on that?"

Mr. Waggoner said, "I will do my best to answer it. There's a lot in that question."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Well I mean, you know..."

Mr. Waggoner said, "I guess what there's been a lot of discussion today and also at the Planning Commission, was the agreement, or lack of agreement, or misunderstanding, however you characterize it, about the 7[00] to 800 feet. I would just summarize all that by saying as a zoning matter, that's all irrelevant for you. In terms of whether you approve it or not, is based on the application that's in front of you at the 700 feet.

"Any of the discussions that occurred outside of the Planning Commission meeting, the Board of County Commission meeting, about agreeing where it should be or where it shouldn't be, that doesn't change what the application is that's actually in front of you. So I would urge you to judge this based on what is in front of you with the application area and not to be swayed in your opinion on this matter as to whether there was an agreement or wasn't an agreement, somebody didn't do what they were supposed to do. I think that's really not relevant as a Planning consideration. Does that, that's kind of the first part."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "That answers the question."

Mr. Waggoner said, "Okay."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "I'll say I'm kind of surprised that we even got to where we're considering 700 feet. I know last time I think we made a motion to send it back, and I think I opposed that because I thought we we're going get back, right back to the same one, 150 feet away, so Mr. Chairman, I guess I was wrong that day, and we actually made some progress on behalf of the land owner, and somebody, helping out our friend there. But anyway, I guess, so I'm just struggling with that, we made

significant progress, I know it's not 800, but it's 700. Then I think that answered my question. I'm not going to have any further questions."

Mr. Waggoner said, "Thank you."

Chairman Dennis said, "Mr. Waggoner, do you have anything else that you need from us?"

Mr. Waggoner said, "I don't. (inaudible) at this time, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Dennis said, "Mr. Holland, do you have comments?"

Mr. Holland said, "I just want to address what was said by Mr. McPhail earlier, because the implication is that I misrepresented or, that's the polite way of saying what he thought I did to him. I just wanted to say what I said earlier and what was true that day, and I apologize if there was a misunderstanding or miscommunication here. I have no authority at that meeting to say we are going to move it anywhere you want. I said to them I would look at, or we would look at moving it anywhere where the landlord would allow us to move it. The email that came the day of the meeting on December 7th that had this attachment with it, which said essentially we looked at your diagram and we're okay with your location.

"Based on that and not having myself talk to the landlord, we can't do any movement without talking to the landlord. I said that we would be willing to relook at this and move it where the landlord would allow us, not anywhere you want us to move it, and there was no specific 800-foot distance discussed to my recollection.

"So there wasn't in my view, in my recollection, any promise to an 800-foot location. I agree with Mr. Waggoner that that's probably irrelevant, but I just wanted to come to say that to you, because I feel like I've been questioned in terms of my veracity, and that's really important to me. I think Verizon has done, has been and willing to work on this and has been a good neighbor, even though I understand why that may not seem that way to the McPhail's. But by moving it, I mean, this is very difficult for us to move it, a site. It's probably \$100,000 to pick up and move a site in terms of all the engineering and planning and regulatory approvals you have to go back through. I mean, we went ahead and did it and agreed to do it, and we went and talked to the landlord. This is where they said they wanted it. So just wanted it say that."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you, sir. Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Holland, I just have a couple quick follow-up questions. I'll try to make this really fast."

Mr. Holland said, "Sure. Sure."

Commissioner Howell said, "If I understand correctly, the diagram that we're seeing on the screen here, that was presented, if you will, to MAPC by Mr. Van Dyke."

Mr. Holland said, "Yes."

Commissioner Howell said, "So you have a copy of that. You showed that to the land owner or you discussed this with the land owner."

Mr. Holland said, "Yes."

Commissioner Howell said, "Although it says 7[00] to 800 feet, do you remember the discussion after that meeting where you guys shook hands on 800 feet? Because that's what he's saying."

Mr. Holland said, "That's what I was just telling you. We did have a conversation after the meeting, where I said that we would be willing to look at moving this location based on the drawing..."

Commissioner Howell said, "Sure."

Mr. Holland said, "...that I just saw, and that we would be willing to talk to the landlord and we would move it anywhere where the landlord would allow us to move it, yes."

Commissioner Howell said, "I'm just wondering if the land owner, when you discussed it with him, if they understood that the neighbors really wanted 800 feet. I wondered if that was..."

Mr. Holland said, "They did. They knew there was a difference between 7[00] and 800 feet. It was determined that the shorter distance was their preferred location. The issue of 700 to 800 feet right now, the only issue as far as I know, is this potential interference with Pixius, and if you just moved it 100 feet, it would eliminate that issue. That's really where this comes down to and because it doesn't make a difference, 100 feet, visually, it doesn't make a difference. It's whether it causes any interference to Pixius. We already have in the record that we would correct any adjustment or issue if that's the case."

Commissioner Howell said, "Yeah, okay. Well, I appreciate your answer. I don't think I have any other questions. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Approved

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

Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Mr. Chair, if it's appropriate, I'm ready to make a motion."

Chairman Dennis said, "Okay, do you want to make the motion or do you want Commissioner Howell since it's his district?"

Commissioner Howell said, "No, I'm not going to make a motion."

MOTION

Commissioner O'Donnell moved to approve the Conditional Use, subject to the conditions recommended by the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission (MAPC), adopt the findings of the MAPC, and authorize the Chairman to sign the prepared resolution.

Commissioner Unruh seconded the motion.

Commissioner Howell said, "Discussion."

Chairman Dennis said, "Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know that 100 feet may not be a big deal to Verizon at this point, but I think to the land owner, this is huge. I understand from Mr. Waggoner's explanation, this probably isn't a reason to approve or deny necessarily, although I just think we are within inches of a touchdown here, and I would say more than likely these neighbors don't want this tower at all, but they're willing to, they will be willing to compromise. That was the number that they felt they had an agreement on, although it wasn't written down. I think it's unfortunate, we're that close to a touchdown and unable to totally, I guess, find an agreement from everyone. From the land owner's perspective, it's not my decision certainly, but I think from their perspective, 100 feet probably wouldn't make any difference to them, I don't see why it would."

"To Verizon, it is essentially the same thing. It does clear up the Pixius issue better. You know, I just don't feel comfortable supporting this motion. So I'm probably going to vote no today, although we will see what happens with the motion. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

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

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So I'm sympathetic to the issue of, somebody thinks they had an understanding and a handshake, to me that is important. But we basically have two sides saying different things, and our attorney saying really we shouldn't consider it in this decision, so that puts us in a position where, I mean well it puts us in a difficult position."

"So this is not 800 feet, but it's 700 feet, and like I said, it's a lot further than what, I didn't think we'd make it this far based on what I heard from the last meeting. So I think if we don't approve this, then we run the risk going back to the other one which is even more objectionable, which is about 150, 200 feet. Either that or we run the risk of ending up in court and having this whole decision overturned. So I'll be, while I'm sympathetic to the concerns, I think I will have to be supportive of this motion today."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you, Commissioner Ranzau. The last meeting, I spoke quite a bit about it. I've seen a lot of these issues come up. Served nine years on the MAPC, so I've seen it time and time again. The question that I think Mr. Holland asked last time is if we sent it back, which direction were we considering, and the only guidance as I recall that I gave him was the east-west setback. I think that we've got agreement on the east-west setback at 700 feet. I understand the concerns of the homeowners, but the alternative is back where it was before. I don't think that that is acceptable at all to the homeowners. So I will be supporting the motion. I see no other requests to speak, Madam Clerk, call the roll."

VOTE

<i>Commissioner O'Donnell II</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Ranzau</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Howell</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Commissioner Unruh</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Chairman Dennis</i>	<i>Aye</i>

Chairman Dennis said, "Okay. Next item, please."

N [18-273](#)

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS' REGULAR MEETING ON MARCH 29, 2018.

Presented by: Joe Thomas, Director, Purchasing.

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

VISUAL PRESENTATION

Mr. Joe Thomas, Director of Purchasing Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners."

Chairman Dennis said, "Mr. Thomas, welcome."

Mr. Thomas said, "Glad to be here."

Chairman Dennis said, "You've been waiting for a while."

Mr. Thomas said, "Yeah."

Chairman Dennis said, "You buying lunch?"

Mr. Thomas said, "Yes, I'd be glad to."

Chairman Dennis said, "If we get through this first."

Mr. Thomas said, "If we get through fast you're buying lunch."

Chairman Dennis said, "We're not going to get through it fast. I don't think you need to worry."

Mr. Thomas said, "Alright, sir. The meeting of the Board of Bids and Contracts of March 29th, we have two items that we'd like to recommend for your approval."

1. ROAD IMPROVEMENTS -- PUBLIC WORKS
FUNDING -- R342 COLDMIX REPL-16+

"This recommendation is to accept the low bid from Flint Hills Materials, LLC for the Base Bid and the Alternate No. 1 for Hot Mix, and that's in the total amount of \$739,455."

2. ACTUARIAL AND BROKER REVIEW SERVICES FOR HEALTH CARE PLAN
-- HUMAN RESOURCES
FUNDING -- HUMAN RESOURCES

"This recommendation is to accept the proposal from IMA, Inc. for service fees in the amount of \$40,000 for one (1) year with a one (1) year option to renew."

Mr. Thomas said, "So I'd be happy to try to answer any questions. We also have other members that would be able to do that as well and recommend approval of both of these items."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you, Mr. Thomas. I think we're probably going to split these up into two separate votes. But Commissioner Ranzau didn't have anything to say."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "I was going to make that suggestion, that we just take them one at a time."

Chairman Dennis said, "Yeah, so I think we're going to discuss the first one was the..."

Mr. Thomas said, "Road improvements."

Chairman Dennis said, "...road improvements."

Mr. Thomas said, "Yes, sir."

Chairman Dennis said, "So I know that Mr. Spears has some information to provide to us today about the road improvements. We're going to start with that one."

Mr. David Spears, Assistant County Manager of Public Works, Facilities Maintenance, Project Services and County Engineer, greeted the Commissioners and said, "A little power point here for you. We had a discussion yesterday at the Commission Staff Meeting. R342, this is about our recommendation, but R342 is the paving of five miles of township low-volume gravel roads. Give you a little history, for decades the first step to improve a gravel road has been to construct a cold mix surface with county crews.

"In 2013, the county worked with Andale Construction to develop a Super Seal. They have a super slurry. We sort of invented this system that we put a seal on top of that so the hybrid name is Super Seal. This was as a contracted replacement for the cold mix, because our pug mill was 30 years old, and it was breaking down, it was costing a lot of money to fix it each time. So we knew we were going to need to either buy a pug mill or find an alternative, so we found an alternative. The Super Seal has been criticized as a single source because there is only one local company with the necessary equipment, and they have the patent on the liquid that they use for the sub-base for stabilization. The cost has steadily increased which has forced us to look at other options due to budgetary restraints.

"This year, our engineers worked with contractors who do both wet and dry cement treated base and cold and hot mix asphalt to develop an open source bid package to replace Super Seal. Seven bids were submitted by five contractors, in other words, a couple contractors bid both ways, both the cold mix and the hot mix. The open source bid package was designed so that all bid options provide roads with generally equivalent service life. So we made this chart, and you can see the columns, the type, cold mix in-house that we used to do, and then the Super Seal, and then this year we have alternate one and alternate two, and then the ultimate construction is a full depth construction, which costs about a million dollars a mile.

