

# Sedgwick County

525 North Main Street 3rd Floor  
Wichita, KS 67203



*Sedgwick County...  
working for you*

## Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, April 11, 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](mailto: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 9:09 a.m. on April 11, 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; Mr. Scott Knebel, Planning Manager, MAPD; Mr. Rick Durham, Deputy Chief Financial Officer; Mr. Tim Kaufman, Assistant County Manager, Public Services; Ms. Tania Cole, Director of Facilities Maintenance and Project Services; Mr. Joe Thomas, Director, Purchasing Department; Ms. Melissa Thompson, Analyst, Records Management; Mr. William Deer, Assistant County Counselor; Ms. Kate Flavin, Public Information Officer; Ms. Lynda Baker, Deputy County Clerk.*

#### **GUESTS**

*Mr. Brent Miller, Aero Plains Brewing  
Mr. Alan Trenary, 1461 N. Burns, Wichita  
Mr. Monty Rush, Stand With Me, Proclamation Recipient  
Mr. John Cutrera, Director, BKD LLP*

### **INVOCATION: Reverend Brent Johnston, First Presbyterian Church.**

### **FLAG SALUTE**

### **ROLL CALL**

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

### **PUBLIC AGENDA**

*Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. We have two people that have signed up for our public agenda. The first individual is Brent Miller. If you could approach the podium please. You have three minutes. Welcome."*

*Mr. Brent Miller, Aero Plains Brewing, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I'm here to speak on behalf of the Delano revitalization plan that I helped, I was on the advisory board on. In addition to being a partner with Aero Plains Brewing and Delano, I recently, until just recently had Delano Bed and Breakfast as well, so I spent seven years running that business, and then I'm involved in my second year with Aero Plains Brewing. We looked at a lot of areas for Aero Plains Brewing within Wichita to place it, and we chose Delano because we could see the potential of the area. I think it's an area that has a great potential.*

*"It has been overlooked over the years, I think, and one that really could add a lot to development of downtown Wichita. I think a lot of the future, really, of downtown*

*success relies on Delano, because the potential there is so great. When I had the bed and breakfast, it was interesting because I had a lot of out of town guests who stayed with us. I was always surprised to see how many people from Oklahoma City and Kansas City, Topeka and other cities knew about Delano, and they actually came to Wichita to come to Delano. So the word is out there that there is a momentum building in Delano. I think now is the time to build upon the momentum. I know the process has been going on for almost 20 years, but the potential there is for the area is great.*

*"I think you can only look at areas like Westport in Kansas City, and the Paseo District in Oklahoma City, and it's easy to see how Delano could easily fit into that model for development and also to create tourism and business relocation. It provides a synergy of commerce and residential area that fits well neatly within the footprint of that area in an organic manner as opposed to just constructed, as you find a lot of development areas. One of the biggest concerns I had is about Delano until working on the advisory board and could see what was actually happening was the lack of what appears to be the non-cohesive manner in which development was kind of starting to be approached in Delano. I think with the plan this helps create the more cohesive plan, one that I think will be, really could be, stand out to be a regional attraction and draw to Wichita. So thank you for your time."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Well thank you for being here and speaking about the Delano plan. We're going to hear more about it here in a little bit."*

*Mr. Miller said, "Alright, thank you."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. Next person signed up is Alan Trenary. Please approach the podium, state your name and you have three minutes sir."*

*Mr. Alan Trenary, 1461 N. Burns, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I want to thank you for the e-waste event. I used to do e-waste back in Colorado before I moved out here. It is a tremendous issue, the amount of just stuff there is. I participate in my neighborhood association on a regular basis, and when I deliver the newsletter for the neighborhood association and saw a portion of my neighborhood, and when I go out I gather trash, and it's amazing how much trash I get out of six blocks of area in my neighborhood. I'm also concerned about the cell phone tower that's going in across from Mead Island. I am very concerned because to me Mead Island has extreme historical significance due to the Wichita tribes' presence there and the lodge that they built there.*

*"I also at one point drilled caissons for building support back in Colorado. It's a tremendous operation with lots of, a big machine is required to do this. This is why we are required to put this cell phone tower in down there in that area. Close to the water like that when you start drilling these holes, the sides of the hole cave in and they require for a casing to be put down in there, and then it has to be pulled back out. "It's just a lot of work, a lot of materials, and to me, it disrespects the neighborhood, it disrespects the Native American community that has their spiritual and sociological interests involved there, and it really seems like it hasn't been presented in a way that is sensitive to the needs and wishes of the people in the neighborhood or to the native community which has such deep bonds to the location. As I said, I spend a lot of time picking up trash in my neighborhood, and I'm concerned about the environment and the environment in general.*

*"I want to thank you for doing the e-waste event. This is very, very important in our*

*society that these things are addressed, because it comes from somewhere and it has to go somewhere. I was also heavily involved with the Rocky Flats Citizen's Advisory Board when I lived out in Colorado, and there's just so much that goes in on so many different levels with this kind of, these procedures and these activities. On that note, I heard the alarm go off. I notice my time is up. I really do appreciate the work that you do, but I feel that you give us a fair opportunity to be involved in our community. Thank you so much for your service."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you sir for being here. Appreciate it. Those are the only two that signed up on the agenda today to speak, but if there's anyone else in the audience that would like to speak on the public agenda, now is your chance. Seeing no one, Madam Clerk, next item."*

### **CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES**

**A**     [18-274](#)

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 21, 2018.  
Commissioner Ranzau was absent.

*Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you, Commissioners. Everyone on the Commission has had a chance to review the minutes. I will make a motion that we approve those. I know Commissioner Ranzau was absent, but he has had a chance to review them."*

**MOTION**

*Commissioner Dennis moved to approve the regular meeting minutes of March 21, 2018.*

*Commissioner Howell 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, "Next item, please."*  
**Approved**

### **PROCLAMATIONS**

**B**     [18-272](#)

PROCLAMATION DECLARING NATIONAL LIMB LOSS AWARENESS MONTH.

Read by: Chairman David Dennis or his designee.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Adopt the proclamation.

*Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you, Madam Clerk. This item will be accepted by Monty Rush, and I've asked Commissioner Howell to read the proclamation today."*

*Commissioner Howell thanked the Chairman and said, "The proclamation reads..."*

*WHEREAS, there are approximately 2 million Americans living with limb loss, over 500 Americans lose a limb every day, and approximately 1,600 have lost a limb in Kansas; and*

*WHEREAS, diabetes and peripheral vascular disease are the leading causes of limb loss followed closely by trauma with studies showing up to 60 percent of limb loss is preventable; and*

*WHEREAS, the number of amputations per day will double by 2050 unless a major public awareness campaign is launched and key prevention initiatives put in place; and*

*WHEREAS, appropriate access to care for people affected by limb loss is vital to enable individuals to reach their full potential, live independently, and live well with limb loss; and*

*WHEREAS, the Amputee Coalition provides education, outreach and support through the National Limb Loss Resource Center for the benefit of persons with limb loss, their families, and health care providers; and*

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

**NATIONAL LIMB LOSS AWARENESS MONTH**

*and encourage all citizens to join in recognizing the importance of this month and celebrate people affected by Limb Loss Difference living full and productive lives, learn about issues affecting people with limb loss, express gratitude to family and caregivers who are a source of support and motivation, and salute combat and veteran amputees who have lost their limbs in service to this country or in retirement.*

**MOTION**

*Commissioner Howell moved to adopt the proclamation.*

*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>

*Mr. Monty Rush, Stand With Me, proclamation recipient, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I just want to express our gratitude and appreciation of this. I hope this will make an impact in our community, and we definitely do appreciate this. Thank you, gentlemen."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. Commissioner Howell has some comments."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "Well thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to say I wanted to appreciate Monty specifically, just FYI, he was a Sedgwick County employee here for a while. I think he works for the City of Wichita now. He is a leader in this organization, and I know he's, they're having an event. Can you tell me when the event is?"*

*Mr. Rush said, "It's April 21st. It's at Wesley Rehab [ilitation Hospital]. It will be between 9:00 [a.m.] to 12:00 [p.m.] that day. It's primarily just a support group. It's for individuals who are an amputee, a caretakers, anyone that might know an amputee. We will be having a food truck, so you are more than welcome to come for that if nothing else, as well as, we're having a list of vendors that also are important to handicapped individuals as well."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "Can you tell us, if somebody wants to support that or attend that event, how can they find out more information?"*

*Mr. Rush said, "They can go to [rushtoit@att.net](mailto:rushtoit@att.net). All the details, just email us and we'll provide you with all the details."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "Just for clarification, is it rush r-u-s-h-t-o-i-t?"*

*Mr. Rush said, "It is."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "Okay, thank you very much. Is there a cost for that event for them to attend?"*

*Mr. Rush said, "It is free of cost. Donuts in the morning will be free. The food truck, of course, you have to pay for that, but otherwise everything else is free though."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "Let me just express my sincere appreciation to you for being a leader on this important topic. I know that this is a major situation, it impacts many people in our communities and our districts here in Sedgwick County, and the last part of that proclamation talked about our veterans. I'd just like to express my sincere appreciation to them for their service."*

*Mr. Rush said, "Absolutely."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "They give sacrificially, many of them..."*

*Mr. Rush said, "Yes."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "...have suffered all sorts of difficult things as a consequence of their service, but those that are living without limbs, they need that help and that support. So I appreciate what you're doing today, trying to bring awareness to that. So with that, I just want to say congratulations for receiving the proclamation, and I appreciate what you're doing for our community."*

*Mr. Rush said, "Thank you, sir."*

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

*Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. Thank you very much for being here today. It's very important, I appreciate it very much."*

*Mr. Rush said, "Thank you, sir."*

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

**Adopted**

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **C     [18-247](#)**

DER2017-03: DELANO NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN: 2018.

Presented by: Scott Knebel, Planning Manager, MAPD.

Recommended Action: Adopt the Delano Neighborhood Plan: 2018 as an amendment to The Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan, authorize the Chairman to sign the adopting resolution, and instruct the County Clerk to publish the resolution in the official County newspaper.

#### **VISUAL PRESENTATION**

*Chairman Dennis said, "Scott, welcome."*

*Mr. Scott Knebel, Manager, Metropolitan Area Planning Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I'm here to present to you an item requesting that the Sedgwick County Commission adopt an amendment to the Wichita, Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan (CP). In particular, an update to the Delano neighborhood plan. For those of you who are not familiar, the Delano neighborhood is shown on the slide here, is the neighborhood immediately west of downtown Wichita, it is bounded by the Arkansas River on the north and east, by Kellogg on the south, and by Meridian on the west.*

*"In 2001, the City of Wichita and Sedgwick County adopted an amendment of the Comprehensive Plan at that time called the Delano Neighborhood Revitalization Plan. That plan has been very successful over the 15-plus years in which it has been implemented. It has resulted in numerous changes to the community that I think many people would recognize, including the Delano clock tower, the Douglas and Seneca Street Streetscape projects, a number of new businesses, particularly along the Douglas corridor in the Delano neighborhood.*

*"The time was determined to be right to update this plan, primarily for a number of different changes that are occurring in the neighborhood that really weren't reflected in the plan, were more reflected in the downtown master plan, which this Commission approved seven, eight years ago, that started looking at the west bank of the Arkansas River for new types of more urban scale development, like the Advanced Learning Library, which is about to open, the River Vista Apartment project, which is close to opening, and then some developments that have yet to occur but have been approved and should start construction yet this year on a site next to the River Vista and the Advanced Learning Library called the Delano Catalyst Site.*

*"In addition to that in 2017, the City and Mayor Longwell in particular began discussions about the future of Lawrence Dumont Stadium and the potential for that site to be a multi-use sports complex that would not only support affiliated minor*

*league baseball, but other sporting activities, concerts, events, those types of activities. That site, as you know, is located in the Delano neighborhood, and really neither the Delano plan nor the downtown plan which addressed the stadium area as well, envisioned that there would be a new or remodeled Lawrence Dumont Stadium at this location. So those events led to the initiation and direction to, from the [Metropolitan Area] Planning Commission (MAPC) to the Metropolitan Area Planning Department (MAPD) to update the Delano neighborhood plan, which you have presented before you today as the Delano Neighborhood Plan 2018.*

*"That plan itself identifies a vision for the neighborhood that addresses the variety of uses that occur in the neighborhood, dining, entertainment, residential, shopping and others, focuses on a pedestrian-oriented urban district, which we're seeing a lot of change in the new projects, as well as the projects along Douglas have been much more pedestrian-oriented in this neighborhood. So the plan itself focuses on 11 recommendations. These recommendations were developed over, or approximately a seven-month period as initial engagement process with the neighborhood in April.*

*"Over the summer, there was a project called Delano's Turn, which was a design exercise by students at the Kansas State University (KSU) that came up with a number of different development ideas and concepts for the neighborhood that were presented to the neighborhood and were well received by the residents and the businesses. Then eventually there was a 13-member advisory committee that was appointed that included Delano businesses, residences, associations, neighborhood associations and other organizations within the neighborhood that went through a planning process to come up with these 11 recommendations. These recommendations are grouped into short, medium and long-term initiatives. The plan itself really is just a guide for future planning in the neighborhood. There are a number of recommendations in the plan, but most of the decisions about the future of the neighborhood are going to be made over the next 15 years as the community works with developers and the governing bodies to implement the changes in the Delano neighborhood.*

*"So these 11 initiatives, the first one is to design what's called a Ballpark Village, which would be the development that would surround the multi-use sports complex, looking at options for perhaps structured parking that would allow development of some of the parking spaces around the stadium. There has been some expressed interest from some developers to participate in a process like this, and so that would be one of the initiatives that would be undertaken as part of implementation of this plan. I mentioned previously the Streetscape development that was done along Delano between Mclean and Seneca. The plan in 2001 called for continuation of that project from Seneca to Meridian with a focus on the area immediately west of Seneca to Vine, where there is still more of the kind of commercial business district that Delano, and the plan suggests that that project should continue to be a priority, and that in this next 15-year process, that project would be designed and constructed to extend that Streetscape further to the west.*

*"The original plan called for some pretty significant neighborhood gateways and monuments. None of those really have gained traction in the 15-plus years since the 2000 plan was adopted, but there is still a pretty significant desire to direct visitors in particular to the various destinations in the Delano district. There's a number of them that people have difficulty finding once they, particularly if they're driving and get off the highway. Most of the destinations are a little bit in the neighborhood. So the plan recommends that there be a system of neighborhood markers and wayfinding signage be developed and installed to direct people to the various destinations within the*



*neighborhood.*

*"The multi-use path along the former rail corridor and the Pearl Street right-of-way was identified in the 2001 plan as a high priority for the neighborhood, and there's been a number of studies, including looks at approaches to do that by the Kansas State students, and that remains a priority, and in fact the city is in the process of hiring a design consultant to design for construction the first phase of that between Mclean and Seneca, and then look at future connections of that segment to other portions of the rail, excuse me, the trail system to the northwest and southwest.*

*"The parking has long been an identified issue in the Delano neighborhood, and we've had multiple discussions with the neighborhood about approaches to addressing what primarily are peak hour shortages of parking at key locations, particularly at lunchtime, dinnertime. There is through WAMPO (Wichita Area Metropolitan Planning Organization) a process that will be, that is in the process of being initiated, I think it gets presented to the WAMPO policy body in May for approval of a contract to look at a parking, overall parking strategy for all of downtown and other neighborhoods including Delano, and this particular plan suggests that the Delano neighborhood should participate in that process and make sure that that process identifies some solutions to their pressing needs as it relates to parking.*

*"Future land use strategy is one of the key initiatives, and probably will be the one piece of this plan in which the Metropolitan Area Planning Department will be most directly involved in implementation. That is to develop a future land use map and a plan for re-zoning, particularly the Douglas Avenue frontage, where there has been over a dozen re-zonings in the last three or four years to support new business development along that corridor. That zoning change relates directly to the parking strategy as well. Then there's a plan itself recommends updating the Delano overlay and the Delano neighborhood design guidelines to reflect the different styles of development that are occurring in the neighborhood, the Ballpark Village, the more mid-rise type development like River Vista, that the current overlay and design guidelines really don't, didn't anticipate.*

*"Then some of the midterm recommendations have to do with a focus on the Handley Corridor. We heard from Aero Plains Brewing, they're one of the new businesses on Handley, which is a north-south street that does not presently connect to Mclean, the connection to Mclean was cut off when the Exploration [Place] project was built. One of the ideas that the students identified in their work was that this Handley Street actually would, if it crossed Mclean, connect directly to the Keeper of the Plains, which is one of the more prominent destinations in our community. So making that connection to that open space, the river corridor along that Handley Corridor is one of the key features of the recommendations.*

*"Addressing housing conditions, there's a number of houses in the neighborhood that are in poor condition that need repairs, so coming up with a variety of different techniques in terms of everything from enforcement to insistence to address the conditions of housing in the neighborhood.*

*"The plan itself suggests looking at Mclean Boulevard, particularly as it relates to the Ballpark Village and that portion south of Douglas Avenue, and trying to connect that Ballpark Village and the stadium more directly to the riverfront by changing the configuration of Mclean Boulevard to make it easier to cross, to perhaps design it such*

*that it could be closed for events, those sorts of things. Then a couple of the longer term initiatives are connecting the stadium and the Ballpark Village to another phase of the Riverwalk improvements in this case called the River Plaza, be that piece between Douglas and Kellogg on the west bank of the river, and then connecting Delano itself to downtown with a pedestrian bridge, similar to what was done with the Keeper of the Plains.*

*"So the Planning Commission considered this item and has adopted it, voted to adopt it 11-0, and the recommendation before you today is to approve that recommendation by resolution. You also have the alternative to make changes to the plan by overriding the Planning Commission, which would require a two-thirds vote, or you also have the option to return the plan to the Planning Commission for further consideration with direction on the items that you might want them to reconsider. With that, I'll answer questions."*

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

*Commissioner O'Donnell thanked the Chairman and said, "Scott, thanks for the presentation today. I had an overview with Dale a few weeks ago about this. I think it's really exciting. I've had the great opportunity to represent the Delano district for many years now when I was on the [Wichita] City Council and in the State Senate, and now on the Commission. There's been so much positive momentum in this area. I know in 2011 we started the Bike [Wichita] initiative in Wichita, and we put up the bike racks there. I know at the same time I'm sure Commissioner Unruh remembers, they took the bull from the [Kansas] Coliseum and they put it on the corner as kind of the entrance to Delano. Since then with new apartments, new construction going in that area, it's been really exciting to see what the future holds for that area. So I'm thrilled about the positive momentum.*

*"I went to the St. Patrick's Day Parade, walked in that. There was over 20,000 people there. So clearly Wichita is seeing a resurgence in this area. I think it's important for the county to recognize that, endorse that, and promote as much as we can this exciting energy that's coming from an area of town that for many, many years had been neglected, and now it's really had it's rejuvenation and a second birth, really. So anyway at the appropriate time, Mr. Chairman, I'll make a motion, but I'm sure somebody else wants to say something, but anyway Scott, thank you for the opportunity for us to look at this today. I know the discussion with Dale was if we put it on consent calendar or not, but I thought it was too important to talk about the potential that we have to see the next 10, 20 years what's going to be happening in this area."*

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

*Commissioner Howell said, "Well thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again I agree with the previous speaker that I appreciate your presentation. You did a great job explaining this. I have a couple of questions I wanted just to clarify a few things. We did approve a Comprehensive Plan in 2016. Is that supposed to be a 10-year plan?"*

*Mr. Knebel said, "The Comprehensive Plan itself actually is a 20-year plan."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "A 20-year plan. I just need to be reminded, and I appreciate that clarification. Is it fairly routine to amend the Comprehensive Plan like this in that 20-year period? I mean just to..."*

*Mr. Knebel said, "Yes. I would say that it's typical to do neighborhood area plan amendments to the Comprehensive Plan during the horizon of that plan, probably on a every two to three-year basis, is pretty common."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "Okay. So based on that, it would be likely that we'll see another amendment probably in a few years again on that same plan."*

*Mr. Knebel said, "I would say that is accurate, yes."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "It could be, a number of things could be in that amendment as well. So the reason I ask, I am aware of at least one thing in my district that I think that needs to be added to the Comprehensive Plan just for awareness. So I want to make sure we don't miss the chance next time. But anyway, I do think it's good to note that. I do appreciate the fact this was led by the community itself, they had a large input to the process. I think that's really good. I would make a point that on page two of our staff report it does mention that there is no financial obligations to Sedgwick County to amend this in terms of we're not promising any money for any particular projects. This is simply just a, I guess remind MAPC of, I guess of the long-range plan for the area so that you guys have things to look at when projects are presented at MAPC if I understand correctly."*

*Mr. Knebel said, "That's correct. A plan like this would provide, you know, guidance to capital improvement programming, for example, but amendments to the Comprehensive Plan themselves are guiding documents, they aren't decision documents as it relates to allocation of resources."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "Okay. Then I'm just curious, but last week we approved an item for Project Wichita that's going to be looking at potentially a lot of things, but one thing on that list that I would anticipate might be one thing to look at is quality of life things. I have heard, I know right now we're moving towards the new ball diamond in place of Lawrence Dumont Stadium, but I understand that could also be challenged and potentially changed to something entirely different. So I'm curious if that was to be impacted by a Project Wichita study, you know, does that impact right now, let me ask it this way. Are these in priority order, these 11 items?"*

*Mr. Knebel said, "They're not necessarily in priority order, no. In fact, likely the first initiative that we'll implement would be the land-use plan, which I believe is item number six."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "Okay. Anyway, I was just curious because it seems like we've got the study that's kind of just been, we just pulled the trigger on. So I anticipate we'll see some information coming out of that study that's going to talk about things like the ball diamond and probably convention center and other things perhaps. But to the extent that that downtown area is prime real estate for those quality of life venues, I would not be surprised if there's, you know, competing ideas for that space, maybe that's not the right spot for the ball diamond. I've heard people talk about that a little bit, so just a thought. The fact that it's in this Comprehensive Plan makes me wonder if this is somehow going to, I guess be impacted by that Project Wichita study. Just a thought. Then, I guess that's really all my comments I have. So again I'll be glad to support this as well, so Mr. Chairman, whenever the appropriate time is, I'll be glad to second Commissioner O'Donnell's motion."*

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

Commissioner Ranzau thanked the Chairman and said, "Thanks for the presentation. There's a lot of things in this, a lot of which I support. There are some things that I have some issues with I'd like to talk about. First of all, I mean the biggest thing is, seems like the ballpark is a big part of this, and I share Commissioner Howell's concerns. I know you don't have, you say it's not a priority, but you do have short-term, medium-term and long-term, and the number one short-term is the first one up there is to design the village, Ballpark Village that will replace Lawrence Dumont Stadium. Now a couple things to say and question about this, when I was on the Comprehensive Plan, and nothing about a new ballpark came up. Can you clarify, I mean, is this a done deal? I know Project Wichita is going to look at Century II, but I've also heard maybe this too. Is there a chance that this is premature, I guess, or that there may be some overlap here or..."

Mr. Knebel said, "Well, certainly I think the ballpark project itself has progressed more slowly than was anticipated when this planning process was initiated. I would say hardly anything is ever a done deal. Certainly in the case of this, there are a lot of decisions that need to be made. The City Council has made a number of decisions that create a funding source for much of the project, so that is, that in and of itself, having those designated resources is something that led the committee and the Planning Staff to believe that the potential for the project to occur was pretty high. But certainly if something changes, then, you know, we adapt to changes all the time in the planning world, and we will do so with this as well."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "You bring up the funding sources. That's really, I know this technically doesn't commit us to a certain amount of money, but it does talk about a variety of taxpayer subsidies in here. The ballpark obviously depends upon, at this point on a TIF (tax increment financing) district which would affect the county, and as I've stated before, it actually would hurt retail businesses outside the area.

"That's always been problematic for me to use these types of plans to promote, you know, a variety of taxpayer subsidies without having a greater discussion about those sorts of thing. So that's problematic for me as well, because once you put it down in writing, then it's you know, it's used then for future, say well we got to do it this way, and everyone says it's okay, but there's never really been a good dialogue about this and how the impact it might have on other areas. But, so really, I'm concerned that maybe it's premature with respect to the ball diamond part of this, the Lawrence Dumont.

"There's a lot of other good stuff in here, and I question whether or not it should be here and the reliance on subsidy should be codified in this, but then I have one last question. In meeting (inaudible) you talk about improving housing conditions to code enforcement. That's something that I have been interested in as far as, you know, regulations. I guess I'm a little concerned about that. When I look at the demographics of the area, you have a lot of poverty within this area, minorities. I'm not so sure it's going to be a productive strategy to try and improve housing through code enforcement. I mean, people who are poor are really more worried about feeding their families than having someone from the government coming around and pestering them with code enforcement issues.

"So that's, I mean, we have code enforcement out there, but to put it in here and to think that's a helpful strategy, I think should be, people should rethink that, actually. It's easy to say it, but then when you get down and do it, and people start getting affected, it doesn't change the status of poverty, really. So those are my issues. I actually think because of the ballpark we should probably withhold approving this until

*we know, let Project Wichita do its thing and see if that's really something the community wants. That's just me, so thank you."*

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

*Commissioner Unruh thanked the Chairman and said, "Scott, appreciate the presentation today, but help me clarify, this plan was developed through citizen input and through the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission and the different agencies that have responsibility to advance these."*

*Mr. Knebel said, "That's correct, and there are a number of people on that advisory committee here today. It was very much citizen-led. That committee included both residents and businesses and organizations with the key stakeholders in the Delano neighborhood."*

*Commissioner Unruh said, "Okay, and this is, at this point, a concept."*

*Mr. Knebel said, "Well, it's a strategy, I think, is probably a better word. There are some concepts in here. I think many of the concepts in here probably need significant study in terms of their viability. Students are fun to work with, they're very enthusiastic.*

*"But they also generally have a lot to learn, and a number of the things that I think they came up with are good ideas to start the discussion, but I wouldn't, we're not recommending specifics as so-called concepts that we're asking you to adopt today. We're asking you to identify topic areas for further study and further planning."*

*Commissioner Unruh said, "Okay, well, I appreciate that, and I know if you want to develop the community, you've got to start somewhere. This is a starting point, and I think you used the word potential. The potential is there to really do something positive for that portion of the community, so I appreciate the hard work that's been done to this point, and with further study and many check points along the way, I'm very comfortable with approving the plan, so thank you."*

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

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Mr. Chair, if we are ready, I will make a motion."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Let me make one comment..."*

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Alright."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "...and I'll turn it over to you."*

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Sounds good."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "I served on the MAPC for about 11 years, and during that period of time, our Comprehensive Plan was kind of out of date. Couple years ago we finally reviewed that and the goal of that was to make it a living document, so that we could make changes to it as things developed in Wichita and Sedgwick County. The Comprehensive Plan is a joint plan between Wichita and Sedgwick County, that's why we're voting on it today, although just about everything in here, it is in Sedgwick County, but it's mainly inside the city of Wichita.*

*"Things can change. If Project Wichita comes up with something new for the ballpark, and there's a different direction, by having the Comprehensive Plan as a living plan, one that can be amended as we're going to do today. As things change, we can make changes in the future to make sure that it stays a viable plan, and that's what the whole goal is, is what we're doing today is keep that as a living, viable plan. So I will be supporting it. With that, I'd like to ask Commissioner O'Donnell if he'd like to make a motion."*

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. I did want to acknowledge a couple of my friends out there. Vincent [Hancock] and Mistie [Sifford] from the neighborhood association, they did put on a great community fair what a couple months ago, right?"*

*"Yeah. I forgot to mention that earlier, but it was wildly successful, and we'll be doing another one. So there's just so much positive energy and momentum that we have in the Delano area, Mr. Chairman."*

#### MOTION

*Commissioner O'Donnell moved to adopt the Delano Neighborhood Plan: 2018 as an amendment to The Wichita Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan, authorize the Chairman to sign the adopting resolution, and instruct the County Clerk to publish the resolution in the official County newspaper.*

*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>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. Thank you Scott for being here today. Thanks for everyone from the Delano district that's here today, appreciate it. Next item, please."*

**Adopted**

#### **D**     [18-225](#)

#### PRESENTATION OF THE 2017 COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT (CAFR).

Presented by: Rick Durham, Deputy Chief Financial Officer.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Receive and file.

#### VISUAL PRESENTATION

*Chairman Dennis said, "Rick, did you leave anyone on the 8th floor? I saw everyone..."*

*Mr. Rick Durham, Deputy Chief Financial Officer, greeted the Commissioners and said, "No sir. As the presentation is being passed out to you, what I want to do first before I get into the presentation is, is that we have representatives here from BKD our independent audit firm. I want to recognize them. Then I'm going to have one of them*

*come up and speak to you about the audit itself. But we have Greg Sevier, Teresa Seymour and John Cutrera from BKD. With that, I'm going to invite John to come up and talk a little bit about the audit and [Chicago] White Sox baseball."*

*Mr. John Cutrera, Director, BKD LLP greeted the Commissioners and said, "Thank you, Rick. Thank you for having us here this morning. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to serve the county as your external auditor. This is our second year performing the audit for the county. I think you'll see from the presentation this morning that the audit process went much smoother than the prior year.*

*"Initial years are always difficult, and I think the Finance Department and county staff really did a great job on making improvements and learning lessons from the prior year audit, which resulted in a much smoother audit process than the current year. So I know Rick has a very detailed presentation on the financial results for 2017. After I talk, so I'm not going to spend a whole heck of a lot of time on the financial results, but I did want to just give a high level overview of the audit process itself and address any questions that you might have. So as part of our audit process, we provide three main deliverables. The first of which is the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR). We also have our required communication with those charged with governance, which in this case is obviously the County Board. Then we also provide a single audit report, which is required if the county spends more than \$750,000 in federal grant awards in a given year. So the first report I wanted to discuss, and I believe you've all been provided these reports ahead of time and hopefully have had a chance to review them.*

*"First one I'd like to discuss is the largest of the three documents, which is the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. So the CAFR is broken up into three different parts. We have an introductory section, a financial section and a statistical section. The CAFR is produced in-house by the Finance Department. Our job is to provide an opinion on the CAFR. So BKD's part of the CAFR is actually the first page after the financial section tab. You'll see it's on BKD letterhead, and this is our opinion on the financial statements. I'm happy to report that in the current year we provided an unmodified or clean opinion, so this is the same type of opinion that we had issued in the prior year. One thing you will notice, if you do look at the opinion, is that we issued it on March 30th. If you compare that to last year, you would see that it was issued at the beginning of June, I believe June 2nd so about two months ahead of schedule. Again, I think a lot of the credit there goes to Finance Department and just making the improvements that were recommended last year, and really just making for a smoother audit and a smoother financial reporting process.*

*"So with that, following the audit opinion, I just want to point out is the Management's Discussion and Analysis (MD&A) that's commonly referred to as the MD&A (Management Discussion and Analysis). If you have not had a chance to get in and read the entire CAFR document, I know it's a very large document, I would strongly recommend that you at least get in and review the MD&A. The MD&A is really meant to just provide the reader with an easily readable document to help summarize the activity throughout the entire CAFR for the entire fiscal year that's written by management. So again, it's just a really nice executive summary I think of the CAFR. So again, if you have not had an opportunity to get into the entire document, certainly would recommend you get in and take a look at the MD&A.*

*"As I mentioned, Rick is going to get into more of the specifics on the changes in*

*terms of financial balances after I talk. The second report I was going to discuss this morning is our required communication with those charged with governance, so this one is on BKD letterhead, it's the shortest of the three documents.*

*"Really what this document is meant to do is just to provide you with an overview of our audit process and also just make sure that you're aware of what your responsibilities are in overseeing the financial reporting process of the county. So I'll briefly just go over some of the key points on this letter starting down at the bottom of page one. The significant accounting policies for the county are disclosed in note one to the financial statement. So if you have not already seen those in the CAFR, we're just making a point that those are there. We encourage you to read through those. We have no issues with any alternative accounting treatments in the current year. Part of the audit process requires management to come up with estimates related to certain financial statement balances. In the current year, those estimates were made around the fair value of investments, the pension liabilities and your other post-employment benefit obligation, along with the depreciable lives of capital assets.*

*"There's also footnote disclosures in the CAFR that we feel are particularly important, and those are the ones around investments, insurance claims payable, net pension liabilities, your other post-employment benefit obligations and your tax abatements, which are disclosed in accordance with GASB (Governmental Accounting Standards Board) 77. Audit adjustments, we did propose a few audit adjustments that were posted by management as part of the audit process. In addition, we came up with some adjustments that were proposed but did not really rise to a material level to be posted into the financial statements, those are attached to this letter. We had no concerns with the accounting principles of the county. No disagreements with management throughout the audit process.*

*"We're not aware of any consultations with that management had with any other accountants. As I said, the audit process went very smooth. We came out for planning and interim work toward the end of November, came back in January through right around the beginning of March, and throughout the process county staff was very responsive. They were ready for us day one, and it really provided for a smooth, efficient audit process. The next part of the letter covers internal control matters, which I believe have already been communicated. So I will skip ahead to page eight of the letter, which deals with some other matters. Really, all that's listed out in this other matters section is future accounting pronouncements that the county will be required to adopt in future years.*

*"So as I'm sure you're pretty well aware of the GASB has been very busy over the past couple years, and they continue to be very busy. So this is just kind of listing out what the county will be required to implement in future years, the most significant of which I would say is GASB number 75, and GASB number 87. So GASB number 75 deals with your other post-employment benefits, and really just requires that the county adopt the provisions of similar to what was adopted with GASB statement 68 with your pensions, and that you're putting the entire liability related to those benefits onto the statement of net position. That one is applicable next year, so effective December 31, 2018.*

*The other significant pronouncement, which is actually a few years off, 2020, is GASB 87. Really kind of reworks how the leases are treated in governmental financial statements. The GASB kind of took a look at that and really made some significant changes in how those are going to be reported. Again, you have a couple more years for that. We've had discussions with management on all these upcoming standards.*



*We have no concerns with their ability to implement them. I'm sure that they'll be implemented efficiently and in accordance with what GASB requires. Of course if necessary, we're always available as a resource to help along with those implementations if need be. With that, I will go on to the third report, which again, is our single audit report, so this report is required because the county spent more than \$750,000 in federal awards in 2017. So the standards that drive the audit for the single audit, the audit is done in accordance with government auditing standards, and it's also uniform guidance, federal uniform guidance.*

*"What the uniform guidance requires us to do is just to identify what I'll refer to as major programs, and that identification is driven by dollar amount and also by risk within the program. So in the current year, we identified three major programs that we tested, which were Aging, WIC (Women, Infants and Children), and Healthy Start initiative. I'm happy to say that our opinion on compliance with those three major programs was, again, an unmodified or clean opinion, so similar to your CAFR opinion. There were no modifications to our single audit report on opinion on compliance with the federal programs in the current year. With that, I'd be happy to address any questions that you all may have on any of the three reports I covered this morning."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you for being here today, and thank you for the audit that you've conducted on Sedgwick County. We do have a question from Commissioner Ranzau."*

*Commissioner Ranzau said, "Actually I just want to say thanks to you and all the folks from BKD for the work you've done this year and last year. It's been tremendously helpful to us, I think, as Commissioners and to our Finance staff, I mean, you came at a time when we really needed some help, and you've done a good job. I feel like you get in there, you're detailed, you tell us what we need to do, you don't pull any punches, and that's what we need. We need the honest truth, and I think we can trust what you give us and use it to go forward, and I'm very appreciative that you're with us."*

*Mr. Cutrera said, "Absolutely, thank you."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. I don't see any other comments, but I echo Commissioner Ranzau's comments that when you came in a year or so ago, we wanted you to do exactly what you've been doing for the past two audits, and we appreciate it very much."*

*Mr. Cutrera said, "Thank you."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. Hey, Rick."*

*Mr. Durham said, "Okay, now go into the details of the CAFR report that John has outlined. I would like to also say thank you to the BKD staff. They come in, they give us a hard look, they don't hold back on us. We have spirited conversations back and forth. They listen to us, we listen to them, and then we implement things that we need to. So with that, I'll get into the CAFR report. I'm certain that all of you brought your CAFR with you today."*

*Mr. Mike Scholes, County Manager, greeted the Commissioners and said, "It's holding open my door."*

*Mr. Durham said, "Okay with that, why do we do a CAFR? The requirement is that*

*annual financial statements are required to be completed within six months by state law and also by bond covenants, that's why we have our financial statements audited. They are required to be audited by an independent CPA (Certified Public Accountant) firm, which is what we just heard from. So that's why we have a CAFR. So here the perspectives that I'm going to use for the analysis as we go through. We look at near-term financing or the traditional fund statements. We'll look at our financial position, using the entity-wide financial statements, and then we'll look at long-term trends in the section in the CAFR called statistics. So we'll do that.*

*"So the primary goal, obviously the private sector is to make a profit. That's not the goal of the government. We have economic goals, but the principal objective is to provide service to citizens. So we'll start with the traditional fund statements, and to begin there, what I want to do is talk about our near-term financing and governmental fund balances. So what we see here is our fund balances of the different funds. So the chart is divided into different colors, and each represents a different fund or fund type for county's governmental activities. The green at the bottom obviously is the general fund, which is far and away the largest single area of our financial system and where most governmental activities take place. So you see the general fund ended with a fund balance of \$66.2 million. Again, up from 2016, so you can see the five-year trend there. Our fund balance is consistently between [S]63 and \$68 million.*

*"The blue segment stacked directly above that is federal and state assistance funds or the grant funds. The five-year trend represents here a relatively constant fund balance across time. Directly on top of that then is the gray segment is all other funds. Let me enumerate for you here what those are. That combines fund balances of the [Sedgwick County] Fire District [No. 1], special revenue funds and capital project funds. Now, the special revenue funds can be identified, or you can find those in your CAFR on pages B-2 through B-5, and they're detailed there. What those are is Wichita State [University] (WSU), COMCARE, EMS (Emergency Medical Services), Aging, Highway Fund, Noxious Weeds, Solid Waste, Special Parks and Rec[reation], Emergency Telephone and Court Trustee. So that's the special revenue funds.*

*"I also mention that capital project funds are in there. Those are detailed on page B-6 through B-7 of your CAFR. That's building and equipment, street and bridge, road and bridge, sales tax. So once again, that gray segment are fund balances for the Fire District, special revenue funds and capital project funds. So we keep moving up that chart, there's a thin blue line of \$2.9 million is represented by debt service. Stacked right on top of that then are debt proceeds, and those are funds that we've taken in, but we haven't paid out yet. Then we keep moving up on top of that is the PBC (Public Building Commission). You can see there is a fund balance of \$2.4 million in PBC. So what I want to do is take that section that was, that green section at the bottom of the chart there, and we drill in, this is the general fund fund balance. Again, five-year trend, and it identifies the classification of that fund balance within each year.*

*"So the red at the bottom represents non-spendable fund balance. Those are things that are assets attributable to inventories, receivables and other things that cannot be readily turned into cash. Gray bar represents the assigned fund balance. What that is, is every year we adopt a budget, we anticipate and budget for contingencies, whether that be a storm event or some other crisis, and that's so we provide legal spending so we don't ever expect a storm to hit or have a crisis, but so we don't want to raise property taxes, we build that into the budget, so that's the assigned fund balance.*

*Then we move up to the green or that light green at the top is the unassigned fund balance. That's the amount of general fund balance for which there's no designated use.*

*"So the sum of the unassigned fund balance and the assigned fund balance is [\$]39.8 million. That's a [\$]39.8 [million] and the [\$]15.4 [million]. That is called unrestricted fund balance. So the county has a policy that states unrestricted general fund fund balance never be less than 20 percent of budgeted expenditures and transfers in the general fund. So what this chart depicts is a demonstration of our compliance with that policy. So we ended the year with \$55.2 million of unrestricted fund balance. Our budgeted expenditures were [\$]209.2 million, and that 20 percent threshold, then based on that, would be \$41.8 million. Our unrestricted fund balance at the end of the year stood at 26.4 percent, as compared to the 20 percent minimum threshold, so the unrestricted fund balance in excess of policy minimum is \$13.3 million.*

*"So now I'm going to go in and go into a little more and look at near-term financing indicators of our financial conditions using the traditional fund statements. So one of the questions that we want to be able to answer in Finance is, has to do with budget solvency. That question is, is the county, does the county's revenues, are they sufficient to pay for the annual budget. So what this chart shows is ten years of expenditures. What we want to see is those data points to be right at or slightly above 100 percent, but what we see is that we're fairly consistently below the 100 percent line. So in our government fund revenues amounted to 96 percent of our expenditures. So to get a more reasonable picture of whether we're able to pay for our operations, we use this indicator, which takes the same revenue base, but compares it to government fund expenditures that excludes the PBC and debt service and debt proceeds funds. "So this measure of operating solvency as opposed to budgetary solvency which you saw on the previous slide, we would like to be at or above 100 percent. In 2017 we ended the year with this measure of 104.9 percent of expenditures, which is a good thing. So another question we have to answer has to do with flexibility of our finances. To what extent do we have full control over the use of our resources? So we look at debt service, that's the total principal and interest obligations that the county incurred as a percentage of all expenditures. So to the extent we have debt expenditures and to the extent we have those expenditures, they're going to consume available resources that we have. So at the end of year 2017, our debt service expenditures amounted to 5.4 percent of all governmental fund expenditures.*

*"Now the spike that you see in 2013 had to do with refundings. So final question that we want to ask is whether or not the county has any difficulty paying its short-term obligations. So we call this, this is a measure of liquidity. So this looks at total cash and investments that the county has on-hand, and at the end of the year, our cash amounted to, what this shows is, is \$9.66 on-hand for every \$1 of a liability. So every \$1 of a bill that we owe, we have \$9.66 to pay for that. So you can look back at the ten-year trend on that. Now, you might notice that in '08 and '09 we had a fairly large balance, and that's when we were in the process of collecting tax to build the arena. So that's why we had that large amount on there. So the last measure when we look at these fund statements, is how much do we rely on other governments to fund our activity. So what we do is look at total intergovernmental revenue, and we divide that by the total revenue.*

*"So what we seen the past 10 years is that intergovernmental revenue has consistently been between 14 and 16 percent of all revenue. So this shows that we're not heavily relying on that revenue to pay for our operations, and it shows, so that number at the*

*end of 2017, that's 13.9 percent. Okay, now we're going to shift gears here, and we're going to move away from the traditional fund statements to what we call the entity-wide statements. These statements wrap up the activity, the financial activity into a single set of statements on a full accrual basis. That's a full accrual accounting. So what that does is that would be similar to what a company would do when they roll all the different activities of their company into one set of financial statements. So we start with the county's net position. In effect, this is our net worth, if you were to look at it from a business standpoint.*

*"So the county had a net position at the end of 2017 of \$498.3 million. That's identified by the series of bars on the left-hand side of the chart. Each bar represents a separate year, so you can see in 2017, [\$]498 million was a fairly decent less than what 2013 and '14 was when our net position was [\$]620 million. So if we look at 2014 and pay attention to that, you'll see that our unrestricted net position was \$85.2 million. That's represented by that light blue section at the top of that bar. Then beginning in 2015, that light blue bar goes down and is at the bottom, and it shows a negative \$29.6 million. That's a swing of about \$115 million.*

*"That's attributed to a GASB pronouncement that John referenced earlier, the GASB pronouncements which we have to abide by, that took place for the first time in 2015, which required us to reflect on the county's financial statements, our share of the unfunded liability of the pension system, the state's pension system or KPERS (Kansas Public Employees Retirement System). So that's why you see the difference there, and I want to make sure that you guys see that because we still have to carry that moving forward. Then within each bar, at the bottom you'll see that the green is capital assets, then the blue segment is our restricted, and then that blue section has the pie chart to the right. So the restricted assets are broken down and you can see the different, you can see the nature of those restrictions. So all told, the restricted net position at the end of 2017 was actually [\$]20 million more than the previous year.*

*"So we move down now and we ask the question, did Sedgwick County's financial position improve or deteriorate. What this chart shows is that our financial position actually deteriorated about one percent in 2017. That's measured like this. Our beginning net position for 2017 was \$504.9 million, and our ending position if we take and go to the far right of the chart back, our ending net position was \$498 million. So what that says is, and those details of this, by the way, I'll mention, are detailed on A-11, and as you can see on each of the charts, and I'll make sure that each of you get a copy of these, it shows the pages where the financials are that the data is pulled on this. So if you refer to the CAFR, these would be on page A-16 and 17. Then the details are actually discussed on page A-11. I'll just continue on, and then for questions we'll circle back.*

*"So one of the things that we're concerned with is the extent of the various activities of the county are able to support themselves with their own self-generated revenue. Again, like I said at the beginning of this, we're not in the profit-making business, so we don't expect activities to be fully self-supporting, but to the extent they can generate their own revenues, it means we don't have to use tax support to pay for those activities. So what this chart depicts is the different areas of the county, the program revenue shown in the green, and then the blue segment is the general revenue, and the percentage is the amount of general revenue required to support each of those programs. So if we look at public safety during 2017, we spent just over \$148 million,*

*and they were able to produce [\$]39 million for program revenue through municipal jail fees, grants to cover those bills, but the balance of that, [\$]110 million was taxes levied on residents. So the way to read the chart is, 74 percent of public safety activities were funded by taxes.*

*"So you can see that similar looking across the other activities of the county. So there are other ways to measure the financial health of the county. Again, we're looking at this is the entity-wide statements. All of the activities of the county rolled up into one set of financial statements. Okay, so what I'll focus on here is solvency measure. What looks at the county's ability to pay off it's long-term debt with it's assets. So what we're doing is taking long-term liabilities, divided by total assets, and so what we see, in 2017, we ended the year with long-term liabilities equal to about 34 percent of assets. So another way to state that is 34 cents of every liability was covered with a dollar. Now remember I said earlier there was a different measure of that.*

*"Now this is entity-wide. So we're rolling all of our activities of the county up into one set of statements. So again, for every \$1 of liability, did I say that right? Thirty-four cents of every liability was covered by a dollar. So we're in good condition to pay off our long-term debt. You see a spike in that measure in 2015. What that was is the spike in 2015 was the KPERS liability that we have to reflect that I showed you earlier.*

*"So we move now to the last tab of the CAFR. The last tab is the statistical section, and this section contains an awful lot of good information for anybody that wants to know about when you really want to evaluate the finances. So first we look at the ten-year history of governmental revenues, so what this chart shows, the green line there is the revenues, the blue line represents the expenses over the last ten years. So the blue line, so what you would hope to see is that revenue line be above that blue line, but in 2017 that was not the case. So the county had revenues of [\$]324 million while expenses of [\$]327 million. What this chart can show is the change in governmental expenses or where the county's been placing emphasis over the past ten years. We do that by looking at the amount of change in expenses by function. So what this shows is the amount of increase or decrease of expenses in 2017 versus 2008. So we're taking a snapshot of '17 versus that same snapshot in 2008.*

*"You can see the differences of where the increases or decreases have occurred in the programs of the county. So obviously public safety spending has increased \$23 million, which I would anticipate to see because that's where the focus that you have chosen to put our financial resources. So looking at this, I talked about the expectations that activities generate program revenue. So what this shows is again a ten-year history of program revenue represented by the green line, and then property tax revenue represented by the blue line. So if you can look at that, property taxes were about \$11 million lower in 2008 versus 2017. Over that ten-year period, program revenue has decreased over that period of time. So what the chart shows overall, in the past ten years, the county has been increasingly relying on property taxes as a principal funding stream to pay for county services.*

*"So the dip you see from '15 to '16 on that program revenue line, remember we lost the Affordable Airfares Program. That's the bulk of that program revenue decrease. So because we are so reliant on property taxes, we want to pay attention to the collection rate. How effective are we at collecting property taxes that have been levied. What this chart shows is ten years of history for collection rate. So let me clarify this chart real quick, because it looks like there is a really big swing from '9 to '17, an upward trend. But if you will pay attention to the grid or the legend on the left, my range is only from 94.5 percent to 98 percent, but the real data falls above 95.5 percent and goes up to*

97.5 percent. So there's really, there's 2 percent there.

*"So what it shows is over time that we've been very effective in our collection rate. So it shows an effective Treasurer's Department in collecting taxes that are levied. Finally I want to talk about long-term debt and what you see on this chart is again, ten years of history of the county's outstanding debt. Each year represented by a bar, and within that bar the colors represented by the type of debt.*

*"So the green is the general obligation debt, and you can see it continues to go down to where we are at 2017. Special assessments represented by that thin blue line, and then PBC represented in the red. There is actually a small black line at the top of that, and those are, that's lease debt that we have for county leases. Okay, we're going to shift gears a little bit. Also in this statistical section is more than just finances, it actually talks, there is a lot of charts that show how did we spend the county's money. So I want to spend a little bit of time and show some of the different programs and the different areas with the statistics that you can find in that section.*

*"So we start with public safety. So in 2017, what I'm going to show is current year's numbers, what that change is in service from one year ago, and also a change from ten years ago. So we look at that ten-year window. So we had average number of 911 calls per month was just over 44,000. That's a decrease of nine percent from last year, but a 26 percent increase from ten years ago. The average number of EMS responses was just almost 5,200, a very slight decrease from a year ago, and a 29 percent increase from ten years ago. Average daily juvenile population was 52. Again, decreases over the one year and the ten-year. The average daily population in the adult detention was 1,448. That's a five percent increase from a year ago, but a six percent decrease from ten years ago. We provided those public safety services with 1,429 employees, a two percent increase from a year ago or five percent less than ten years ago.*

*"Then we go now to the fire service. So we measure residential structure fires of 100,000 households. So we had 189 residential structure firefighters in 2017. Decreases both in the one-year and ten-year. The average number of medical responses per month, 408. Four percent less than last year, but a 42 percent increase from ten years ago. We provided that service with nine fire stations, the same as last year or a 13 percent increase from ten years ago. We look at health and welfare services. The number of mental health clients seen, 13,572, slight increase over a year, and an 11 percent increase over ten years. The number of eligible for developmental disability services, just over 2,500. Again a small decrease from a year ago, 20 percent increase from ten years. We provided that with 479 employees, essentially the same number as last year, but 22 percent less than 10 years ago.*

*"So we look at public health service. The number of health clinic patient encounters, nearly 142,000. Four percent less than a year ago, and 25 percent less than 10 years ago. We provided 19,809 immunizations, also down over a one-year and a ten-year trend. We had just over 3,000 tuberculosis encounters, a one percent decrease from a year ago, and a 36 percent decrease from 10 years ago. We move now and look at culture and recreation services. The annual attendance at the Sedgwick County Zoo was just over 581,000, an 18 percent decrease from a year ago, an 11 percent decrease over the 10-year period. The attendance at the Sedgwick County Park was just over a million attendees, a two percent increase from a year ago and a four percent decrease from 10 years. The number of culture and recreation employees is 106, and that's seven percent more than a year ago, and 17 percent less. Now we looked at the Intrust Bank Arena, and I'm not sure what that 53 percent means up in*

*the title. It means nothing, it's obviously a typo on my part. But the number of events we had in 2017 was 87.*

*"That's 15 percent less than there was a year ago. There's no 10-year data because the arena hasn't been open for 10 years yet. So we can see annual attendance down about nine percent, the ticket sales ranking, where the arena is ranked among all U.S. Arenas is 59. The profit return to the county since opening, \$2.4 million. Public Works, the number of road miles improved in 2017 was 144 road miles, both increases from a year and 10 years ago. The number of road miles maintained is 597, that's one percent less than last year and 4 percent less than 10 years ago. That's a result of annexation, the cities annexing roads. The number of household hazardous waste tons disposed was 650-tons last year. That's a 14 percent increase from a year ago, and 33 percent from 10 years ago. We did that with 125 Public Works employees, also three percent less than a year ago and five percent less than 10 years ago.*

*"General government service, the number of registered voters in 2017 was 292,029, a one percent decrease from 2017, but 18 percent more than 10 years ago. The number of real estate taxable parcels was a slight decrease of less than one percent, and over 10 years, it's actually one percent increase, so you can see it's relatively stable. The number of documents filed with the Register of Deeds was just about 75, well 75,500, decreases in the one and 10-year trends, but the number of real estate records processed was 74,665, a 32 percent increase. We provided those general government services with 410 government employees, a one percent increase or eight percent decrease over 10 years.*

*"Okay, that's the end of my slide show, but I would be remiss if I did not at this point recognize and thank the team that puts all this together. Believe me, I'm just the guy that stands up here and talks about the data. The hard work is done by the people that are in the Division of Finance, and they are represented here, Lorian [Showalter Arie] is sitting on the front row in the Budget Department, but the accounting staff are the ones who put the data together for the CAFR, and they are the ones that have the robust debate with John [Cutrera] and Teresa [Seymour] and Greg [Sevier] and his staff when the audit is going on. They are represented, Hope Hernandez is our Accounting Director, next to her is Mandy on the other side, Mandy Estes, sorry. On the other side is Melissa Slaughter, next to her is Brandi Baily, and am I missing anyone? Marty, I see you back there hiding. Marty Hughes is back here.*

*"Those are the people that do the hard work every day that you don't see and you don't hear, and that's a good thing, because you really don't want to hear about accounting problems. You just want it to happen and have the numbers put in the right column. That's pretty much right? So I will say that there are times that even when Lindsay [Poe Rousseau] and I are looking at the numbers, we're saying we need an accountant because we don't know what this means, so even we do that, isn't that right, Lindsay? So with that being said, that's the conclusion of my presentation in the CAFR and the statistics, and I would attempt to answer any questions that you might have, or I may defer that to the accounting staff that's actually sitting here. They may be better able to answer any questions you might have. Chairman."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Well Rick, thank you very much for the presentation today. I don't know if you confused us totally, or we're just..."*

*Mr. Durham said, "If I did, then my work here is complete."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "I have no one asking to speak right now, but we do appreciate*

*all the work of our staff up there on the eighth floor and everything that they do, and we appreciate the folks from BKD that came in and validated the hard work that everyone up on the eighth floor is doing for us. It is a very comprehensive report that you presented to us, the CAFR is very comprehensive, and we do appreciate everything that's been done. I do not see any questions. That's amazing. You, as I, I take that back. Commissioner Unruh has obviously a very intelligent question to ask."*

*Commissioner Unruh said, "Well I had several intelligent questions as you were going along, and right towards the end my head exploded with all that data, so I've lost the intelligent questions. But I just saw the, on the pictorial slide you had about health and welfare, it just showed that our mental health clients have gone up 11 percent. Those eligible for developmental disability service has gone up 20 percent. But the number of health and welfare employees went down 22 percent. Then over on slide number 22, it shows that our expenses for health and welfare is down \$12 million in the 10-year span. Is that because of lack of support from funding from grants and assistance from federal and state agencies? Is that the result of decisions by this Commission? We lost money, we don't have as many people, but the demand has gone up is what it appears to me. Maybe it's not even a good question, I don't know."*

*Mr. Durham said, "No, it is a good question because a number of years back, there was staff cuts, and there was a chart, and I think maybe chart 22 is what you're referring to, where it showed that decrease of, I have support."*

*Commissioner Unruh said, "I see that."*

*Mr. Durham said, "Maybe I should just defer to Mr. Kaufman and have him answer that. But I think chart 22 that you were referencing..."*

*Commissioner Unruh said, "Yes."*

*Mr. Durham said, "...is this chart that shows that large decrease in health and welfare. Those were program cuts, and if I can say that correctly, and then maybe you can discuss funding from your grant agencies."*

*Mr. Tim Kaufman, Assistant County Manager, Public Services, greeted the Commissioners and said, "The funding for services in the health and welfare area over the last ten years has varied pretty widely from all different sources. We've seen some reductions at the local level.*

*"The bulk of those reductions that we see are actually tied to changes in Medicaid rules. So there are services that were reimbursed in the past that are no longer being reimbursed for or the volume of services has been reduced by the payer. KanCare is the name for Medicaid in Kansas and there have been a number of changes to that program over the past 10 years, and so the bulk of that reduction that you see comes through reductions related to Medicaid services and the way they're paid for."*

*Commissioner Unruh said, "Alright, thank you, I mean, that helps me with that question. I can't find the slide that showed our dependence on other people for funding government services. I suppose that goes along with the answer that Tim just gave us."*

*Mr. Durham said, "Yes it does."*

*Commissioner Unruh said, "Because it looks like we're going to have to start covering*



*more of our own programs. Outside help is not as generous as it was."*

*Mr. Durham said, "That is a correct statement, sir."*

*Commissioner Unruh said, "Okay. Well, thank you Mr. Chairman, that's all I have."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you, Commissioner Unruh. Further questions? Seeing none, thank you Rick, we appreciate it."*

*Mr. Durham said, "Thank you, sir."*

#### MOTION

*Commissioner Unruh moved to receive and file.*

*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, "Mr. Manager, I know the next item on the agenda we'll be calling in just a moment. How long do you anticipate it running, because we may want to take a little quick break."*

*Mr. Scholes said, "It might be good to take a break."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. With that, we'll take a short recess."*

*The Board of County Commission recessed at 10:41 a.m. and returned at 10:47 a.m.*

*Chairman Dennis said, "With that, I'd like to call the meeting back to order. Madam Clerk, next item, please."*

#### Received and Filed

**E**      [18-263](#)

DISCUSS PURCHASE OF COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING.  
Presented by: Tania Cole, Director of Facilities Maintenance and Project Services.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Receive and File.

#### VISUAL PRESENTATION

*Mr. Scholes said, "It's the smallest item on your agenda but the most exciting. I'm sure we're going to get a lot of good discussion about this. I'm honored to be here to talk about the county administration building. A couple of introductions real quick. This will be basically, I will start off the brief, we'll talk through a little history, and then I'll bring*

*Tania [Cole] up and she'll talk about the particular options that you had us analyze, and then in the end I'll get back up and hopefully we'll make some decisions. But first I have some introductions real quick. We do have Joe Johnson here and Justin Graham from SJCF (Schafer Johnson Cox Frey) Architecture, we're happy to have them here. They've been pivotal in helping us through this process. Also, Steve Martens, NAI Martens is here. He will be here just as support in case we get into areas where we need to talk about towards the end. Then Tania will again help me in this briefing.*

*"First off, if you look at the slides a little bit, I have a little bit of an agenda and how we'll move through this, but at the end, if you look at the bottom bullets, I have a series of decision points right there, and there is obviously a flow to it. First thing we'll cover, in the end I'll ask for a decision on the Riverview Building, on whether we want to proceed. If you remember, in the January 3rd discussion, BOCC (Board of County Commissioners) meeting, there were two things you wanted us to do. First off was the Riverview Building and get into a due diligence period, start the analytics of if that would be the right fit for us and we've done those analytics and again, Tania will come up here and brief that.*

*"The second thing, Chairman, you did ask for us to look at a new build option as a comparison to the Riverview Building. We've done that. I've asked the staff to put together two options on that, basically two different flavors of the same thing to give you, again, more choice. We have done that, we will brief that towards the end.*

*"So if you look at those decision points, Riverview, if you say go out and purchase the Riverview Building that makes the other decision points moot, if that one is you do not want the Riverview Building, you want us to continue to look at more options. That's also a decision point. But also, with those two particular new build options those are each decision points. We will, again, address those at the end, but I wanted to put it out front, just so you can in the back of your mind understand as we go through this, and in your mind, make a decision that will help us in the end select an appropriate course of action.*

*"If you look at some of the history of this, I put this up here, but really it started back in 2016 during the budget discussions, when we started really hearing from public safety and the needs that they have in terms of space. Their space management needs were really discussed in earnest during the budget talks, so we knew when it came to the next year's budgets discussions that this would be something that we would have to discuss which is why we kicked it off with a budget retreat, we talked about it at the February 16th meeting, and then as we went through the budget discussions and then we had a space management presentation June 13th. We presented it as a recommended budget, the County Manager's budget on July 12th, where we made some recommendations for the CIP (Capital Improvement Project) budget, and then you adopted those on August 2nd 2017.*

*"Then finally we had the meeting January 3rd where we were given the marching orders to do the due diligence on the Riverview Building and bring you back options. So that's just a little bit about the history. Again, there's a lot in here that I didn't put in there, but this has been discussed for essentially the last two years, but really it's been discussed for the last decade. This has just gotten to a point where we felt like we needed to bring it to you, which is what has led us here today. If you remember, when we brought you this space needs study on the different needs from the public safety, we discussed the [18th Judicial] District Court and their need for five new courtrooms, but their additional square foot need was about 30k, and also the D.A. (District*

Attorney), we had Marc Bennett come in here and speak to the Commissioners on multiple occasions, and he has talked through his needs.

*"In the analysis that Justin Graham did, it essentially said that the D.A. was going to need approximately 5,000 more square foot, but their total program need is about 35k. The Sheriff, not so much affected in this building, but did indicate that they needed another 2k. So for just the County Courthouse, the District Court, D.A. and Sheriff, their additional square footage need was about 47k. County administrative programming, the piece that would be fit into a potential new admin[istration] building, this was the programming need. If you look at the numbers in parenthesis, of all the administrative functions that we have listed here, on the left hand number is what they currently have, the right hand number is what they would need.*

*"Probably the biggest growth here is, again, the Board of County Commissioner's meeting room, this particular room. We did discuss the need for having a bigger room, and that has an effect as we get into the analysis and Tania comes up here to brief it, and you look at the analysis, that did have an effect on what we found when we were doing the analysis of the Riverview Building. This is the total square footage for all the admin functions. We had about 73,000 square feet that we need. That does not count the circulation space. If you add the circulation space, it came out to about 93,000 square feet.*

*"At the January 3rd meeting, we talked about two options, the first one being the Murfin Complex, which was the \$7.9 million option, which included the building on Main Street, as well as the Sunflower Bank and the Murfin Plaza Building, so those three buildings were discussed at that \$7.9 million price, and then option two, which is the option that you chose, was the Riverview Building at \$7.01 million. Due diligence period was executed January 5th. We have been in that in earnest. Just recently finishing up, and we will provide that assessment to you. With that, I'll bring up Tania and she'll go through the Riverview Building in detail."*

*Ms. Tania Cole, Director of Facilities Maintenance and Project Services, greeted the Commissioners and said, "As the Manager stated, right now we are in the due diligence period on the Riverview Building, and what occurred when we entered into that due diligence period on January 5th was we enlisted the help of several folks, Schafer Johnson Cox and Frey (SJCF) to provide us with a building assessment of the Riverview Building. We also had the [Metropolitan Area of] Building and Construction [Department] (MABCD) Chief Inspectors go through the building, as well as Facilities Maintenance, Environmental Resources, and our I.T. (Information Technology) Support Services (ITSS) Department.*

*"What they looked at in this building assessment included the structure and condition of the building, the mechanical and electrical systems, inspection of the roof, the conditions and components of the elevator system, the interior and exterior conditions of the windows, the I.T. networking, environmental systems, as well as what the Manager had mentioned, and that is the space availability and layout of the County Commission meeting room. Just as a reminder, the Riverview Building was built in 1983; 91,700 square feet, full basement, seven stories and 300 parking stalls. What came out of that assessment is we understand that this is a well-maintained building. The building structure and working systems appear to be in good condition, however,*

*there are some recommended repairs if we are to occupy this facility.*

*"The recommended repairs there, you'll see there's a laundry list, and I'll go through that briefly. For the site, it's recommended that we look into the ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) parking and the ramp modifications. There are some slope issues and inadequate ADA parking stalls there, so there are line items there for those items, as well as there are significant cracks in the parking lot that we would look to crack repair and then do some restriping.*

*"Moving to the building, and I might just point out, you'll see asterisks on three of those items, those are items that could be repaired over the next 25 years. Nothing that we need to do immediately, but something we need to look into in the next 25 years. So with that, the elevator controller and machinery, right now the controller is obsolete, so if we ever needed to get into a situation where that would need to be replaced, we would first look to repair it. If that cannot be repaired, we would have to look at modernizing those elevators. As well, what we found is that the first floor has compliant ADA restrooms, the remaining of the building do not have compliant ADA restrooms, so we've put in a line item there to modify six restrooms, so three women's and three men's, basically every other floor would have an ADA-compliant restroom.*

*"The wet seal glass, what was discovered is that over the years, the gasket in the window framing system has shrunk, and so to accommodate for that and to stop water from infiltrating into the building, they've done what's called a wet seal, where basically you will go through and caulk the perimeter of those windows. They are in good condition at the moment but something that we need to just keep an eye on over the next 25 years to look to re-caulk that. As well we have a line item there for glass replacement. As you've seen, that building exterior is all glass, so just a line item there to consider 25 percent replacement over the next 25 years of the glass.*

*"We did do a roof inspection, or they did do a roof inspection and they found that there's probably about one or two years left remaining for that roof, so we would need to look at replacing the entire roof there. Then as you can see, there are several mechanical items listed there, and let me kind of just chunk that out. The system, the HVAC (Heating, Ventilation and Air conditioning) system is currently on a ground source heat pump system, and what they've found is the well water that's coming through can be extremely high in iron content and what happens with that is there is bacterial growth. They addressed that bacterial growth by cleaning it, but during the peak cooling season, they've found that they need to take that plate heater exchanger, tear it down, clean it, and that causes the system to shut down over those couple hours. So what's recommended there is a redundant plate heat exchanger system, so that would eliminate that downtime to clean out that bacteria.*

*"Also, they recommend converting the system to cooling towers in lieu of a well water system, which would require less maintenance and provide chemical treatment options. As well, there is a dedicated outdoor air system that's located on the roof. They found that the ventilation air that's distributed to each floor is not providing the adequate ventilation requirements, so they're suggesting that we replace that system. Then as well, they reviewed the current heat pumps. There are approximately 140 heat pumps in the building, 35 to 40 percent of those have been replaced over the years, and what they've found is that these are well past their normal life span and there are not replacement parts available, so we would need to replace those 80 original heat pumps in the building. Then lastly, there is PVC (polyvinyl chloride) in the heating air system that's exposed throughout the building that would need to be replaced or wrapped with*

*fire resistive-rated material to meet fire code. So that is what we understand for major maintenance repairs and upgrades to the facility. That totaling [\$]2.5 million for those repairs.*

*"If you were to take out those items that can be done over 25 years, that equals [\$]775,000. Another consideration as part of the Riverview Building assessment are the tenant leases that are currently in the facility. It's almost, I would say, 100 percent occupied. There's a small bit of vacant space, but I would like to point out there are varied expiration term dates, and you will see that there is a tenant that has renewal options there until 2024. That is an anchor tenant and they occupy about 45 percent of that tenant space. This tenant did provide the county with an offer to purchase or buy out their lease, and they would be willing to vacate their portion of the building by December 31st of 2020.*

*"Just as before, we'd like to provide you with a list of pros and cons, and so for the Riverview Building, the pros that we see are it's a large building, 91,000 square feet, there is adequate parking on the site, and appears to be a 35-year-old well-maintained building. The cons on that is, as I mentioned before, well-maintained building but recommended maintenance repairs are needed to the building. That's the [\$]2.5 [million] that I mentioned previously. What you'll see with this building are higher utility costs because it is an older building. I just mentioned the limited availability to the building with the tenant leases. What we've found is the County Commission meeting room, there is limited space and layout. You don't gain much more than you have right now with your current existing room.*

*"Then last piece, then, being we would have to drill or bring fiber over from the Ronald Reagan Building to Riverview. Those estimated costs right now are at [\$]50,000 to do that. So to go over the costs for the Riverview Building, again, asking price is a little under [\$]7.1 million, repair costs are the [\$]2.5 million, the remodel costs, we're estimating low remodel costs at \$25 a square foot, higher remodel costs at \$45 a square foot, so you'll see that range there in the [\$]2.2 [million] to [\$]4.1 [million] in remodel costs. I might just point out the \$25 is what was spent on the Ronald Reagan remodel. So that's where that, we've come up with that \$25 a square foot number. The utility costs, that ranges between \$1.25, to \$1.94 a square foot. What I might point out on the \$1.25 a square foot for the lower utility cost would be we would have to invest in about a [\$]450,000 new building control system or automated control system to get those lower utility costs. So ultimately for utility costs over 25 years, you're looking at [\$]3.3 million, to [\$]4.4 million in utility costs.*

*"So to provide you with a grand total, and again, this does not include any lease buyout costs, but total costs for a low remodel, low utility, is [\$]15.2 million, high remodel cost and high utilities is [\$]18.2 million for the Riverview Building. As the Manager mentioned at the last meeting that Tom [Stolz] presented to the Commission, it was asked by Commissioner Dennis that we look at new construction costs, and so the next two items that we're going to talk about are new construction costs, but I just wanted to mention that generally, we understand that new construction costs are estimated between [\$]200 and \$225 a square foot. What you see is lower utility costs with new construction because you have a more efficient mechanical and electrical systems, and then I've just put a map there as part of providing you with information on new construction costs, we wanted to give you options of what availability there is in the downtown area to do new construction for a county admin building.*

*"So that brings me to option one, which is new construction, and what you see there are, basically is the Courthouse, and to the north there, the long piece is the current annex where the D.A. occupies the first and second floor, and then to the west, it*

would be an area that we would construct a new building. So the new building, we would look at about 55,000 square feet, and then the remodel portion is 18,000. What I might point out is that as we looked at this, the departments that we considered moving into the new build, as well as the annex, include nine departments, the County Clerk, the County Commission, County Counselor, County Manager, Facilities, Finance, H.R. (Human Resources), Register of Deeds and Treasurer.

"One thing that I might point out with this is it's still undetermined where we might put the entrance for this. We've looked at both on the new build to have the entrance on the north end, as well as the annex on the north end, but we still need to do some further study of that. As we talked about where that entrance might go, it brought up another idea, and that was to look at whether or not we could demo the entire annex, therefore providing more space to do a new build in that location. So that completes option one.

"I might just point out again the pros and cons of this Courthouse build. The pros then being we would have to do no land purchase because we own that land there, adequate parking with the public and employee parking garage to the north. This would give you the ability to build-to-suit so you wouldn't have to be retrofitting or remodeling a current building, you would be able to build that as you see fit. Again, lower utility costs with that new build, and then we would maintain the campus setting. So then the cons then would be the confined space on the Courthouse campus. As you can see, just going back, it's not really a clean, open square area to build. It kind of has some a little bit of a puzzle to it. So that's what I'm referring to in the confined space area and as well what I spoke to is no defined feasible entrance if we are to keep that annex.

"So option one, looking at the estimated cost for the addition, we're looking at [\$]12 million. Again that's the 55,000 square foot new build. We would have some limited annex demo and remodel, that's just a little over [\$]1 million, utility costs, you'll see savings there at \$1 a square foot, again, that refers to the new build, the 55,000 square feet. Then the Manager asked what it would look like if we were to add additional floor to bring other departments over, and so the amount there that you see would be for an additional floor to that new building, as well as the utility cost, that [\$]4.3 million. So total cost there for the Courthouse build is [\$]14.5 million, to [\$]18.8 million. Again, the [\$]18.8 million would be if we added an additional fourth floor.

"Okay so then moving on to option two, there is a parking lot on Third and Main, and let me just kind of familiarize you with where we're talking about. To the bottom there, that is the Epic [Center] Tower, then to the north is the city-owned parking lot, and then to the west there would be the Ronald Reagan Building. So what we're looking at there is, again, those same nine departments would move over into this new build, 21,000 square feet per floor with a total of 63,000 square feet for the building.

"We also programmed in there, and you'll see that red block space, that is the footprint for a 4-level garage, a total of 368 parking stalls in that parking garage. So you can see with that you've got 368 stalls in the parking garage and 32 surface parking stalls, for a total of 400 stalls. Right now, Ronald Reagan employees are taking up 134 spaces in that particular lot, the Third and Main lot, and so if you take that 134 that we would need to provide parking for, that leaves a remainder of 266 stalls. Again, I won't list out those same departments, but again, those nine departments would move over.

"Okay moving to the pros and cons on this new build, what we have here is you're close to City Hall right across the street from City Hall as well as county operations, you're right next to Ronald Reagan. I know that the Clerk, Register of Deeds and

*Treasurer interact a lot with the Appraiser's office as well as GIS (Geographic Information Systems), who are now in the Ronald Reagan Building, as well as the [Metropolitan Area] Building and Construction Department, the Planning Department that sometimes can have a lot of interaction with various departments. So option two, then, looking at the new build, estimated cost, the land right now is an unknown cost. The new build is \$215 a square foot or [\$]13.5 million in total for the new build. Yes, sir?"*

*Commissioner Ranzau said, "I thought the land cost was \$2 million."*

*Ms. Cole said, "That may be the case. I'm not real positive on that. I think we reached out to the City, but I don't know, we haven't negotiated anything or we don't know what that exact price is."*

*Commissioner Ranzau said, "Well that's what I was briefed on was that it was \$2 million."*

*Mr. Scholes said, "As Tania said, the initial, when we first reached out to them, was about \$2.5 million. If the Commissioners decide to go in this direction we would then start a negotiation to see what the exact price would be. But initial was \$2.5 million for that particular..."*

*Commissioner Ranzau said, "So this total cost doesn't even include the cost of the land acquisition."*

*Mr. Scholes said, "It does not, that's [\$]21 million without that."*

*Ms. Cole said, "Okay. The new parking garage, then, is estimated at [\$]18,000 per stall, so [\$]6.6 million, again, lower utility costs on a new build at \$1 a square foot, so [\$]1.5 million for a total cost of [\$]21.7 million. Again, that does not include the land cost. With this graph, I thought it would be helpful to provide you with all of the options together, and so what this graph is showing you in the blue are the remodel construction costs and so that's the, on the new build, that includes the garage, on the Courthouse addition, both four floors and three floors, that includes the demo remodel of the annex, and then on the Riverview low and high, that includes the building cost, the repair cost and the remodel cost. So what you're seeing there as well is the utility costs over 25 years. That's indicated in the red.*

*"This gives a little bit more detail on the cost, again, same numbers that I've mentioned before. We've got the, for the Riverview, you see there the building costs, the repair costs and the remodel costs all in one, and you have the utilities that would be over 25 years what that total cost would be. So again, Riverview high, [\$]18.2 million, Riverview low, [\$]15.2 million, Courthouse add, [\$]14.5 million, and Courthouse add of four floors, [\$]18.8 million, new building, [\$]21.7 million. Again, I just might point out that those costs do not include Riverview lease buyout or the new building land cost. So then on the bottom, what I've done there is taken the total square footage of all of these buildings and new additions and then divided that by a square foot.*

*"So you can see the comparison there of the square foot cost for the Riverview is \$150 a square foot, Riverview low, \$130 a square foot. Then your Courthouse add, three and four, between [\$]240 and \$235 a square foot, and then the new build, at \$300, or excuse me, \$320 a square foot. This is just another reminder, in 2018 CIP adopted, we had budgeted in 2019, \$16 million for a county administration building, then in three years, 2020 to 2022, [\$]7.5 [million] over that three year phase of doing expansion and*

*renovation. So I will turn this back over to the Manager."*

*Mr. Scholes said, "Alright, Commissioners. Again, back to the decision points. So the first one would be on the Riverview Building. Based off the analysis and the information that we have provided, is the Riverview Building a choice that the Commission would want us to follow to try to start that process of negotiation and getting to that contract. For me, as I mentioned earlier in the briefing, one of the critical tentative points that we were looking for in a new building was in terms of trying to find more square footage for a particular BoCC meeting room.*

*"The plates and the floor space that the Riverview Building allow for don't allow for any type of meaningful expansion. If we put it in there, there would be a lot of difficulty in terms of trying to fit the Commission in there and giving them an ability to even egress from that particular meeting room. So we're kind of land-locked into that plate over there without doing further renovation and further cost being added to it. The analysis on, if you look at the money and what you're getting as far as a bang for the buck, you potentially get everything that you want, build-to-suit, with a new build as opposed to fixing an old building and then trying to fit ourselves into that. Based off of that analysis, it would be my recommendation that we would say no to Riverview Building and look at the next two options."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you Mr. Manager. I need comments from the Commission on what you want to do first? We're going to take it one step at a time. We'll look at the Riverview Building and we'll go through the rest of the options, and so the first step is what do you want to do on Riverview? Commissioner Ranzau."*

*Commissioner Ranzau said, "Thank you Mr. Chairman. Well I've been skeptical of this project in general from the beginning. With that being said, I'm sorry, I have to disagree with the Manager wholeheartedly. I think clearly if you look at these, the best option is the Riverview Building.*

*"You get bigger bang for your buck, you get 90,000 square feet instead of 60 [thousand] or 50 [thousand] or 70 [thousand], lower cost per square foot. I mean even the high range of Riverview is lower than the others. Even at that, it's pretty high. I mean the reason for doing this was the Sheriff, D.A. and the Courts. The fact that we might want a bigger meeting room for us, was not a big driving factor as far as I'm concerned, it's minor. I mean, the vast majority of the time, we got mostly staff in here, and it would be a little bit bigger than what it is here, but we don't need a Taj Mahal here for the County Commission when it's vacant a vast majority of the time. So, not to mention, I mean, we don't need to have an early buyout, we actually would have incoming revenue from those people that are in there now. We could take that, set that aside, use that to apply towards all of our expenses of renovation, which would decrease our costs.*

*"I think we had talked about that if we were to go forward, we'd actually go back with a counteroffer, right now we're at [\$]7 million, but with all the things that need to be done, we try to buy it at a lower price. It has good parking, you don't have to build a new parking garage, you don't have to pay \$2 million. One of them, the highest one here, which is the new building, 345,000, I mean \$345 per square foot doesn't even include the cost of land acquisition, which I was briefed on, the City is asking \$2 million for that.*

*"So you look at all the cons that I see here for the Riverview Building, these are all very easily manageable, and then I look at the pros, 91,000 square feet, adequate parking,*



*(inaudible) for a well-maintained building, cost per square foot is, well, it can be [\$]100 to \$180 per square foot less. So I would not withdraw this one from consideration at all, if we want to get bang for our buck, we get the biggest building, the cheapest price that's still nice, and it looks good, it meets all our needs, and, you know, that's my thoughts. I mean, let's not turn down this whole building because we want a bigger meeting room for a couple of hours a week."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you."*

*Mr. Scholes said, "Commissioner that was just a component. It's the total totality of the cons, not just that particular point. That was certainly an added, I just wanted to highlight that."*

*Commissioner Ranzau said, "Well sure, but it's a very minor issue compared to the staff, to the space needs by the Sheriff, D.A., the Courts, etc. That was the driving factor so I would, it's not a big deal to me."*

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

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Manager, I would agree that we shouldn't completely put the kibosh on that, we need to keep it in discussion, keep it in the cue, in case we get to that point, because I have some thoughts when we get down to, I believe, the final bullet point is other options for Steve Martens, when we can talk about the Epic Center idea that I believe the Chairman brought to you in the past. So I would like to keep that Riverview alive for now."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. I don't see any other Commissioners that want to talk about this, but I don't think we've got a consensus either. Commissioner Unruh, let's talk about the Epic Center."*

*Commissioner Unruh said, "Well I don't want to interrupt you Mr. Chairman, if you want to make a comment."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Well I'll finish up. I was not hot on Riverview Building back when it was first presented, and that was one of the reasons I asked you to take a look at new construction. You're looking at a 35-year-old building, you're looking at a building that's all glass, I'm not convinced that 25 percent of the glass is all that you're going to have to replace. Thirty-five years ago, we didn't have all of the communications backbone in buildings that we've got today that are needed, that the Riverview Building was originally built as a building that had different clients on each floor. If Sedgwick County moves in, you've got one client for the entire building. That completely changes the direction of your communications infrastructure. You now have to have a backbone that serves the entire building rather than individual users on each floor, so that we can all communicate back and forth together."*

*"I've never been a big fan of the Riverview Building. When it came up before, I wanted us to move forward and look at it because a lot of people were excited about it, but at the same time I thought we ought to take a look at a new building. I think over the long run, if you look at a new building, your maintenance costs, your logistics, and my background is logistics, you take a look at something that you're not going to have to*

*perform any major maintenance on for a number of years that's going to be built that's energy-efficient rather than under standards that are 35 years old. I'm not in favor of keeping the Riverview Building.*

*"In addition, when you take an overlay of what we need for a Board of County Commissioner's room, and I understand what Commissioner Ranzau said, that we've been getting by with this little room here for some time, but if we're going to have something that is new or different, we ought to make sure that we meet the needs of every user, and that includes the Board of County Commissioners and it includes what we need for a meeting room for the Board of County Commissioners, and the Riverview Building does not meet the needs of a room to house Sedgwick County, the Board of County Commissioners.*

*"If I go back and look at what our forefathers have taken a look at in the past, all I have to do is look out my window first of all and take a look at the Courthouse that was built over 100 years ago, and it's still there. The building that we're in here today is 50 or 60 years old. If our forefathers had the foresight to get facilities for our citizens and for the workers in Sedgwick County and build two different buildings in order to be able to do that, and now we're looking at how that we can cut corners any direction that we can, and make do. I think that we probably ought to take a lesson from our forefathers and make sure that we do produce a product that is going to be around in the years to come so that they look back and they say what happened to the Commission in 2018 that they came up with this idea. So I don't support the Riverview Building. Commissioner Unruh."*

*Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you Mr. Chairman. Well I appreciate your comments, Mr. Chairman, and in summary, I'd say that I'm in agreement, that I think it's time to make a decision one way or another. I think some of these items we can eliminate to focus on things that are more of a possibility. But it seems to me that if we're going to invest this kind of money, we need to be considering a 50-year perspective on it and what do we want to have built that is going to last that length of time, be the most efficient for us, but satisfy the needs we have and an adequate County Commission meeting room I think is one of my high priorities.*

*"So I understand the Riverview Building is, in my opinion, really an outstanding building, it's a good building, I'd be proud to be there, except that I just don't think it accommodates a BoCC meeting room very well, and along with some of the other potential maintenance problems we might face, but we'll have those, I suppose, with any building. But I just hate to start off with a compromise, and it seems to me that that's what we'd be doing. So all that being said, I am willing to make a decision that we'll take it off our list of consideration and keep considering the two build possibilities that are before us. If we do that, I would like us to consider taking down what we've referred to as the annex and making a complete new structure there rather than trying to build a building, adding on to two pieces of an old building, and make a building that we can have an attractive front door to it.*

*"So I think we ought to perhaps look at that possibility as we consider the other location, and also, I'm not averse to discussing the possibility that Commissioner O'Donnell just brought up as far as being a partner in another building. So with all that said, the bottom line is if you want an opinion on whether or not to continue consideration of Riverview, I'm in favor of eliminating that from our consideration. That's all I have."*

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

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the presentation today from Tania and from Manager Scholes. Thank you for doing that. I've been spending a lot of time considering Riverview and we have a lot of data on that, but since we don't really have another direction at the moment, we've got a number of options, and I think these are some interesting options.

"I'm not against the idea of building new, but I think we don't have enough data yet to settle on any one option here. In fact, the couple of options that were not even mentioned yet, but Commissioner O'Donnell did mention it briefly, but there's potentially space in the Epic Center we could purchase and there's an existing parking garage we potentially could use. To me that's an interesting discussion. We ought to at least understand that before we, I guess we need to understand that deeply, you know, deeply is that really an option for us. I think there's potentially a space between the Epic Center and the option two that was presented this morning, this piece of land that could potentially be built upon. I think that's interesting, and whether that would open up parking in the existing parking garage to the west of that would be another interesting option.

"I understand the Murfin Complex, as it was considered, was a three building complex, and if we're not interested in the two smaller buildings there, I'm still interested potentially in the Murfin Building, but I don't think we got a bid from them regarding the single building, so I guess there's another option I'm interested in. So I guess my point is this, there's a number of things we have not looked at that I hate to take the one thing we understand the deepest off our list. We ought to keep it on the list. Unless something comes up as being a better deal, I think Riverview ought to stay on the table. I don't want to eliminate anything until we have a direction. I think we just say we understand it, where we're at, we're not interested right now, we're continuing to look.

"It's possible that the seller would want to lower the price to get our attention back. I don't know if they would do that or not, but if they're listening to this meeting, and I'm sure they probably are. If they know they've lost our interest because of these issues, maybe they would change their offering to us, for example. I don't know. But I hate to take the option off the table, when again, when you have these options on the table it creates more negotiation power to us to have a number of ways we can go, and there's things we don't understand right now that until we have a better direction to find I hate to take any option off the table, so I think Commissioner Ranzau made some good points. I hadn't thought of some of those points he made, I appreciate the discussion this morning. I'm not ready to take it off the list. I think we ought to keep it on the list. I think I'm less interested in it now than I was, because I think the problems are more significant than I realized before.

"I think the new build options are certainly interesting. But they are going to get expensive. In terms of the chart that was presented, I know this is probably not the time to discuss this, but based on what was presented, the least expensive option would be a new building, it would be option one, with three floors, not four. But that's only moving I think 53,000 square feet of new space. It would not move everything that's on that wish list. It's going to move I guess the most important functions that are in this building that we need to move out of this building. It would give a space for those, but it wouldn't move everything in our entire administration. It would leave some things across the street, but that would be a brand new building, it would be less utility cost, it'd be less cost per square foot. I think there's challenges in terms of an entrance. We ought to examine that and come up with an idea, how would we do that? If that's the direction we're headed, what would that look like.

*"Until I understand that, I don't want to take Riverview off the table. So again, I think it's premature to take anything off the table is my opinion, and I see the value of a new building. I understand the points that Commissioner Ranzau made, but I think it's just unnecessary to take anything off the table. Thank you Mr. Chairman."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. Mr. Manager, do we have funds that we have to pay outright now for an option to buy, if we ever wanted to buy the Riverview Building? Are we expending anything right now?"*

*Mr. Scholes said, "No, I don't think we're spending anything. We're not expending anything."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "So, if we would just leave it on the list, there would be no cost to us, just leave it on the list as something in the future, if the other options didn't pan out?"*

*Mr. Scholes said, "Well, my concern with that is, you know, the Riverview Building is a currently occupied building with multiple leases in there. They certainly want to know something sooner than later, and the owners of that building have at this point haven't been leasing any new renters because of the potential of us purchasing the building. So their life is on hold right now. So the sooner that we can make a decision for them, the better. So that is a complicating issue with the Riverview Building. You see based off of our list, they do have quite a few renters in that building."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Alright. I'm sorry, Mr. Yost."*

*Mr. Eric Yost, County Counselor, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Mr. Chairman, we do have the option up until a certain time but after that we've lost our option, and that is the end of May."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Are we paying anything for that option?"*

*Mr. Yost said, "No, we've already paid for that option."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "We've already paid for it."*

*Mr. Yost said, "Yeah."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "But at the end of May, if we wanted to continue an option, we'd have to pay again."*

*Mr. Yost said, "Right, if they wish to accept it. We'd have to renegotiate. I mean, I think at some point, we have to fish or cut bait."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "So you're telling me really on the Riverview Building, end of May is really a major decision point."*

*Mr. Yost said, "Yeah, and I think probably at some point, probably about the middle of May, because May 27th is our last day, and that's a Sunday."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Okay. Well right now it looks like we've got two commissioners, Commissioner Ranzau and Commissioner Howell that are interested in keeping it as an option. We've got two commissioners that don't think we ought to*

*keep it on the options, so I guess I'm going to have to turn it over Commissioner O'Donnell."*

*Commissioner Unruh said, "He wants to keep it."*

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Yeah, I want to keep it as an option."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "You do want to keep it as an option."*

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Yeah, absolutely."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Okay. Well, then I guess I'm going to have to ask the Commissioners at what point are we going to make a decision on it because we just heard from Mr. Yost that we got until the end of May to do something. Are you all ready to make a decision by the end of May, that we either buy it or we drop it off the list? Are we going to keep moving it down? Commissioner Howell."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "Mr. Chairman, I guess I need to understand the cost of the option, and look at our planned meeting schedule and find out when that decision must be made. I don't think we ought to make it prematurely, so if we can make that decision in the middle of May and the cost was relatively inexpensive, I guess I'd like to understand those details and make the decision at the appropriate time, but today may not be that day."*

*Mr. Yost said, "We've already paid for the option that takes us through May 27."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "But what is the cost?"*

*Mr. Yost said, "Any new option, I don't know what it would cost..."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "Okay."*

*Mr. Yost said, "...because we don't have that negotiated yet."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "Okay. Well I guess it was worth asking the question. If we don't exercise a new option or negotiate a new option, I guess we have until about the middle of May to still make a decision."*

*Mr. Yost said, "Correct."*

*Mr. Scholes said, "May 23rd would be the last BoCC meeting before that, it's May 23rd."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "I guess it would be my preference to not make a decision today but make it when we need to."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Okay. Commissioner Ranzau."*

*Commissioner Ranzau said, "Thank you. From my understanding of the meeting that we had a while back that started this process, we made a motion to enter into a contract with Riverview, do our due diligence, thinking that we would proceed to buy it unless we found, we looked at some other alternatives, new buildings to see if something was more cost-effective, we'd go that way. I guess my position is we haven't*

*found anything that's more cost-effective, they're actually more costly. Now I know the third floor new courthouse is a lower cost, an absolute lower cost, but price per square foot, and unless I'm looking at something different is, is actually higher. So I mean, in keeping with that, I thought we wanted, I'm certainly, I don't want to cross Riverview off, and I would have thought that the next step with Riverview was actually to make a counteroffer based upon our due diligence.*

*"We've got all those repairs and things, now we can go back and say well we got all this list to do, now here's what we think we can really afford to pay for it, and we'd make them and that offer based upon that and see, that's just more of the due diligence thing. So I would, if we're going to keep it on the list for the next month and a half, I wouldn't just stop. I would continue that process, because presumably that's one of the reasons why we did this stuff to see, to see what the costs were and all that sort of stuff. So that would be my take. I'd go back with a counteroffer, in addition to doing some of these, if you want to look at other options, that's fine, but to get down to the actual price that we can get the Riverview for, we need to keep going through that process, I would think."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Okay. Commissioner Howell."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just for clarification. I agree, it's the price per square foot is less, however, it's purchasing more than we need to actually solve our problem statement. Our problem statement is the Sheriff, the D.A. and the Courts here in this building need more space, and the 50,000 square foot that, option one would provide, is a smaller option. It doesn't meet the need that has been, not only that the problem statement has been met with that, the Riverview Building is less per square foot, but it's a 90,000 square foot building.*

**Received and Filed**

*"We would actually move more than is necessary to solve the problem statement, and it does create some unused space elsewhere in our county footprint that we'd have to find other uses for or something. So it creates, in my opinion, a little bit additional overhead for us to have more facility space than we need. So again, I'm not against the Riverview Building, certainly not, I'm not really advocating for option one, but I do want to make the point that the 53,000 square foot, that option one would provide, a three floor option would be enough space to solve the problem statement which is pushing us into this direction in the beginning is providing space for the Sheriff, the D.A. and the Court System that they desperately need. That's all. Thank you Mr. Chairman."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. Alright Mr. Manager, it looks like Riverview Building stays on until mid-May."*

*Mr. Scholes said, "Until May 23rd."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Alright. Commissioner Unruh."*

*Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you Mr. Chairman. I just want to clarify, the way that I took Commissioner Ranzau's comment was almost that we had made a decision to go forward on the Riverview and try to negotiate a better price. I want to make clear that that's not my position. I mean, we can leave it on for consideration, but I don't think that there's, have been any decisions by this Board that we're going to try to*

*move forward and nail down a hard price. Than just to reiterate, I think that if, well, I guess there's no need to say any more. Clearly the will of the Commission is that we leave it on the options list, but unless there is strong support for going that way, when we have other options to consider, it seems to me like we would be better in this business of negotiation to state our case and just keep it on and let the Riverview people go on about their business if we're not going to go that way. So that's all my comment."*

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

*Commissioner Ranzau said, "Yeah, just to clarify, I wasn't trying to say that was the decision we have made, but I would recommend that if we're going to keep it on, that we actually do that, otherwise, I mean it just makes sense, it's just more, it's part of the due diligence thing is to continue to negotiate. We paid for the option, we might as well use this time to make sure we get the lowest cost possible for this so that we can have a good number at the end of the six weeks. I mean, it wouldn't cost us, anything, really, to do this. It's just a matter of authorizing staff to go out and, you know, we hired a broker here to help us do that sort of stuff, and so we just say hey, continue the negotiations, and we're going to continue to look at other options."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Commissioner Unruh."*

*Commissioner Unruh said, "Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Manager, are we not at that point? Didn't we have Martens' Company talk to them, and tried to come to their best price? I thought that that had already been accomplished."*

*Mr. Scholes said, "Well, we have not gone back to them once we've done the due diligence. In finding out what we did to go back to them and try to negotiate a better price. We got the best price that started the due diligence process."*

*Commissioner Unruh said, "Alright, thank you."*

*Commissioner Ranzau said, "I'll just say, and I'm saying this because that's what I was briefed, that the next step, that we want to proceed, we then go back and make a counteroffer based upon what we find out in our due diligence, and I would encourage us to do that."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Okay, but we have not agreed as a Board of County Commissioners, to accept or to proffer any counteroffer that I'm aware of for them to accept."*

*Commissioner Ranzau said, "No. That's what I'm saying. Today, I would encourage us to tell staff that as a result of the due diligence, and we haven't taken it off the board that we tell them to continue the process with our broker to make that counteroffer based on what our due diligence."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Us to make a counteroffer or them? Because I'm not ready..."*

*Commissioner Ranzau said, "I'm just going by what I was told that we would probably go back to them and say hey, this is what we found, here's what we would counter. That being said, how we do that is what we have a broker for. But that's why I was briefed that would be the next step, if we kept it on the list, and I think we should do that. I mean, that's what you'd do if you were buying a house, and you had an*

*inspection, you had a bunch of stuff listed out and you go back and say okay we found these things. I want you to fix this, that and the other and maybe reduce the price, that's part of the process. I'm just saying if we want to keep it on the list with our options, let's not just stop what we're doing, let's follow through it, you know, and let our broker help us out with that."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "But we have other options, so I am not ready to go back with a counteroffer and say will you accept this and then drop all the other options, Commissioner."*

*Commissioner Unruh said, "Well, I was just going to say that the discussion kind of assumes that if we get the right price we'll buy the Riverview Building, and I don't think we've come to the conclusion, I mean, there might be some of us that we don't care what the price is, we don't think that fits our needs long term. I guess that's where I am."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Okay."*

*Mr. Scholes said, "I think it would be clearer if we started in the negotiations with them and we got to an acceptable price, that their belief would be that we would then buy the building. We'd almost be locked into it. So I think it's just something to consider. I don't want to negotiate in bad faith."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Commissioner Howell."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "Just since we're clarifying our opinions, I guess I would say that the price is an issue for me. If the price was significantly less, I don't know what that means, but if it was more interesting to us I would be interested in getting more serious about that, but right now as it sits I'm not as serious. They need to get our attention. But there probably is a number they can come down to that I would say absolutely I'm very interested at this point, so I'm not going to, there's nothing being presented today that is not something we can't solve in terms of the maintenance issues. They're all solvable. The biggest downside is probably the size of the Commission room, but we've had this Commission room 50 years, you know."*

*"This is, it's not ideal, but it's a small concession for millions of dollars of savings to the taxpayer. We rarely fill this room up. A couple of times since I've been here, we've used the overflow room. So again, it's not ideal, but it is usable. Most of the time it meets our needs. So I don't know if I want to spend millions of dollars to solve a problem that only happens a couple of times in over a four year term. So to me, if the price is significantly more interesting, I'm absolutely going to be interested in that building. I'm not going to discount the building because of that issue. The other issues, the maintenance issues, are all solvable, but together, as it sits right now, all those things piling up, it's not interesting to me right now, but it can certainly get my interest if they would change the price significantly. Thank you."*

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

*Commissioner Ranzau said, "I guess I don't necessarily think that, I don't know how we do it. We don't necessarily have to make a counteroffer I guess. We just take the information back to them and see if they have a different number they'd like to put on there. I don't know. I mean, if we're going to go back to the City and ask how much money they'll be willing to sell it for and kind of look at those numbers, we could go back to them and say well, here's what we found, is there anything else you have to*



offer.

*"I just wouldn't stop the process because we paid, you know, to do this. This wasn't in our, wouldn't fit our long term needs. I'm not sure why we voted several weeks ago to even go down this road. But let's not stop the process on this building if we're going to go forward with others. There's going to be ongoing discussions and talks with other options, let's continue the discussions with this. Maybe it's not in the form of us making a formal counteroffer, but it's just letting them know we'd be willing to entertain any suggestions they might have."*

Chairman Dennis said, "Okay. Well, what we do know is the Riverview Building is still an option."

Mr. Scholes said, "Correct."

Chairman Dennis said, "The next two together are really one possible option, and that's to build a new building. I do believe that we need to pursue both of those and find out what the best one of those two, if there is a best one, or whether we should continue to pursue either one of those. But I don't want to take either one of those off the table right now, and I look for the other Commissioners to see if they concur. Commissioner O'Donnell."

Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Thank you Mr. Chairman. Yes I concur with you that we should look at building as an option in those two locations, whether it's on the campus or if we can negotiate a price from the City, but I know also in part of your discussions with me, there was even a discussion about building a new one next to the Epic Center. Is that correct?"

Chairman Dennis said, "That's correct."

Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Okay. So let's keep these alive."

Chairman Dennis said, "Okay. Commissioner Ranzau."

Commissioner Ranzau said, "Personally, I would eliminate the most expensive one that requires us to build a parking garage and buy land. If we want to build a new building, we should do it here because we already have the land, we already have the parking garage. That adds cost and complications that are unnecessary, and it is the most expensive option with not even including the land acquisition than all of it. So I would just, I'm not sure, I mean I would dismiss the most cost-effective one and focus on some of these others."

Chairman Dennis said, "Well, thank you. Any other comments? I like both of those options. I don't want to remove either one of them. I know that the one at Third and Main is the most expensive of the two, but it's more expensive because a parking garage is required. Now, there's a whole bunch of employees that won't like what I'm going to say next, but if they've ever been stationed at the Pentagon or StratComm (Strategic Communications) or any place like that, a block and a half is a really nice walk. You'd fight for a parking lot with a block and a half away, and we have a huge parking garage right here where if we built a block and a half from that parking garage, there is not a necessity for a new parking garage down there, truly."

"Now I know that we live in Wichita where we're used to walking 20 feet from parking to

*our place of business, but I think if we keep the option of Third and Main, and I don't know what that'd even cost.*

*"I don't know what it would cost to buy that piece of property from Wichita, or if they're even interested in selling it, but I would also keep that in mind, that we do not need a parking garage at Third and Main. Anybody that can't walk a block and a half to work, that's just not acceptable in my mind that we're going to even consider \$18,000 a parking stall to keep people from having to walk a block and a half. Anyway I'd like to keep both of those on there. If someone convinces me the parking garage, and that's the direction we go, is a necessity, why, I'll keep an open mind on it. But right now, I don't consider a parking garage a high priority. Commissioner Howell."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you Mr. Chairman. I do think we ought to keep all of these options moving forward. I think option one and option two are worthy to explore or maybe to develop a little bit further. But on option one, I think there's, you know, there's a three floor option, there's a four floor option, there's a raze the annex or replace that option, those all three need to be I guess developed, not just one of those three but all three of those need to be developed. Then the entrance issue, the entrance to the building, which I guess is probably one of the biggest concerns, is how do you access the building. I think we need to try to solve that with option one, with the three or four floor options, and so I think that really is going to be a key whether or not the annex can stay in place or needs to be part of the reconstruction here. So I'm open to the idea of having these new options all brought to us."*

*"Again, Commissioner O'Donnell, I agree with what he said, I think that the area next to the Epic Center needs to be explored as well. So there's five construction options that need to be explored for us to figure out a direction going forward. I don't know how we're going to solve that the next four weeks, but I don't want to take any of those off the table. I do agree with Chairman Dennis. I'm not interested in a parking garage at all. I think that needs to not be part of our consideration. So to me, that option two requires a parking garage, it's losing my interest because of that alone. That land is probably, as Commissioner Ranzau said, probably \$2 million, plus another \$5 million for a parking garage, that is, in my opinion, that's almost more expensive than doing almost anything over here in option one. So I think option two is probably going to eliminate itself due to high cost, if a parking garage is required. Thank you Mr. Chairman."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. Further discussion? Commissioner Ranzau."*

*Commissioner Ranzau said, "Just one last request. Could you send us all this stuff electronically..."*

*Mr. Scholes said, "Sure."*

*Commissioner Ranzau said, "...the preparation or the presentation from today, and then the stuff we received in the packet?"*

*Mr. Scholes said, "I think Tonia was going to put a place on the web to dump all the information."*

*Commissioner Ranzau said, "All that, okay. Thank you."*

*Mr. Scholes said, "The final item on there was just other options. You mentioned the Epic Center multiple times. It's something that we were approached, you know, almost*

*in the preliminary fashion. We do have Steve here. Anything that we want to do on the other side, we'll put Steve on it as our broker to help get him into a process to start flushing out that particular option that we can bring back to you. So from my understanding, is by May 23rd, at that BoCC meeting, we will bring you the same options and flush out the other options and provide a little more clarity to the new build options. So we really haven't made a decision today except to continue studying and bring you back some more flushed out options at the May 23rd meeting, if that's correct."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "We have agreement that on May 23rd, we're only going to discuss these options. We're not going to start adding other things unless does Mr. Martens have anything else that you think we ought to be adding to this."*

*Mr. Scholes said, "So we would focus on the Epic Center as a course of action."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Okay, my only concern is we can keep adding options and eventually never make a decision."*

*Mr. Scholes said, "That is correct. I was hoping to narrow down those options today, but..."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Commissioner Howell."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "Well to that point, thank you Mr. Chairman, to that point, you know, it's been my preference for years, the way we would do this. We need to define our real requirements, and we would exercise a process, we would look at all the options we can think of over some period of time and then we would simply rate those things and then drive towards what are the best choices. That's really not what we're doing here. I'm okay with where we're at right now, but I think this brings to us the same challenge, we don't know what we don't know, and it seems like there's always more options out there to consider, and it's hard to make a decision, this is the best option, let's move in that direction, when there's things we haven't explored.*

*"So I still like a process, if we were going to define our requirements and really put everything on the table at the same time, it helps to say these are all the options we can think of, let's pick one of these options and go in that direction, because that's really all there is. This really isn't as process-driven as I would like, but I guess that ship has sailed. I would ask though, I hate to add one more thing to your list of things to do, but I really think we need to talk to Mr. Murfin as well and find out what is his actual price for that building. Because I'm not interested in the 120 North Main or the building across the street or the bank building, but I am interested in the, I think it's the six floor Murfin Building.*

*"We don't have an estimate of what he would want to sell that for. He's been involved in this, but it was a complex, not really a smaller decision. If we can move 50,000 square feet of space, that building more than satisfies, I think it's what, 65,000, I forget."*

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "70,000."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "70,000 square feet, it more than satisfies our needs, we would fit comfortably in that building. I think the meeting room issue is not as big of an issue there in my opinion. I've walked through that building. I think it's something we ought to consider that. You know, in terms of we're looking at Epic Center and we're looking at potentially Riverview, he might come back with a different interesting offer,*

*perhaps, and I don't know why we wouldn't add Murfin to that list and say what is your actual price of that or do you want to get our attention with a good offer or not, and if he comes in with an interesting offer, I'd like to have that on our list of things to consider. But anyway, so I'd just like to say please consider that as well, add that to the list of things to explore before you come back next month. Thank you Mr. Chairman."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Before I turn it over to Commissioner O'Donnell, I do have a problem with the Murfin complex from a security standpoint. Where it, I think it's Second Street that runs right along where the potential of a meeting room would be. There's no capability of putting bollards along the street to protect the side of the building where we would be holding our meetings. Even if there was a large truck going down through there and just had an accident, not some type of an attack, there's no way of protecting that side of that building whatsoever. I think that in today's life, go look at the new building across the street for the City, and it's completely surrounded by bollards for a reason, and we have to recognize the times that we live in. If you cannot protect the folks in that building because of the configuration of it along Second Street, I don't think that it's even close to a viable solution. Anyway, Commissioner O'Donnell."*

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Thank you Mr. Chairman. I would just say that if we could get Mr. Martens to look at any of these options, whether it's go to the Epic Center, talk to Mr. Murphin, whatever the options are, let him look for options for us and he can bring them back at that meeting next month. He is a professional, he understands that. One of the compelling issues for me is that there is a lot of space available in downtown Wichita. Now most of those buildings aren't for sale or they have different tenants in it, but if there is an opportunity to keep the cost down, I ran on a platform of fiscal conservatism, as I know everyone on this panel did, looking for the cheapest end, while the most efficient for what we need in options. That's why I want to keep Riverview alive, because with its square footage it still is a pretty efficient building dollar for dollar."*

*"So I'm just saying if we give Mr. Martens a month to look at some other options to bring them back to us, then we can have that second meeting and start taking things off, because I'm open to looking at a new building but I'm also open to looking to see if Mr. [Phil] Ruffin would sell us square footage in the Epic Center.  
"If it's there and available, we can move in soon, I think that's a strong option as well. So, and I'm open to the Third and Main as well. So I'm not picking one thing other than just saying we need to have a few options."*

*Mr. Scholes said, "If I could make one statement in reference to the Murphin Complex, we somewhat discounted that at the last meeting because there were several variables and some limitations and constraints that if you look at the Riverview Building, you would certainly be able to transfer some of that just because it's an old building and again, we would probably find some things just like we did in the Riverview Building that we would have to repair. But also, it's a smaller building. It's about 20,000, or even less than that, it's yeah, about 20,000 square feet less. We would face even a smaller area to put the BoCC room in their basement and also the parking situation there. We would have to come up with a parking solution, and it is also farther away from this campus, and if we didn't build a parking garage, we would have to come up with a creative solution. So for long term that may not be the best option, but we can certainly give it a go again if the Commission wants us to keep that on the plate."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Well I see nothing else. With that, I would entertain a motion*

*to receive in file."*

**MOTION**

*Commissioner Howell moved to receive and file.*

*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, "I want to thank Schafer Johnson Cox and Frey and Steve Martens for all the work you've done up to this point. I hope that someday we can make a decision."*

*Commissioner Ranzau said, "At least we agreed on receiving and file."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "We did. 5-0. Joe, you got some good words for us today?"  
Mr. Joe Thomas, Director of Purchasing Department, greeted the Commissioners and said, "I hope so sir."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Okay."*

*Mr. Thomas said, "I assume I'm the next item."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Madam Clerk, next item, I'm sorry."*

**F**      [18-299](#)

**REPORT OF THE BOARD OF BIDS AND CONTRACTS' REGULAR  
MEETING ON APRIL 5, 2018.**

**Presented by: Joe Thomas, Director, Purchasing.**

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

*Mr. Thomas said, "The meeting that was conducted on April 5th for the Board of Bids  
and Contracts, we have one item to present for.*

**1. ROAD IMPROVEMENTS -- PUBLIC WORKS  
FUNDING -- R175 PREVENTIVE MX-16+**

*"The recommendation is to accept the bid from Cutler Repaving, Inc. in the amount of  
\$1,297,167.17.*

*"I'll be happy to try to answer any questions you may have, and I do recommend  
approval of this item."*

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

*Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just curious, I was reading the backup material on this. I see there was 46 vendors were solicited. Did you only get one bid back?"*

*Mr. Thomas said, "Yes, sir. What this particular process, Cutler Repaving has the only piece of equipment, it's a custom-built piece of equipment that can do this. The reason we continue to send it out to that list of vendors is that we're hoping that eventually there may be another entrant into that type of work, if they do build a machine."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "My question is these other companies, they certainly do, you know, asphalt rejuvenation. They have other processes in place that they might do them that would be different than this one I'm curious, was our spec for this specific process that would eliminate anything else to be considered in how to get this done?"*

*Mr. Thomas said, "Mr. Spears."*

*Mr. David Spears, Assistant County Manager of Public Works, Facilities Maintenance, Project Services and County Engineer, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Commissioner Howell, this process is just one of our tools in our toolbox for preventative maintenance. We've used this company for about 20 years. They do not any longer have a patent on the machine. Anybody can make the machine and use it. I will say that where we use this, for example, we used it in your district last June, on 63rd Street, if you recall. This year, we're going to do the other half of that from Greenwich Road over to the county line. We used it last year on 13th Street up north, and we were going to use it on Central Street this year, from 127th to the county line, and then we're also going to use it on the main street in Garden Plain this year.*

*"So it's not a large amount of road, but they're four lane. So you have a lot of lane miles. We generally put them on curb and gutter roads, and what they do is they mill off an inch of the pavement and they put back two inches. They put the inch that they milled off, recycle, plus an inch of virgin material and they mill in such a way that when they come down to the gutter line, it's flush with the gutter. In other words, the asphalt doesn't go over the gutter which could mess up the drainage. We like the process. Like I say, we use it mainly on the curb and gutter roads. Commissioner O'Donnell, you might remember we used it in Clearwater last year. We had a lot of good compliments on that. Commissioner Ranzau, we used it up on Meridian before south of Valley Center. In fact Valley Center used them also.*

*"We used out by Spirit [AeroSystems] on MacArthur Road and on Oliver. So it really looks good when it's finished, and we'd highly recommend going on with it. I will say the other thing is that the unique thing about it is that they use a lot of subcontractors. Fifty-six percent of what they do, where all the asphalt comes from local, all the grinding or milling is local, all the trucking is local. So they do utilize that. Their employees, they move around to different, you know, cities in this region. Their employees stay in either hotels or R.V. (recreational vehicle) parks, some of them have their families, and they, you know, of course, they're buying food and that sort of thing. So we like the process. It's just one of our tools. Like I say, we use it on curb and gutter roads."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "I appreciate the answer, but I guess my question was if it wasn't for this particular company providing this particular process, these other 46*

*companies have ways they can do some, I mean they all have, I would assume there's other companies that can provide some kind of process to rejuvenate a road without replacing the road. I mean, is this the only company that can do something? I guess if we spec'd out this exact process, you're only going to get the one answer."*

*Mr. Spears said, "This is the only company in this region. There are other companies in the United States that also do the same thing. It is unique, though. Not many will grind off an inch and put back that inch plus another inch of virgin materials. I don't know the 46 companies that Joe sent it out to, and maybe none of those even do any type of this process. I think they just send it out to a lot of contractors."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "Well anyway, I just want to make, I know they do a great job and I'm glad to see this done. Last year they did a great job on the areas you just already described. I'm glad to see some more roads in my district getting this done as well. I know it does look fantastic and they do a great job. To that extent, I'm happy for this, but it is about \$245,000 for a mile, and if we spec'd out the exact process, we simply didn't, I guess I would say, you know, my preference would be for us not to define the process as much but just simply say we want this end result and how they get there is less interesting to me than exactly how they do it. So the cost is fairly high. It's \$245,000 a square mile."*

*Mr. Spears said, "But they're four lane miles. They're not just the two lane miles, they're four lane miles."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "Right, I understand that. Anyway, I'll support this this time, but I guess I'm just, I would like to consider, you know, maybe having other discussions with other companies and find out, you know, how do they, how would they attack this problem if it wasn't for this exact company providing this exact service. There's got to be other ways to do this, I would think. Just a thought. That's all my questions, but I'll be willing to make a motion here in a minute, Mr. Chairman."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Okay, thank you. Do I see any other comments? Mr. Spears, when you're trying to convince all the Commissioners to vote for something, you ought to tell them you're going to do something in Commissioner Unruh's district or my district too okay. Just a thought."*

*Mr. Spears said, "Did you notice that?"*

*Chairman Dennis said, "I noticed that, but you did guarantee you got three votes."*

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Not necessarily."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Not necessarily, oh, just a side comment. Sorry about that. Anyway, I see no other comments."*

#### **MOTION**

*Commissioner Howell moved to approve the recommendations of the Board of Bids and Contracts.*

*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, "We have an off-agenda item. Are you aware of that Madam Clerk? Very good, call the next item then please."

Ms. Lynda Baker, Deputy County Clerk, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Do we need to take a vote to take up an off-agenda item?"

Chairman Dennis said, "Okay, I'm sorry."

MOTION

Commissioner Dennis moved to take up an off-agenda item to reconsider the report of the Board of Bids and Contracts' meeting on March 29, 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, "Alright Joe, you're back on."

Mr. Thomas said, "Yes sir. As you mentioned Mr. Chairman, this was an item that originally we brought to you last week, with the recommendation this is for the actuarial and broker review services for the health care plan, and that original recommendation was to accept the best proposal from IMA Inc. As instructed by the Commissioners, we were instructed to have the evaluation committee reconvene and review its decision, particularly in the light of the cost difference between the recommended proposer IMA and Gallagher, which was about a difference of \$10,000.

"But before I go into the actual results of that committee meeting, I just want to give a very brief history of two of the tools that we use in our procurement tool kit, and you're probably familiar with them. The first one of course is our bid process, and when we issue bids, we have a very clearly defined group of specifications. When we send those bids out, we get the bids returned, we look at the low price meeting the specifications. In that case, we do not use an evaluation committee. The process is the buyer, the Purchasing Director and the user departments. In this case, we have what's known as a proposal, which is another tool that we have, and basically proposals are issued in order to find a solution to a particular issue or problem that we have.



*"We don't have clearly defined specifications because we depend on the proposer's hopefully creativity, maybe saving time, saving expense, and so these requests are made and we get these back. The way we can evaluate a proposal is that we usually set a group of criterion which becomes a set of evaluation criteria that is then given maximum points for each criterion and a total. That way, when the proposals come back, each individual, and now we establish an evaluation committee. Each individual on the evaluation committee reviews those proposals individually, then we come together as a group to review those proposals in our scoring and it's at that time we look at outliers and other issues that may result in us altering or changing our score to reach a final decision, or we ask for further presentations from the supplier, proposer or best and final offer.*

*"So in this case as the proposal was reviewed, the committee had given you the scores, and the scores between IMA and Gallagher was a one point difference, very close between the two proposers. After meeting, we decided what we want to do, and you had the macro view of the one point. We wanted to drill down and give you the actual point differences in each of the criteria that the six evaluators came up with. We thought maybe that would also help you see how we evaluated both proposals.*

*"The first criteria was the firm's experience with public sector entities, and that had a maximum of 15 points. IMA received 12.83 score, whereas Gallagher received the full 15 points, so they were superior in that particular criterion, judged that way. The second criterion was the demonstrated ability of the key personnel. This was very close. IMA had a score of, excuse me, the maximum points was 20, IMA had a score of 19.5 and Gallagher had 19.17, just a third of a point difference between the two. The next two points, demonstration, third one demonstration of understanding the scope of services to be provided. Here's where the difference was pronounced in favor of IMA. IMA's scoring out of the 20 points was 19.67 and Gallagher's was 16.33 or a difference of 3.34 points.*

*"The fourth item was the process and strategy for providing the required services, and that was a 25 point maximum. IMA had a 24.5 score and Gallagher had a 20-point score, a 4.5 difference. Then the final one was the cost, which is important, and the competitiveness of the cost, and after a best and final offer was requested, IMA scored out of the 20 points 15, and Gallagher who had the lowest price scored the full 20 points.*

*"So that gives you an idea of the individual scores which were a little further apart in certain areas, in particular, for Gallagher, in favor of their public sector experience, as well as their costs, made them a better proposal, but in the case of IMA, it was the ability, excuse me, the ability of the key personnel, understanding the scope, and also the process and strategy. So after considering this and looking at the scores again, the evaluation committee felt that IMA's specificity in the areas of understanding the scope of services to create a process and strategy was well worth the difference of price between the two proposals. So with that being said, sir, or sirs, the recommendation is to remain with the original proposal of recommendation which is with IMA Inc., and that is in the amount of \$40,000 for one year with a one year option to renew. So I'd be happy to answer any additional questions you may have, but that is the results of our reconvening."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Well thank you very much, and I want to thank the evaluation team, the Board of Bids and Contracts folks for going back and taking a look at it*

*again. You know, I was one of the ones, and Commissioner Ranzau had some significant concerns about one point difference and whether or not that that was worth \$10,000. None of the board members that I'm aware of have read these proposals. We rely on the different people to read them and to evaluate those, and then we rely on the Board of Bids and Contracts to validate that and make us a recommendation. Last week when we heard this, our concern was one point and whether that was worth \$10,000 and that was what we asked you all to go back and take a look at. Again, we respect very much each one of the people that did the evaluation and each one of the members of the Board of Bids and Contracts that validated that. I am certainly, again, my concern was the one point and \$10,000, that's what we asked to you look at. You validated that your decision was the right decision, and therefore I will support that.*

**MOTION**

*Commissioner Dennis moved to approve the recommendation of the report of the Board of Bids and Contracts' meeting on March 29, 2018.*

*Commissioner Unruh seconded the motion.*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Commissioner Ranzau."*

*Commissioner Ranzau said, "I'll just say I remain unconvinced that we should go with the more expensive one. I think they're both capable of doing it, and a 25 percent price difference is significant to me."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Further discussion?"*

*Commissioner Ranzau said, "I have looked at the proposal."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. Any further discussion?"*

**VOTE**

<i>Commissioner O'Donnell II</i>	<i>Aye</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>

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

*Chairman Dennis said, "Again, thank you all very much for doing that for us. I appreciate it. Madam Clerk, next item."*

**Approved**

[18-331](#)

RECONSIDERATION OF 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.

Mr. Thomas said, "The meeting that was conducted on April 5th for the Board of Bids and Contracts, we have one item to present for.

1. ROAD IMPROVEMENTS -- PUBLIC WORKS  
FUNDING -- R175 PREVENTIVE MX-16+

"The recommendation is to accept the bid from Cutler Repaving, Inc. in the amount of \$1,297,167.17.

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

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

Commissioner Howell said, "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just curious, I was reading the backup material on this. I see there was 46 vendors were solicited. Did you only get one bid back?"

Mr. Thomas said, "Yes, sir. What this particular process, Cutler Repaving has the only piece of equipment, it's a custom-built piece of equipment that can do this. The reason we continue to send it out to that list of vendors is that we're hoping that eventually there may be another entrant into that type of work, if they do build a machine."

Commissioner Howell said, "My question is these other companies, they certainly do, you know, asphalt rejuvenation. They have other processes in place that they might do them that would be different than this one I'm curious, was our spec for this specific process that would eliminate anything else to be considered in how to get this done?"

Mr. Thomas said, "Mr. Spears."

Mr. David Spears, Assistant County Manager of Public Works, Facilities Maintenance, Project Services and County Engineer, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Commissioner Howell, this process is just one of our tools in our toolbox for preventative maintenance. We've used this company for about 20 years. They do not any longer have a patent on the machine. Anybody can make the machine and use it. I will say that where we use this, for example, we used it in your district last June, on 63rd Street, if you recall. This year, we're going to do the other half of that from Greenwich Road over to the county line. We used it last year on 13th Street up north, and we were going to use it on Central Street this year, from 127th to the county line, and then we're also going to use it on the main street in Garden Plain this year.

"So it's not a large amount of road, but they're four lane. So you have a lot of lane miles. We generally put them on curb and gutter roads, and what they do is they mill off an inch of the pavement and they put back two inches. They put the inch that they milled off, recycle, plus an inch of virgin material and they mill in such a way that when they come down to the gutter line, it's flush with the gutter. In other words, the asphalt doesn't go over the gutter which could mess up the drainage. We like the process. Like I say, we use it mainly on the curb and gutter roads. Commissioner O'Donnell, you might remember we used it in Clearwater last year. We had a lot of good compliments on that. Commissioner Ranzau, we used it up on Meridian before south of Valley Center. In fact Valley Center used them also.

"We used out by Spirit [AeroSystems] on MacArthur Road and on Oliver. So it really

*looks good when it's finished, and we'd highly recommend going on with it. I will say the other thing is that the unique thing about it is that they use a lot of subcontractors. Fifty-six percent of what they do, where all the asphalt comes from local, all the grinding or milling is local, all the trucking is local. So they do utilize that. Their employees, they move around to different, you know, cities in this region. Their employees stay in either hotels or R.V. (recreational vehicle) parks, some of them have their families, and they, you know, of course, they're buying food and that sort of thing. So we like the process. It's just one of our tools. Like I say, we use it on curb and gutter roads."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "I appreciate the answer, but I guess my question was if it wasn't for this particular company providing this particular process, these other 46 companies have ways they can do some, I mean they all have, I would assume there's other companies that can provide some kind of process to rejuvenate a road without replacing the road. I mean, is this the only company that can do something? I guess if we spec'd out this exact process, you're only going to get the one answer."*

*Mr. Spears said, "This is the only company in this region. There are other companies in the United States that also do the same thing. It is unique, though. Not many will grind off an inch and put back that inch plus another inch of virgin materials. I don't know the 46 companies that Joe sent it out to, and maybe none of those even do any type of this process. I think they just send it out to a lot of contractors."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "Well anyway, I just want to make, I know they do a great job and I'm glad to see this done. Last year they did a great job on the areas you just already described. I'm glad to see some more roads in my district getting this done as well. I know it does look fantastic and they do a great job. To that extent, I'm happy for this, but it is about \$245,000 for a mile, and if we spec'd out the exact process, we simply didn't, I guess I would say, you know, my preference would be for us not to define the process as much but just simply say we want this end result and how they get there is less interesting to me than exactly how they do it. So the cost is fairly high. It's \$245,000 a square mile."*

*Mr. Spears said, "But they're four lane miles. They're not just the two lane miles, they're four lane miles."*

*Commissioner Howell said, "Right, I understand that. Anyway, I'll support this this time, but I guess I'm just, I would like to consider, you know, maybe having other discussions with other companies and find out, you know, how do they, how would they attack this problem if it wasn't for this exact company providing this exact service. There's got to be other ways to do this, I would think. Just a thought. That's all my questions, but I'll be willing to make a motion here in a minute, Mr. Chairman."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Okay, thank you. Do I see any other comments? Mr. Spears, when you're trying to convince all the Commissioners to vote for something, you ought to tell them you're going to do something in Commissioner Unruh's district or my district too okay. Just a thought."*

*Mr. Spears said, "Did you notice that?"*

*Chairman Dennis said, "I noticed that, but you did guarantee you got three votes."*

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Not necessarily."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Not necessarily, oh, just a side comment. Sorry about that. Anyway, I see no other comments."*

**MOTION**

*Commissioner Howell moved to approve the recommendations of the Board of Bids and Contracts.*

*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, "We have an off-agenda item. Are you aware of that Madam Clerk? Very good, call the next item then please."*

*Ms. Lynda Baker, Deputy County Clerk, greeted the Commissioners and said, "Do we need to take a vote to take up an off-agenda item?"*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Okay, I'm sorry."*

**MOTION**

*Commissioner Dennis moved to take up an off-agenda item to reconsider the report of the Board of Bids and Contracts' meeting on March 29, 2018.*

*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, "Alright Joe, you're back on."*

*Mr. Thomas said, "Yes sir. As you mentioned Mr. Chairman, this was an item that originally we brought to you last week, with the recommendation this is for the actuarial and broker review services for the health care plan, and that original recommendation was to accept the best proposal from IMA Inc. As instructed by the Commissioners, we were instructed to have the evaluation committee reconvene and review its decision,*

*particularly in the light of the cost difference between the recommended proposer IMA and Gallagher, which was about a difference of \$10,000.*

*"But before I go into the actual results of that committee meeting, I just want to give a very brief history of two of the tools that we use in our procurement tool kit, and you're probably familiar with them. The first one of course is our bid process, and when we issue bids, we have a very clearly defined group of specifications. When we send those bids out, we get the bids returned, we look at the low price meeting the specifications. In that case, we do not use an evaluation committee. The process is the buyer, the Purchasing Director and the user departments. In this case, we have what's known as a proposal, which is another tool that we have, and basically proposals are issued in order to find a solution to a particular issue or problem that we have.*

*"We don't have clearly defined specifications because we depend on the proposer's hopefully creativity, maybe saving time, saving expense, and so these requests are made and we get these back. The way we can evaluate a proposal is that we usually set a group of criterion which becomes a set of evaluation criteria that is then given maximum points for each criterion and a total. That way, when the proposals come back, each individual, and now we establish an evaluation committee. Each individual on the evaluation committee reviews those proposals individually, then we come together as a group to review those proposals in our scoring and it's at that time we look at outliers and other issues that may result in us altering or changing our score to reach a final decision, or we ask for further presentations from the supplier, proposer or best and final offer.*

*"So in this case as the proposal was reviewed, the committee had given you the scores, and the scores between IMA and Gallagher was a one point difference, very close between the two proposers. After meeting, we decided what we want to do, and you had the macro view of the one point. We wanted to drill down and give you the actual point differences in each of the criteria that the six evaluators came up with. We thought maybe that would also help you see how we evaluated both proposals.*

*"The first criteria was the firm's experience with public sector entities, and that had a maximum of 15 points. IMA received 12.83 score, whereas Gallagher received the full 15 points, so they were superior in that particular criterion, judged that way. The second criterion was the demonstrated ability of the key personnel. This was very close. IMA had a score of, excuse me, the maximum points was 20, IMA had a score of 19.5 and Gallagher had 19.17, just a third of a point difference between the two. The next two points, demonstration, third one demonstration of understanding the scope of services to be provided. Here's where the difference was pronounced in favor of IMA. IMA's scoring out of the 20 points was 19.67 and Gallagher's was 16.33 or a difference of 3.34 points.*

*"The fourth item was the process and strategy for providing the required services, and that was a 25 point maximum. IMA had a 24.5 score and Gallagher had a 20-point score, a 4.5 difference. Then the final one was the cost, which is important, and the competitiveness of the cost, and after a best and final offer was requested, IMA scored out of the 20 points 15, and Gallagher who had the lowest price scored the full 20 points.*

*"So that gives you an idea of the individual scores which were a little further apart in certain areas, in particular, for Gallagher, in favor of their public sector experience, as well as their costs, made them a better proposal, but in the case of IMA, it was the*

*ability, excuse me, the ability of the key personnel, understanding the scope, and also the process and strategy. So after considering this and looking at the scores again, the evaluation committee felt that IMA's specificity in the areas of understanding the scope of services to create a process and strategy was well worth the difference of price between the two proposals. So with that being said, sir, or sirs, the recommendation is to remain with the original proposal of recommendation which is with IMA Inc., and that is in the amount of \$40,000 for one year with a one year option to renew. So I'd be happy to answer any additional questions you may have, but that is the results of our reconvening."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Well thank you very much, and I want to thank the evaluation team, the Board of Bids and Contracts folks for going back and taking a look at it again. You know, I was one of the ones, and Commissioner Ranzau had some significant concerns about one point difference and whether or not that that was worth \$10,000. None of the board members that I'm aware of have read these proposals. We rely on the different people to read them and to evaluate those, and then we rely on the Board of Bids and Contracts to validate that and make us a recommendation. Last week when we heard this, our concern was one point and whether that was worth \$10,000 and that was what we asked you all to go back and take a look at. Again, we respect very much each one of the people that did the evaluation and each one of the members of the Board of Bids and Contracts that validated that. I am certainly, again, my concern was the one point and \$10,000, that's what we asked to you look at. You validated that your decision was the right decision, and therefore I will support that."*

**MOTION**

*Commissioner Dennis moved to approve the recommendation of the report of the Board of Bids and Contracts' meeting on March 29, 2018.*

*Commissioner Unruh seconded the motion.*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Commissioner Ranzau."*

*Commissioner Ranzau said, "I'll just say I remain unconvinced that we should go with the more expensive one. I think they're both capable of doing it, and a 25 percent price difference is significant to me."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Further discussion?"*

*Commissioner Ranzau said, "I have looked at the proposal."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you. Any further discussion?"*

**VOTE**

<i>Commissioner O'Donnell II</i>	<i>Aye</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>

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

*Chairman Dennis said, "Again, thank you all very much for doing that for us. I appreciate it. Madam Clerk, next item."*

**Approved**

## **CONSENT**

*Mr. Mike Scholes said, "Commissioners, I recommend you approve consent agenda items Golf (G) through Romeo (R)."*

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

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "I move that we approve the consent calendar. What, I did have a question. Last week, we talked a lot about records destruction. This week we're talking a lot. Have we figured out what sort of a footprint we are getting rid of out at the salt mines and what that is going to do to our budget."*

*Mr. Scholes said, "We have not taken that discussion any further. We're waiting to finish the administrative building as kind of a main tenet and building block, or almost domino, that once we get that figured out we may have the ability to open up storage in other places that we don't know about right now, but we want to get through this discussion as kind of the primary discussion that in the end will cause some of those other dominoes to fall."*

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Yeah I understand that, Mr. Manager, but my question was these documents that we destroyed last week and this week, these are all items that are stored out at the..."*

*Mr. Scholes said, "Correct."*

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "...salt mines, right? So I would think because there's so, I mean, it's numerous, right, and..."*

*Mr. Scholes said, "Correct."*

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "...I know that some of them went back 100 years last week."*

*Mr. Scholes said, "Correct."*

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "This is going back it looks to the '90s, yeah oh, '80s for the Appraiser's Office, through the last about four years ago, so I would think that we're getting rid of a big footprint up there. So I'd be interested in an analysis."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "We have someone that can answer you."*

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Oh, good deal."*

*Ms. Melissa Thompson, Analyst, Records Management, greeted the Commissioners and said, "For the most part, the records that we destroyed last week, the 650 plus and the 1,304 this week, the majority of those are stored here in the Courthouse. Probably off the top of my head, I'm thinking about 3[00] or 400 are stored at the salt mine right now that we will be destroying once you approve."*

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Out at the salt mines?"*



*Ms. Thompson said, "Out at the salt mines."*

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "So the 3[00] or 400, what we're approving today?"*

*Ms. Thompson said, "Last week and today, yes."*

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Right. How many of those were out at the salt mines versus how many are..."*

*Ms. Thompson said, "Approximately 3[00] to 400."*

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "How many were here in the Courthouse?"*

*Ms. Thompson said, "Well, there's a total of almost 2,000 boxes being destroyed last week and this week."*

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Okay."*

*Ms. Thompson said, "So approximately..."*

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Only about 20 percent of them were out at the salt mines."*

*Ms. Thompson said, "That's correct."*

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Okay, but you're going to continue to review those? Because that's where the cost is for us..."*

*Ms. Thompson said, "Right."*

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "...it's not in the building."*

*Ms. Thompson said, "That's correct."*

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "So if we need to move some from the salt mines to the Courthouse or destroy more of those boxes. It's an ongoing cost, pretty substantial, six figure cost annually for us."*

*Ms. Thompson said, "Absolutely, sir. The situation with what's being stored at underground vaults is that a large majority of those boxes have a permanent retention, so those boxes will remain at the salt mine unless the county decides to build its own records center to accommodate."*

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "You're very resourceful. One more question, Mr. Chair. So of those, so say about 1,600 we're destroying onsite, how many do you have onsite on a given day here at the Courthouse?"*

*Ms. Thompson said, "Records..."*

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "How many boxes?"*

*Ms. Thompson said, "...that we're storing for county departments? Our records center here is capable of storing between 6[000] and 7,000 items."*

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "So you're getting rid of a..."*

*Ms. Thompson said, "We're getting rid of a lot."*

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "...very healthy percentage."*

*Ms. Thompson said, "Yes, sir."*

*Commissioner O'Donnell said, "Okay, that's good to know. Thank you. Thank you Mr. Chair."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you."*

#### **MOTION**

*Commissioner O'Donnell moved to approve consent agenda items Golf (G) through Romeo (R).*

*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>

*The Board of County Commissioners recessed into Fire District Number 1 from 12:21 p.m. and returned at 12:23 p.m.*

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

- G**     [18-294](#)     Agreement between Sedgwick County, Kansas and the Kansas & Oklahoma Railroad, L.L.C. for the removal of the existing railroad crossings at Main Street and 295th Street West in Garden Plain, Kansas. District 3.  
**Approved on the Consent Agenda**
- H**     [18-244](#)     Consideration of a grant renewal in the amount of \$286,590 from the Kansas Department for Aging and Disability Services (KDADS) to Provide Enhanced Supported Employment Services.  
**Approved on the Consent Agenda**
- I**     [18-276](#)     Retail Dealer's Cereal Malt Beverage License Application for Kwik Shop

#706 located at 3601 E. 47th St. S., Wichita, KS, 67210.

**Approved on the Consent Agenda**

- J**     [18-269](#)     First Quarter 2018 Range Reallocations.  
**Approved on the Consent Agenda**
- K**     [18-288](#)     A resolution to authorize destruction of Finance records (DISP 2018-296 Finance 1997-2014).  
**Approved on the Consent Agenda**
- L**     [18-289](#)     A resolution to authorize destruction of Treasurer Office records (DISP 2018-301 Treasurer 2009-2014).  
**Approved on the Consent Agenda**
- M**     [18-290](#)     A resolution to authorize destruction of Elections records (DISP 2018-297 Elections 1999-2013 and 2015).  
**Approved on the Consent Agenda**
- N**     [18-291](#)     A resolution to authorize destruction of Health Division records (DISP 2018-292 Health 1996-2014).  
**Approved on the Consent Agenda**
- O**     [18-292](#)     A resolution to authorize destruction of Appraiser Office records (DISP 2018-294 Appraiser 1983-2012).  
**Approved on the Consent Agenda**
- P**     [18-293](#)     A resolution to authorize destruction of COMCARE records (DISP 2018-293 COMCARE 2001-2012).  
**Approved on the Consent Agenda**
- Q**     [18-281](#)     General Bill Check Register for April 4, 2018 - April 10, 2018.  
**Approved on the Consent Agenda**
- R**     [18-282](#)     Payroll Check Register for the March 31, 2018, payroll certification.  
**Approved on the Consent Agenda**

### **LEGISLATIVE ISSUES**

*Chairman Dennis said, "Thank you, Will."*

*Mr. William Deer, Assistant County Counselor, greeted the Commissioners and said, "The legislature is adjourned until April 26th, when the veto session will start. The two bills that we had pass out of conference committee were the Urban Area Designation and the Election Commissioner Budget Bill. Those are both still in the process of being sent to the governor. As of this morning, they hadn't been signed. But I would anticipate the governor signs those and those two bills become law."*

*Chairman Dennis said, "Very good. Any questions for Mr. Deer? Seeing none, why good work, we so far got two out of four big ones that we're working on and hopefully we get the other two."*

*Mr. Deer said, "Absolutely. Thank you."*

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

## **OTHER**

*Chairman Dennis said, "Other. Does any Commissioner have anything to discuss under 'other'? Seeing no one else, last over the weekend, I got to participate in an event called 100 Men Who Cook. It was a fundraiser for the Pando Initiative. We totally raised well over \$100,000 for to help students here in this area. I teamed up with Northwest High School, and we were in the top five for table decorations, and we had a wonderful strawberry cheesecake. The students made three cheesecakes on Friday night and then served them, and we ran out almost immediately. They were a very hot item. The students did an outstanding job and their instructor.*

*"One other item we probably ought to talk about is that there is a community movement in partnership with the City of Wichita to help keep our children safe. There's an event coming up that we heard about a little bit earlier on April 12th. It's at 6:30 p.m. in Century II Exhibition Hall. You can register today at [\[www.beyondtolerancewichita.org\]](http://www.beyondtolerancewichita.org), and we want to make sure that everyone is aware of that event. Does anyone else have anything else that they'd like to discuss today? Seeing none, Madam Clerk, next item. We have nothing else? Well thank you very much."*

## **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

## **ADJOURNMENT**

*There being no other business to come before the Board, the Meeting was adjourned at 12:23 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: