

January 12, 2016  
Reno County Courthouse  
Hutchinson, Kansas

The Board of Reno County Commissioners met in agenda session with, Chairman James Schlickau, Commissioners Dan Deming and Brad Dillon, County Administrator Gary Meagher, County Counselor Joe O'Sullivan and Minutes Clerk Cindy Martin, present.

The meeting began with the Pledge of Allegiance and a short sectarian prayer led by Adam Pounds, Bahai's of Hutchinson.

There were no additions to the agenda.

**Mr. Dillon moved, seconded by Mr. Deming,** to approve the Consent Agenda consisting of the Accounts Payable Ledger for claims payable on January 15th, 2016 of \$392,306.79 as submitted and also consisting of pending Added, Abated and Escaped Taxation Change Orders numbered 2015-1432, 1433, 1438, 1440 through 1444, 1447 and 2016 1-3 and 6-9. Next item directs the chairman to sign minutes for December 1<sup>st</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, 15<sup>th</sup>, 22<sup>nd</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup>, 2015 as submitted. The motion was approved by a 3-0 vote.

Commissioner Schlickau stated it was that time of year to reorganize the Board and that he appreciated the opportunity to be the Chair for the last two years. **Mr. Dillon moved, seconded by Mr. Schlickau,** to reorganize the Board of County Commissioners for 2016 appointing Commissioner Deming as Chairman with Commissioner Schlickau as Vice-Chair. The motion was approved by a 2-0 with Mr. Deming abstaining from the vote since it pertained to him.

City of Hutchinson Director of Planning Jana McCarron met with the Board to discuss changes requested by the county to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Amended City of Hutchinson Neighborhood Revitalization Program and Interlocal Agreement between the City of Hutchinson and Reno County. Ms. McCarron stated most of the changes concerning the county were under Part 9, Procedures to Submit application, (3) pre-project appraised valuation prior to beginning the work, (4) Part 2 projects certified as completed prior to December 31 clarifies to submit when the project is finished not waiting and (6) following receipt of Part 2 the Appraiser shall conduct an on-site inspection of the

construction project and determine the new valuation of the property. She concluded that these are all procedural changes to help county staff better administer the program. **Mr. Schlickau moved, seconded by Mr. Deming,** to approve the amended agreement for the City of Hutchinson Neighborhood Revitalization Program and Interlocal Agreement as previously outlined by Ms. McCarron. The motion was approved by a 3-0 vote.

County Clerk Donna Patton met with the Board to give a brief explanation on an annual resolution to cancel certain county warrants. She stated these are warrants from a period of more than three years since the signing of such warrants and gives people a chance to claim money owed to them from the county before we cancel the warrants. If anyone calls in to the Clerk's office or Treasurers' office, just give us a current address and the Treasurer will have a check reissued. The Clerk's staff checked through the list and to date two checks were voided and one was reissued. The list will be available on the county website and then back on the agenda in two weeks for approval.

The Board took up consideration of the Reno County Bicycle Master Plan, as recommended December 15, 2015 by the county's bicycle committee.

Commissioner Schlickau began the discussion by providing a background of information from committee reports and comments exchanged at the December agenda meeting. Included in his review was a summary of the task of the committee members, and important considerations to make proposed routes safe to cyclists and to the traveling public. In a memorandum provided by the Reno County Planning Commission to County Commissioners, Chairman Harland Priddle stated, "the Planning Commission noted the plan does not commit, require or request any county funds be budgeted for the Reno County Bicycle Master Plan". Mr. Schlickau stated the advisory committee correctly identified that most of the proposed routes do not have a paved shoulder and are not currently wide enough to permit the establishment of a bike lane. He continued by stating that for the county to purchase right-of-way, widen the road surface, and paint bike lanes was cost prohibitive and an unacceptable use of taxpayer funds. Mr. Schlickau also noted that cyclists are legally permitted to ride on Reno County roads, and some roadways are more suitable for cyclists than others. He commented that the plan provided by the advisory committee was a report with recommendations and would require significant changes in content and language in order to be inserted into the transportation

section of the Comprehensive Plan. County staff may find some of the information provided in the report useful as they finalize the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Schlickau thanked the Reno County Bicycle Trail Advisory Committee for their diligence and effort in compiling a comprehensive report. He then stated conclusions and recommendations. He recommended moving forward with an implementation plan referring to the evaluation, directing staff to contact a traffic engineer to evaluate the identified road surfaces for safety qualities. The traffic engineer can determine the appropriate signage that should be erected. Mr. Schlickau continued, "We do not want to encourage bicycle traffic on roads that do not meet certain standards. By conducting a traffic study on the identified roads, the county is taking a reasonable step to ensure public safety." Mr. Schlickau recommended taking action by approving a motion to direct county staff to contact a traffic engineer to evaluate the six proposed routes for safety qualities and report findings to the Board for a final decision. He further recommended that the county pay for the traffic study by Sid Arpin, BG Consultants. Public Works Director David McComb estimated the cost to be \$800 to \$1,200.

Chairman of the Reno County Bicycle Trail Advisory Committee Bob Updegraff, owner of Harley Bicycle Shop, met with the Board to verify that the Vitality Group paid for the signage on Old K61 highway. He stated the county was not responsible for any funding. He then defined the funding options along with the marketing plan implementation. Mr. Updegraff discussed various aspects of their marketing strategy. He then explained that the committee wanted their report to be part of the Transportation portion of the Reno County Comprehensive Plan. This would further their efforts with marketing along with grant funding which needed approval from the Board of Commissioners, otherwise he stated it would be harder to move forward. Mr. Updegraff continued to discuss signage and the possible universal signs throughout the state for cycling routes. He asked the Board to make them a stand-alone committee and to implement the plan to be able to move forward with their marketing and funding.

Mr. Dillon inquired about future plans for the bicycle committee. Mr. Updegraff replied that there were three items they would like to see moving forward; (1) when building new roads incorporate a bike path or wider shoulder for cyclists, (2) increased cycle usage in the county, (3) signage awareness

for automobiles to understand to look for cyclist on routes. Mr. Dillon then inquired about the marketing the committee was involved with.

Elizabeth Grilliot with Vitality Group and Hutchinson Recreation explained the routes on the maps that show the City of Hutchinson's cycle routes and about the flip side showing the county routes and information. In the future if the plan were to be approved they would be more likely to receive funds from grants for marketing and education material. Mr. Schlickau asked if they had already received funding from a grant for the mapping portion. Ms. Grilloux stated that they had received a grant from Healthy Communities Initiative. She also replied to the question of costs. There were costs toward hiring a graphic designer and printing and distribution of the map in the county. All were paid for from that grant. She continued with the need for approval from the Board to include the county routes on the flip side of the map. Mr. Updegraff commented that they could just put the county map on without approval but thought it unwise to do so.

Mr. Schlickau questioned the importance of adopting the report provided by the bike advisory committee as part of the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Updegraff indicated that the plan must be approved before they can apply for grant funding. Ms. Grilliot stated that they already had funding secured through the Healthy Living Initiative Grant to prepare the bike trail maps. Mr. Schlickau recommended members of the bike advisory committee assist planning and cycling promotion in connection with the Hutchinson Recreation Commission and Reno County communities.

Mr. Meagher spoke about the (MUTCD manual) uniform traffic manual for proper signage and placement following an evaluation from a traffic engineer. He also spoke about bike route liabilities.

Public Works Director Dave McComb added one comment about the signage. He agreed with Mr. Meagher to have the engineer review when we resurfaced Old K-61 Highway. He stated that Reno County applied for a grant to widen the road for bicycle traffic and were denied funding. He stated that we did not designate Old K-61 Highway as a bike route we only put up bicycle warning signs and is not a designated bike route. The engineer traffic study would determine whether these proposed bike routes could be designated as official bike routes or just install warning signs to caution bicycle usage on these roads. He said after

the study Reno County legal staff should review for any liabilities.

Mr. Dillon inquired about the significance of signs. Mr. Updegraff discussed bicyclist signage for awareness of cyclist sharing the roads.

Mr. Schlickau wanted to have the study done before moving on and Mr. Updegraff agreed. Mr. McComb stated it could take 60 to 90 days for the study and Mr. Meagher inserted we could ask to expedite as much as possible. The Board would evaluate when the results came back. County Attorney Mr. O'Sullivan would not recommend the adoption of the plan as is since the verbiage would need to be changed.

**Mr. Deming moved, seconded by Mr. Schlickau,** to approve a motion directing county staff to contact a traffic engineer to evaluate the six proposed routes for safety qualities and report the findings to the Board of Commissioners for a final decision. The motion further recommended approval for the county to pay \$800 to \$1,200 for the traffic evaluation study. The motion was approved by a 3-0 vote.

Solid Waste Office Manager Megan Davidson and Monte Markley SCS Aquaterra Vice President, met with the Board to recommend approval for SCS Aquaterra's proposal to provide solid waste consulting services for 2016 at a cost of \$246,300. Next item for approval was to provide air quality and gas collection control system consulting services at the landfill for 2016 at a cost of \$76,300. This was a reduction in cost from last year since it did not include start up fees. Ms. Davidson stated these were annual task orders that included Kansas Department of Health and Environment groundwater monitoring reports and annual permit renewals.

Ms. Davidson also recommended approval to send out bid requests for the construction of a new municipal solid waste disposal cell referred to as "Cell 7" at the landfill and update the spill prevention plan. This year these were added items to the annual assistance from SCS.

Mr. Markley commented that Cell 7 was an interim item not done very often and the same with the spill prevention plan. He stated that his company had reduced fees last year and done the same this year. He also explained that SCS had become more efficient on the regular basis reports during the long standing relationship with the landfill. Mr. Markley added that SCS was

finishing the design plans for Cell 7 and projected it to be ready to bid by the end of this month. He stated with the 30 day advertisement period, the timeline after a preconstruction meeting would be as follows; notice to proceed would come early in the second quarter, construction to begin early May, and a projected completion of the cell by mid-October.

Mr. Deming asked for clarification on 15 percent markup charges on certain expenses from the SCS fee schedule. Mr. Meagher read what was included in the 15 percent and stated traditionally these were not charged to the Reno County Landfill. Mr. Markley acknowledged that they would not be charged. **Mr. Deming moved, seconded by Mr. Dillon,** to approve items #10, #11, and #12 on the agenda. The motion was approved by a 3-0 vote.

Mr. Meagher presented the Mortgage Registration Tax and Recording Fee update stating with the change in the formula at the state level last year the report shows we were behind \$235,910.83 from 2014 to 2015 overall.

At 10:10 the meeting recessed for five minutes.

The meeting reconvened with all Commissioners, County Administrator Gary Meagher, County Counselor Joe O'Sullivan, and Minutes Clerk Cindy Martin, present.

Mr. Meagher was also present to offer explanation on a meeting last Friday with Treanor Architects and the low bidder on the security entrance project, and then presented slides showing the construction cost analysis.

|                     | <u>Original</u><br><u>Estimate</u> | <u>Low Bid</u><br><u>w/o Alt</u> | <u>Low Bid</u><br><u>w/Alt</u> |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Construction</b> |                                    |                                  |                                |
| Entry & Remodel     | \$1,064,652                        | \$1,426,300                      | \$1,426,300                    |
| Contingency         | 53,233                             |                                  |                                |
| TOTAL               | 1,117,885                          |                                  |                                |
| <b>Alternates</b>   |                                    | 0                                | \$ 86,100                      |
| Total Construction  |                                    |                                  | \$1,512,400                    |
| <b>Other Costs</b>  |                                    |                                  |                                |
| Architectural 7%    | 78,252                             | 99,841                           | 105,868                        |
| Other Soft Costs 6% | 67,073                             | 85,578                           | 90,744                         |
| Total               | \$ 145,325                         | \$ 185,419                       | \$ 196,612                     |

**Project Totals**

|                |             |             |             |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Project Costs  | \$1,263,210 | \$1,611,719 | \$1,709,012 |
| Contingency 3% | 37,896      | 48,352      | 51,270      |
| Total Project  |             |             |             |
| Costs          | \$1,301,106 | \$1,660,071 | \$1,760,282 |

Other project expenses would include exit door alarms, security equipment and cameras. Other soft costs included civil engineering, testing, document printing, telephone or data cabling, FFE, and any other equipment.

Mr. Meagher offered a possible cost savings of \$50,000 by changing the appearance of the front entrance from an all curtain wall of glass to a store front type entrance with more metal and sections of glass. He stated if we keep to the glass enclosure it would have to be replaced by an outside agency where if we go with a store front type our maintenance department could replace the glass. Mr. Meagher will have updated cost figures for five or six alternate changes to present next week.

Sheriff Henderson was in attendance and offered the possibility of inmate labor to help cut costs for the remodel of the old jail area connected to the Law Enforcement Center. The Sheriff's department would have to furnish the inmates boots, jeans and shirts to work.

Mr. Meagher commented that the security entrance was bid as a package. \$1.1 million with \$700,000 set aside for security, \$427,000 set aside for the remodel plus ten percent added. We could look at bidding it out separately for the entrance and the annex remodel.

Judge Buck Lyle spoke to the Board about using the security entrance at the Law Enforcement Center (LEC) since it had an existing elevator. His biggest concern was safety for the courtrooms during certain court cases.

Sheriff Henderson commented on the security incidents. He spoke about the Capital allowing hand guns but still going through screening before the person can enter the courts. Judge Lyle talked about putting up metal screening machines at the LEC. The Sheriff stated the LEC entrance would not be deep enough for metal detector machines and that jurors and parking could be an issue. The corridor cannot be widened as originally

planned however the plans included a waiting area for people who were going to municipal court to help get them out of the hallway.

Judge Joe McCarville made several comments on security stating that most of the violence comes from domestic and not criminal cases. He commented that crime has increased 10 percent toward Judges.

Mr. Meagher inserted that with an increase of elevator traffic we would probably have to replace the LEC elevator at an estimated cost of \$85,000.

A brief discussion continued about other courthouse security methods.

Community Corrections Director Randy Regehr met with the Board for his regularly scheduled meeting. Mr. Regehr discussed various current issues not requiring action by the Board.

At 11:20 the meeting adjourned until 9:00 a.m. Tuesday, January 19, 2016.

Approved:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair, Board of Reno County Commissioners

(ATTEST)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Reno County Clerk  
cm

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date