"So I think maybe, Commissioner Ranzau, your key question yesterday was you want the better alternative. What I want to say to you today, the Super Seal is a better product compared to our cold mix. The reason that it's better than our cold mix is because it has, the subgrade is treated. When we did our cold mix, we did nothing to the subgrade, we just took the cold mix out and laid it on the road. It was about five inches thick. So I wanted to make that clear. So I'm not, when you compare the Super Seal with the alternates today, the cold mix, they have a treated base, although it be

dry. So those, any of those alternates are going to be better than our cold mix originally was because it treats the base.

"Now, there's argument even amongst our profession what's better, a dry base or a wet. Depending on who you talk to, you get a different answer. I have my own opinion. It's not important. But there's others that have a..."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Hold on, it is important. If your opinion isn't important, then why do we have you here? I mean..."

Mr. Spears said, "Well, I just want to say there's other engineers who think the dry mix can work fine if you have to get it mixed right, and we will have an inspector on the job full-time. We do on all of our jobs. So if you get that mixed and mixed and mixed and all the particles touching with the dirt, it will work out fine. So we used to do this with flyash years ago. If you see the full depth construction, you see down there, it has six-inch treated base, rock and geo grid, that's what we're doing now. With flyash or cement, and then we even went further on that one, we did a subbase below that.

"But what I'm saying is, back then, that was dry, and we have those roads all over the county, so it will work. It will work. Now, so maybe that's where you and I possibly had a misunderstanding about what's better than what. But definitely I know I've said the Super Seal is better than the cold mix. There's no doubt about that, then a cold mix without any subgrade treated, but on these things we bid, it's going to have a treated base under the cold mix, okay? So that's the difference between that, that we bid and what we used to do. We didn't do anything to the base. So that's the key. So I just wanted to..."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Right, but you've also told me repeatedly that the wet is better than the dry."

Mr. Spears said, "In my opinion, it is."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "A question on your cost. You have \$215,000 per mile, I calculated out [\$]188[000]."

Mr. Spears said, "Well, the last bid that we had on Super Seal, that is not this bid that we just got."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Oh okay, okay."

Mr. Spears said, "Previous bid, when they are alone..."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Okay."

Mr. Spears said, "...that's the bid, was [\$]215[000]."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "So the bids today, as I calculated it out, is Andale, which has the wet base is [\$]188,000 and the Flint Hills is [\$]148,000 for the dry, which is about \$40,000 difference per mile."

Mr. Spears said, "I didn't (inaudible), the Andale would be about [\$]940,000 divided by five. Is that what you did?"

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Yes."

Mr. Spears said, "That would be right then. Then the Flint Hills, the low bid was about [\$]740,000..."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Right."

Mr. Spears said, "...divided by five."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Divided by five."

Mr. Spears said, "Right that's..."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Right."

Mr. Spears said, "Yes. That's the difference, okay? I wouldn't argue with your numbers."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "No, no."

Mr. Spears said, "I didn't do that, but I'm sure you're right. Okay, want me to go on?"

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Yeah."

Mr. Spears said, "Alright, let me get this. It may be irrelevant, but over to the ultimate construction, full-depth, that's when we go out for bids and we usually have like APAC [Kansas] or Cornejo [& Sons] or Venture [Corporation] or sometimes Flint Hills bids on that too. So it's a much better, has more traffic on those roads, and that's why we do that. These other roads, like I said, are township, low-volume roads. That's the difference why we're doing not as good of a product as the full-depth construction. So I wanted to add to that the life expectancy. When you go through this all the same headings at the top, but the life expectancy, cold mix, five [years] to seven [years]. But also understand, that doesn't mean we take the road back to gravel, not at all. So when we have a problem with the road, which we get the call, or you get the call and you call me, or somebody down at Public Works, we go out and fix the road. So they never go back to gravel.

"Once we've got them paved, they're going to be paved. That will be the case in this, too. The bid we just had, if there's a problem, we go fix it. That's why we put on those three, until surface won't withstand traffic or widening required. In other words, you build it and they will come. So what if we pave this, and then you have a lot more traffic on it. What if we pave this and they build a sand pit over by it, and then the big trucks are going down there, and they destroy it. We're going to have to fix it and that's what we do, maintain. So that's why we had the title under there, until surface won't withstand traffic. We will fix it if something goes wrong. If not, if nothing goes wrong, in six years we're going to put a preventive maintenance overlay on top of that anyway, which would be NovaChip or Bond Tekk, or whatever we thinks appropriate.

"So we will take care of the road one way or the other. Then if traffic increases, we'll look at that. You know, we may have to really beef it up with a big overlay on top of it. So I think that's all I wanted to say about that slide. You can see the number of miles in our system down below, like the full-depth, that's most of our roads, because we average about 2,500 cars a day on our roads. These roads we're talking about here, these five miles, we have, like I said yesterday, we don't have a traffic count, but I can

assure you, it's under 500 cars a day, maybe even under 100 cars a day. We have some township roads way out west that are less than like 50 cars a day. So there's not, we average 2,500 on our main line roads.

"So our recommendation is the responsive responsible bidder with the lowest bid based on unit prices should be selected for the award. Public Works staff verified that the recommended bidder has the equipment required to complete the job. This takes a special equipment that we put in the bid that they had to have, and we made sure, we contacted them and they do have it. So that will be done. So we're going to recommend the low bidder, Flint Hills. So I'll be glad to answer any questions."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you, Mr. Spears. Do you have any questions for Mr. Spears? Commissioner Ranzau."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "No questions, but just to kind of comment where I'm coming from. So we're doing these roads out there, I mean, they aren't, like you said, 2,500 vehicles a day, but some of them have more traffic than others. I can just speak for the particular mile that I've gotten, I think it is not going to be 50 or 100, it will be used."

Mr. Spears said, "You're talking about Hoover?"

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Yes."

Mr. Spears said, "Yes."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "I mean, it is important to know that we had the cold mix, and then we had the million mile option, okay?"

"We had you know, we needed to be in the cold mix, it didn't make sense to go to a million dollars a mile, so we looked for alternate alternatives. We started with slurry seal, and it's better, and it's got a really good base, okay? Now we have another option, but it's dry. It is cheaper, but, I've been, you know, the question is, is the extra, you know, \$40,000 a mile worth what I have been led to believe is a better base, okay, because the base is important. You put any surface, anything on top of it later on, I think the particular mile that I want to do would be fairly traveled by a vehicle or traffic, it would never need to be, you know a million dollars a mile type road, but I am just very hesitant to go with something that I have been convinced by our Public Works Director after many conversations is actually better than the dry alternative.

"I guess in my mind, I mean, you know, we're still saving 80 percent, you know, \$800,000 per mile, even if we go with the wet mix, compared to what we'd have to do if we actually wanted to upgrade these. That doesn't make sense, but the \$40,000 difference per mile, for a road that I expect would be there, need to be in that condition indefinitely, to me it's insurance, and it's hard for me to all of a sudden after you have told me repeatedly that this is better, just to say that the extra \$40,000 isn't going to be worth it, and that's where I'm coming from."

Mr. Spears said, "Let me just say this. This might make you feel better, might not. There are, Andale's thing is relatively new, okay? The dry mix has been around for I know at least 35 years. There's dry mix roads on sub-bases all over this nation and all over Kansas, and you know, if something goes wrong, you fix it. I want to tell you this."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "I don't want to have to fix it. That's the problem."

Mr. Spears said, "Let me finish. The Super Seal, there are some of the roads with a few little problems, and we are going out and fixing them. Not major, but some, the edge dropping off, and Andale is very good about going out and fixing it. But I just want to tell you, nothing is perfect. Nothing's perfect."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "No. I get that, but you also told me that you sent somebody up to some other state where they do this slurry seal, and they've done lots of miles up there, and it might be new to us, but it's been used, and I understand that the dry will work, but you have convinced me that the wet is better, and I think the \$40,000 is worth the long-term investment. I know it'll work, or I think it will. I mean, we don't have this exact kind in our system yet, but we know the stories. You sold me on it, and now..."

Mr. Spears said, "Well the dry will work, too. The dry will work, too."

Commissioner Ranzau "Well we hope so, but you convinced me the wet will work better. I think it's worth an extra \$40,000 miles for the next, you know, 50 years."

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

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, we had a nice robust discussion yesterday in staff meeting, I have been thinking about this since then, but on the Super Seal road, in six years, you're going to do something to that road as well."

Mr. Spears said, "Yes, sir."

Commissioner Howell said, "Add some kind of a little surface touchup on that road, will a Super Seal or this technology."

Mr. Spears said, "Well to interrupt, on some of them we already have because of the few little things that happened. We put some NovaChip, a NovaChip preventive maintenance overlay on some of them already."

Commissioner Howell said, "Do you think you're going to do a more aggressive six-year maintenance effort because of a cold mix road versus a Super Seal road? At that six-year mark, is it going to be more expensive at the six-year mark to do a little overlay on a cold mix versus a Super Seal? Does that make sense? Let me say it this way."

Mr. Spears said, "Yes."

Commissioner Howell said, "In six years you're going to touch that road regardless..."

Mr. Spears said, "Okay."

Commissioner Howell said, "...whether it's a cold mix road or Super Seal."

Mr. Spears said, "Correct."

Commissioner Howell said, "Is it going to be the same cost..."

Mr. Spears said, "But in the meantime, if something goes wrong, we will go out and fix it."

Commissioner Howell said, "Right, but the cold mix roads have typically lasted you said five to seven, so..."

Mr. Spears said, "Right."

Commissioner Howell said, "...they're not failing prematurely failing necessarily."

Mr. Spears said, "No, but..."

Commissioner Howell said, "We might do little repairs if we need to, but we'd do it on the Super Seal or on cold mix, we have to do repairs on both types of roads regardless."

Mr. Spears said, "Correct."

Commissioner Howell said, "My point is, at the six-year mark, when we have to do a little overlay, we're going to do that overlay whether it's a cold mix or a Super Seal or a wet base or a dry base."

Mr. Spears said, "If we put NovaChip on it, it's a half inch NovaChip road, whether it's cold mix or hot mix, you're going to put the same NovaChip on it or whatever treatment you pick."

Commissioner Howell said, "So my point is, if you were to look at, say a 50-year cost of that road, it's going to be cheaper to do the wet, I'm sorry dry base, because it's \$40,000 cheaper per mile to begin with. Down the road, our activities on that road at that point going forward are almost identical, basically."

Mr. Spears said, "Right, unless something happens to the road. Unless, like..."

Commissioner Howell said, "A failure of some sort."

Mr. Spears said, "...a failure of some sort."

Commissioner Howell said, "We have no data to know."

Mr. Spears said, "We'd have to go out and patch it."

Commissioner Howell said, "We have no data to know that a dry base or a wet base is going to fail more regularly than the other type, we don't know that. Do we?"

Mr. Spears said, "It just depends on how well you construct it in the first place."

Chairman Dennis said, "Mr. Spears, before you answer that. Mr. Spears, we're losing our audience. I just want to tell them thanks for watching, and you're going to have to go online in order to pick up the rest of Mr. Spears' comments."

Mr. Spears said, "Well I'm sure they already fell asleep."

Commissioner Howell said, "And no one's watching now. Alright, I appreciate that answer. You know again, you did say yesterday that the independent third party opinion of this is that the dry base is in fact a quality road, and their opinion was as good as the wet base. On the dry base, there's at least several contractors that can provide that, so there's competition built in."

Mr. Spears said, "There's many contractors that provided that have made their living for years doing it."

Commissioner Howell said, "I think if we commit to a wet base only, the slurry seal, we're really held hostage with whatever they want to charge because, and they have been. They've increased the price because there is no competition on that product. So I like the dry base, because again, we have experience in the past, maybe a long time ago, but it was a good road. The third party says it's good, and we have competition built in, and I think to arbitrarily spend \$40,000 more per mile to me is not a smart place to go here. We need to..."

Mr. Spears said, "What I liked with the competition in the five bids was that Andale's bid came down. The last time we had it was [\$]215[000], and whatever, what number did you figure out, Commissioner Ranzau?"

Commissioner Ranzau said, "[\$]188[000]."

Mr. Spears said, "It came down from [\$]215[000] to [\$]188 [000] with the competition. I think that's great."

Commissioner Howell said, "That's tremendous."

Mr. Spears said, "Right."

Commissioner Howell said, "That's exactly what we need is competition, so I'm fine with the recommendation, so I'll support that, and I'll make a motion at some point. Mr. Chairman, I'll do that whenever you're ready. Thank you."

Chairman Dennis said, "I'm ready. We'll let you, he can make a motion, and you can make a comment."

MOTION

Commissioner Howell moved to approve Item number one of the Board of Bids and Contracts.

Commissioner Unruh seconded the motion.

Chairman Dennis said, "Commissioner Ranzau."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Well let me say, I would disagree with Commissioner Howell. I don't think this is an arbitrary difference of \$40,000. I've been led to believe over time that the difference is, I mean, one is better than the other, at least I've been convinced by the Public Works Director. One's better than other, so yeah, you're paying a little bit more for it, but it's better, so I think you're getting a better product which I think is better long-term for us, but I'd be willing to, you know, do a compromise and I'll take the wet on mine. You guys can have your dry if you want,

but...

Mr. Spears said, "You can't do that."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "...but anyway, I've been telling you, I mean, I don't know why we would settle for a product that's not quite as good, so I think it's kind of a gamble, but I'm going to trust the judgement of my Public Works Director who has told me repeatedly this is a better product, so."

Mr. Spears said, "Anticipating that, we've talked to legal and you can't accept two bids off the same..."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "I knew you couldn't..."

Mr. Spears said, "Were you just kidding? Okay."

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

Commissioner Howell said, "Just to be clear. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, I do want the best roads in my district as well. I think we all want that for our districts. We want that for all of Sedgwick County roads even if it's not my district. We want the best roads possible."

"We've got to be careful with taxpayer money, of course, and I guess the data in front of me says that these roads are equivalent. I don't have any data other than subjective opinion based on past discussions. But what's in front of me right now says these roads are equivalent. One's \$40,000 cheaper, and the Bid Board did their due diligence. I don't have an opinion that's going to go against the data that's in front of me as well as the process we follow to get to this point. So I appreciate the comment that we want the best roads, and I agree, we do want the best roads, but that comes with a cost, and there's no data to say that it's actually better. That's just subjective opinion at this moment that we don't have any data to say that, so anyway, I'm ready to vote. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. Well, thank you Mr. Spears for being here with us today. You get to buy lunch because you talked longer."

Mr. Spears said, "I'm glad to be here."

Chairman Dennis said, "Anyway, I appreciate the information. I am not an engineer. I rely on our professional engineers for advice, our professional engineers who have come back and given us a recommendation. I am also a fairly conservative republican who likes to save money, so I'm going to support the motion. With that, Madam Clerk, please call the roll."

VOTE

<i>Commissioner O'Donnell II</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Commissioner Ranzau</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Commissioner Howell</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Commissioner Unruh</i>	<i>Aye</i>
<i>Chairman Dennis</i>	<i>Aye</i>

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you, Mr. Spears."

Mr. Spears said, "Thank you."

Chairman Dennis said, "Well welcome back, Mr. Thomas."

Mr. Thomas said, "Yes, sir."

Chairman Dennis said, "You're not going to get off this one easy either."

Mr. Thomas said, "I'm here for the long run."

Chairman Dennis said, "We're ready to hear about the recommendation."

Mr. Thomas said, "Yes, we made the recommendation on item two, the actuarial and broker review services, and I believe there was going to be some discussion about that as a separate item. Would you like me to read the recommendation again, sir?"

Chairman Dennis said, "We know what the recommendation is for IMA [Inc]."

Mr. Thomas said, "Yes, sir."

Chairman Dennis said, "I think there's going to be some questions about that."

Mr. Thomas said, "Okay."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. Commissioner Ranzau, do you want to ask questions or do you want me to?"

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Go ahead."

Chairman Dennis said, "Well, thank you. I think probably Eileen [McNichol] needs to come up. I'm sure you already know what my questions are, but we have a bid from IMA [Inc.] that is \$10,000 more than the bid for Gallagher [Benefit Services]. But there is one percent difference in those two bids. In your professional opinion, is one percent difference worth \$10,000 for our taxpayers?"

Ms. Eileen McNichol, Director, Human Resources, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I just, Joe is providing me a clarification. It's a one point difference between the two bids as opposed to one percent."

Chairman Dennis said, "But if we divide it out, it's one percent."

Ms. McNichol said, "Okay. Yes, in my professional opinion, based on the information that we received in the RFP (request for proposal) and the follow up questions that we asked on the best and final offers, IMA is providing a very well rounded full bodied recommendation with an 11 step process on how they will manage the, helping us with the actuarial review and the RFP process for both medical and all the aspects of the RFP that we will be putting out for our 2020 health insurance provider."

Chairman Dennis said, "Okay, let me ask you another question. If it was two percent difference and \$20,000, would it be a better deal to go with Gallagher or IMA?"

Ms. McNichol said, "I wouldn't be able to give you that answer because that would just be purely speculative."

Chairman Dennis said, "So if it was a three percent difference, we could go [\$]30,000 if, based on your \$10,000 and one percent, I'm trying to find out where the break point is."

Ms. McNichol said, "The committee, when the RFP committee reviewed this, and we talked about it, everyone gave their evaluations, their determinations, and you know, the committee together made a recommendation based on the information that we had. It wasn't based solely on price. Joe can explain how price is incorporated into the calculation, but it was the entire package and Gallagher got the full credit for the fact that they had the lowest price, but they did not have the best proposal."

Chairman Dennis said, "Let me take a look at a couple of things here. On and I do not want to know who the evaluators are, but one evaluator rated overall, I think it was B, let me see, B was 75 percent for Gallagher and it was 90 percent for IMA."

Ms. McNichol said, "Yes, sir."

Chairman Dennis said, "That alone is enough to sway six points, which would have been the difference. They're so close between the two of them, and I don't know where the break point should be. That's what I'm trying to find out, is where this break point should be. Is it one percent? Is it a half percent? Where is it worth \$10,000 more to our taxpayers? I know that you had six people look at this, and I respect what they did, but then when it comes down to a decision point, I need to know where are break point is. What are we going to accept for a difference, and truly one percent difference is what the total difference is between these two evaluations. Is it truly worth \$10,000?"

Mr. Thomas said, "I understand that quandary that you presented, sir. When we look at the scoring on the Item E which is the price cost competitiveness, we quantify that directly mathematically, so that's why you see the difference between Gallagher getting the full amount, which was 20 points because they did have the best price and then you have IMA with 15, so of course that brings that part of it down five points on the average. But then the rest of it is done qualitatively based on the point system, and so because of, you have a total of 30 data points, and this represents the 20 percent of the 30, that's why the overall score could be changed based on those other data points. Does that make..."

Chairman Dennis said, "Problem is one score, for example, if you look at Gallaher on the evaluator B, got 75 percent total, and evaluator B gave 90 percent total for IMA. That 75 percent is truly an outlier because if you look all the way across Gallagher, they got 95, then drop down to 75, 95, 98, 80 and 100."

Mr. Thomas said, "Yes."

Chairman Dennis said, "That 75 is an outlier..."

Mr. Thomas said, "And that's..."

Chairman Dennis said, "...and that 75 drove the entire evaluation."

Mr. Thomas said, "What we do sir, and I'm glad you brought that point up about the

outliers. We write down all of the scores, and we have outliers, we have a group discussion as to why there are outliers. There are two things that may happen. In one case, you may have one person who missed something that the rest of the committee saw or read, so they're allowed to say oh, I may need to change my score. Conversely, you may have one person who caught what the other four of five missed. So that's why we have the discussions for the outlier, because that allows us to adjust the scores at that time. When we discussed this, there was a consensus among the group but no changing in the points for the individual scores, so that we're allowed to do that. They're allowed personally.

Approved As Amended

"We don't try to coerce them in any way to change their score, but they are allowed to do that based on the group discussion, and no one changed their scores. I hope that answers that part."

Chairman Dennis said, "We have a number of other Commissioners have questions, so I'll let them start asking. Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You hit most of the points I wanted to bring up. Again just so everyone understands, it's a 25 percent difference in cost, it's a one percent difference in the scoring of these companies by six different people that was added up and divided out. So the scoring of that was a one percent difference between Gallagher and IMA, but it's a 25 percent cost difference. So again, in your earlier comments, Mr. Chairman, it sounded like the cost difference was one percent. I want to make sure everyone understands it's a 25 percent difference in cost. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

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

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Well, I just want to say I have some of the same concerns as the Chairman. I mean, Gallagher's highest ratings were the highest of any of the others. They were highest. You got a 100, you got a 98, a 95, a 95. Now some of the lowers were lower. It's just some interesting results, and then I agree, it's a 25 percent cost difference, I get it, I guess I'm not convinced that a one, you know, this isn't exactly a scientific analysis, but you know, you try to put numbers on people's opinions, and that's fine, and we had, you know, two of them that were at 90.5, 91.5 and others that went all the way, you had 85, 79, 85, 84. I think it clearly shows here that it's not exactly a precise thing, but it says that Gallagher and IMA both rose to the top. They were very close, they separated themselves, so then it's hard for me, I mean, you can make the argument their essentially the same as far as the outcomes when you compare it to deviation from all the others. Then the price becomes, to me, even more problematic, I guess."

Mr. Tim Kaufman, Assistant County Manager of Public Services, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Commissioners, if I may, I was a member of the evaluation committee. I think I was one of the disinterested third parties, because I don't have a dog in this particular fight, but I do have a perspective.

"My perspective may be different from the other members of the committee because they all have different perspectives. One of the things that I did as we went through this discussion, in part because, the overall total scores are driven in large part by that

pricing factor. I went through and I did the old Olympic scoring model where I threw out the high and the low on all of the scores. We averaged them, and as I went through that process, again, IMA received the highest scores overall. You're absolutely correct. This was a close decision between IMA and Gallagher. Collectively, the impression of the group was that the overall response that was provided including the pricing factor, was that we received a better response from IMA than we did from Gallagher.

"Again, they're very close in score, and there's a difference in price, but we didn't do a request for bid, we did a request for proposal. That's why we had that five factors to score on, and as we went through the scoring process, again, the scores overall are closer in part because of the weight that was given the pricing factor. So if we, and I haven't done this math, but I think if you throw the pricing factor out and rescored everything, again, IMA would have a higher score and it would be a greater difference in score than that one point that you see when you factor in the price as well as everything else, if that helps. If I confuse things worse, I apologize."

Chairman Dennis said, "At this point in the day, it's very easy to (inaudible). Commissioner Unruh."

Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well I appreciate that you went through the exercise and threw out the high and low scores, and my looking at that scoring, I try to eliminate just the price factor and see what they do on basis of performance rather just on the basis of price. IMA comes out ahead when you just take those factors. I trust the process. I think it was well thought out. I trust the folks who scored it, and to me, this discrepancy that we're discussing right now doesn't rise to the point where I would want to make a decision other than what's been recommended to us. So I'm going to support the recommendation of the Board of Bids and Contracts. Part of that is based on the fact that I know we used this company before when we went through process of trying to evaluate health care insurers, and I believe they did a great job and had full confidence of our staff at that time. So clearly a close call, but I trust the recommendation that came out of this group. That's all I have, Mr. Chair."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. Let me ask you a question. Is there, do we have to make a decision today?"

Ms. McNichol said, "You can do whatever you want, sir."

Chairman Dennis said, "No, is there a time crunch?"

Ms. McNichol said, "We need to move forward as much as we can, and this RFP went out the end of December. This is part of the process that we need to do so that we can develop, we can review the plan design we have so that then we can develop the RFP to put it out for the provider that we'll use in 2020. So time is of the essence. It would be nice if you could decide."

Chairman Dennis said, "Could the decision be made at the next meeting?"

Ms. McNichol said, "Sure."

Mr. Mike Scholes, County Manager, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Commissioner, it can be made. We can put it back on the agenda for next meeting."

Ms. McNichol said, "Sure."

Chairman Dennis said, "Okay well, I don't want to overrule what you all voted on. I would just like you to go back and look at it from our point of view that is one percent worth 25 percent increase in cost? That's the only question that we've got. I think all of us are pretty well united in that. If you come back to us and you tell us that one percent is worth 25 percent increase in cost, I probably would vote for it next time, but today I'm just not sure I'm ready. Commissioner Howell."

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you. I have a couple quick questions. In the eyes of the Director of Purchasing, is Gallaher a qualified company? Do they have the things we need them, they did present the elements we need them to have to do this job."

Mr. Thomas said, "They did, and they were the top two, and that's why it was so close."

Commissioner Howell said, "Okay, so normally when we look at bids, if we select something that's not the lowest bid, usually we've got something tangible as to why we're not picking the lowest bid. There's some reason why we do it. This process that was used here is very subjective, opinionated process. I think it shows in the ratings they gave the various companies. They're so varied. It's hard to make sense of what we're looking at there. So if we're not going to lowest bid, I think we need to have a reason why. The summary as to something that makes IMA better than Gallagher. What is that thing that we're picking the more expensive company for? We don't have that. All we've got is a matrix, and right now I don't really understand it. No one's articulated a reason why we're going to pick a more expensive bid. Yes, sir."

Mr. Thomas said, "Let me clarify sir. This was not a bid, but it was proposal."

Commissioner Howell said, "Okay, a proposal."

Mr. Thomas said, "The reason, we just didn't want, it would've been unfair to either one. If it had just been a bid, then we would have people who just met the specifications and we just pick the low price. When we did it this way, we wanted the best quality. So we chose the five criteria, and I can read the number of points. It was a total of 100 points, and since in a proposal, cost is not the determining factor, that's why you see cost as nearly having 20 points of the 100."

Commissioner Howell said, "Okay."

Mr. Joe Thomas said, "So as a proposal, this was done through a very extensive evaluation process and scoring."

Commissioner Howell said, "Well I think pushing this back is a smart thing whether it be a week or two, but in that timeframe, I don't know if it's possible to do this, but it'd be nice to have someone review how we got to this point or maybe repeat part of this process to maybe get a, I guess, more clarity on why we're picking one company over the other. Finally, if there's a way to articulate the real differences in these companies as to, from our perspective as to why we would want to choose a lot more expensive company. I guess I don't have that data, and I need that data to support that. So that's my request. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. Well I certainly have never seen the proposals"

whatsoever. So for me to overrule you right now would not be even halfway reasonable. But to ask you all to go back and take a look at it again and come back to us, and if you come up with the same conclusion again, I'm fine with that too. But I'm not going to vote to say that I would place one above the other without ever even seeing the proposals, that would not work. So I would like to move it back. Lindsay, did you have something you wanted to say, I'm sorry."

Ms. Poe Rousseau said, "Sorry Commissioner. The only thing I was going to say is I also was a member of the evaluation committee for this, and when we speak to the \$10,000 increase, of course, that's going to be a concern from a finance perspective. For me though, the larger concern is that we're dealing with a \$30 million health insurance budget that this is going to inform the changes that we made for our employees. That \$30 million that we spend on medical and pharmacy, to me, is the primary focus and I was, as a part of the reviewer committee, for me that comprehensive step-by-step process that Eileen referenced, the 11 steps was persuasive to me as being worth some additional cost. So I just wanted to give you that context, but we'll look at it again and come back and say that to you again if that's where we land."

Chairman Dennis said, "Sounds good. I appreciate it, Lindsay. Well I would entertain a motion to defer this till the next meeting."

[18-312](#)

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS' REGULAR MEETING ON MARCH 29, 2018.

Presented by: Joe Thomas, Director, Purchasing.

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

MOTION

Commissioner Ranzau moved to defer Item 2 of the Board of Bids and Contracts until a future meeting.

Commissioner Howell seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

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

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

Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. We'll see you again next week."

Mr. Thomas said, "Yes, sir."

Chairman Dennis said, "Okay. Mr. Manager. I'm sorry, Madam Clerk, next item."

Deferred

CONSENT

Mr. Mike Scholes, said, "Commissioners, before I recommend you approve consent agenda, I bring your attention to item V, and to prevent a coo from happening, we are talking about records in that particular item which is outlined in the attached PDF (portable document format). We like our Register of Deeds, Tonya Buckingham, and we don't want anything to happen to her, so this is approving the records destruction and not her. So with that, I recommend that the consent agenda items Oscar (O) through Alpha Hotel (AH)."

MOTION

Commissioner Unruh moved to approve consent agenda items Oscar (O) through Alpha Hotel (AH) as explained.

Commissioner Ranzau seconded the motion.

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

VOTE

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

Chairman Dennis said, "Next item."

- O** [18-254](#) One (1) Right of Way Easement for Sedgwick County Bridge Project 839-R-390; Bridge on 143rd Street East between Harry & Pawnee. CIP# B490. District 5.
Approved on the Consent Agenda
- P** [18-255](#) Two (2) Right of Way Easements for Sedgwick County Bridge Project 636-33-1150; Bridge on 71st Street South between Webb Road & Greenwich Road. CIP# B491. District 5.
Approved on the Consent Agenda
- Q** [18-256](#) One (1) Right of Way Easement for Sedgwick County Bridge Project 644-19-2847; Bridge on 103rd Street South between Maize Road & 119th Street West. CIP# B492. District 2.
Approved on the Consent Agenda

- R** [18-257](#) Agreement with the Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT) regarding the treatment of noxious weeds growing on KDOT right of way in Sedgwick County. All Districts.
Approved on the Consent Agenda
- S** [18-217](#) Shelter Plus Care housing rental assistance contracts.
Approved on the Consent Agenda
- T** [18-258](#) A resolution to authorize destruction of County Manager records (DISP 2018-299 County Manager 1992-2014).
Approved on the Consent Agenda
- U** [18-259](#) A resolution to authorize destruction of Human Resources records (DISP 2018-298 Human Resources 2010-2015).
Approved on the Consent Agenda
- V** [18-260](#) A resolution to authorize destruction of Register of Deeds (DISP 2018-287 Register of Deeds 1909-2014).
Approved on the Consent Agenda
- W** [18-261](#) A resolution to authorize destruction of Regional Forensic Science Center (RFSC) Records (DISP 2018-300 RFSC 2012).
Approved on the Consent Agenda
- X** [18-262](#) A resolution to authorize destruction of Aging Department records (DISP 2018-295 Aging 2010-2012).
Approved on the Consent Agenda
- Y** [18-264](#) A resolution to authorize destruction of the Division of Information, Technology and Support Services 1997-2013 (DISP 2018-288 DITSS).
Approved on the Consent Agenda
- Z** [18-265](#) A resolution to authorize destruction of Division of Corrections records 1984-2014 (DISP 2018-291 Corrections).
Approved on the Consent Agenda
- AA** [18-266](#) A resolution to authorize destruction of Sheriff Records (DISP 2018-302 Sheriff 1994-2015).
Approved on the Consent Agenda
- AB** [18-267](#) A resolution to authorize destruction of Clerk records (DISP 2018-303 Clerk 2010-2015).
Approved on the Consent Agenda
- AC** [18-268](#) A resolution to authorize destruction of Public Works Records (DISP 2018-304 Public Works 2012-2015).

Approved on the Consent Agenda

- AD [18-218](#) Order dated 3/12/2018 to correct tax roll for change of assessment.
Approved on the Consent Agenda
- AE [18-220](#) Treasurer Claim Certification.
Approved on the Consent Agenda
- AF [18-278](#) General Bill Check Register for March 21, 2018 - March 27, 2018.
Approved on the Consent Agenda
- AG [18-279](#) General Bill Check Register for March 28, 2018 - April 3, 2018.
Approved on the Consent Agenda
- AH [18-280](#) Payroll Check Register for the March 17, 2018, payroll certification.
Approved on the Consent Agenda

LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

Chairman Dennis said, "Will."

Mr. William Deer, Assistant County Counselor, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Real briefly, the bills were concerned about which is the Urban Area Bill and then there's two Election Bills, an Election Commissioner Bill and the bill related to the ballots are both in, or all three of them are in Conference Committee. Conference Committee should be meeting as we speak and for the rest of the week here and next week. So the way that'll work is those bills will hopefully get wrapped up into a conference report, and that will prevent them from being amended on the [House of Representatives] Floor. Pretty good prognosis that all those things will pass. So that's all I've got."

Chairman Dennis said, "When do they go on vacation?"

Mr. Deer said, "The first adjournment I believe is Friday."

Chairman Dennis said, "Friday, okay."

Mr. Deer said, "So then it, I misspoke. They will not be meeting next week, but they potentially will do Conference Committees in the veto session when they come back."

Chairman Dennis said, "Okay, good. Any questions for Mr. Deer? Seeing none, thank you. Next item, please."

OTHER

Chairman Dennis said, "Do any of the Commissioners have anything for 'other'?"

Commissioner Unruh said, "Not now."

Chairman Dennis said, "Well very briefly, last evening I got to sit on selection board for the Corp. of Cadets for JROTC (Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps) for USD (Unified School District) 259. As we always see, they were four outstanding young, they'll be seniors next year that will be representing the Corp. of Cadets, and I sincerely enjoyed sitting on that. Also, I once again thank Lindsay and her staff and the folks at the VA for all the work that they did on the EMS information that we've been working on. I don't see anything else to come before us today. It's been a long meeting. I appreciate everyone sitting through this, and thank you for everything." Chairman Dennis said, "Do any of the Commissioners have anything for 'other'?"

EXECUTIVE SESSION

ADJOURNMENT

There being no other business to come before the Board, the Meeting was adjourned at 1:23 p.m.

*BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF
SEDGWICK COUNTY, KANSAS*

*DAVID T. DENNIS, Chairman
Third District*

*DAVID M. UNRUH, Chair Pro Tem
First District*

*MICHAEL B. O'DONNELL II, Commissioner
Second District*

*RICHARD RANZAU, Commissioner
Fourth District*

*JAMES M. HOWELL, Commissioner
Fifth District*

ATTEST:

Kelly B. Arnold, County Clerk

APPROVED: