BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF DOUGLAS COUNTY, KANSAS

MONDAY, MARCH 15, 2004

8:30 A.M.

-Convene

-Pledge of Allegiance

CONSENT AGENDA

(1) (a) Consider approval of Commission Orders

(b) Authorize Notice to Township (Patty Jaimes)

(c) Consider approval of request for funding of KU PRI Biosciences Study (Lynn Parman)

REGULAR AGENDA

(2) Consider approval of Agreement for Phase 2 Engineering Services – Bridge Replacement Project No. 23 C-3890-01 – Bridge No. 09.24-16.00 (Keith Browning)

(3) Receive report on technology fund (Kay Pesnell)

(4) Reconsider recommendation of award for storage building (Jackie Waggoner)

(5) Review proposed schedule for preparation of 2005 budget including the solicitation for budget requests from outside agencies (Craig Weinaug)

(6) Discussion of 2004 objectives (Craig Weinaug)

(7) Other Business

(a) Consider approval of Accounts Payable (if necessary)

(b) Appointments

(c) Miscellaneous

(d) Public Comment

(8) Adjourn

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 17, 2004

6:35 P.M.

-Convene

-Pledge of Allegiance

CONSENT AGENDA

(1) (a) Consider approval of Commission Orders

REGULAR AGENDA

(2) Planning Item: Z-09-30-03: A request to rezone a tract of land approximately 154.9 acres from A (Agricultural) District to I-2 (Light Industrial) District. The property is generally described as being located north of N 1800 Road (Farmer's Turnpike) and west of E 900 Road. Submitted by 1800 Junction L.C. Property for Russell L. Tuckel, Jr., Penny J. Tuckel/Venture Properties, Inc., property owners of record (Jeff Tully)

(3) Other Business
   (a) Consider approval of Accounts Payable (if necessary)
   (b) Appointments
   (c) Miscellaneous
   (d) Public Comment

(4) Adjourn

MONDAY, MARCH 22, 2004

-No Commission Meeting

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 24, 2004

-No Commission Meeting

MONDAY, MARCH 29, 2004

-No Commission Meeting

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 2004 (Lecompton City Hall)

-Consent: Consider approval of resolution granting a cereal malt beverage license to Clinton Store (Patty Jaimes)

-Joint meeting with Lecompton City Council to discuss planning options for areas adjacent to Lecompton

MONDAY, APRIL 5, 2004 (8:30 am)

-Consideration of proposal to collect delinquent personal property taxes (tentative) (Craig Weinaug)

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 7, 2004

-Discussion of Disposition of County Owned House on Rhode Island (Weinaug)

MONDAY, APRIL 12, 2004

Presentation from Richard Caplan with regard to K-10 Corridor Association activities

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 28, 2004

-Receive report from ECO^2 Committee (Jim Roberts)

Note: The Douglas County Commission will now meet regularly on **Monday mornings at 8:30 A.M.** (*starting with the March 15, 2004 meeting*) and Wednesday evenings at 6:35 P.M. at the Douglas County Courthouse. Specific regular meeting dates that are not listed above have not been cancelled unless specifically noted on this schedule.

The board of county commissions in any county shall not issued a license without giving the clerk of the township board in the township where the applicant desires to locate, written notice by registered mail, of the filing of the application.

NOTICE TO THE TOWNSHIP BOARD

STATE OF KANSAS DOUGLAS COUNTY ,ss

TO THE TOWNSHIP CLERK OF CLINTON TOWNSHIP

THIS IS TO NOTIFY THE MEMBERS OF YOUR TOWNSHIP BOARD THAT APPLICATION HAS BEEN FILED WITH THE COUNTY COMMISSION BY CLINTON STORE TO SELL CEREAL MALT BEVERAGES AT RETAIL IN SAID TOWNSHIP AT 598 N. 1190 RD . SUCH SALES ARE TO BE IN ORIGINAL UNOPENED CONTAINERS AND NOT FOR CONSUMPTION ON THE PREMISES.

THE TOWNSHIP BOARD MAY WITHIN TEN (10) DAYS FILE AN ADVISORY RECOMMENDATION AS TO THE GRANTING OF SUCH A LICENSE AND SUCH ADVISORY RECOMMENDATION SHALL BE CONSIDERED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS BEFORE SUCH LICENSE IS ISSUED.K.S.A. 41-2702

DONE BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS THIS 15TH DAY OF MARCH, 2004

_____
CHAIRMAN

_____
COUNTY CLERK

(SEAL)

(1)(c)

LAWRENCE•KS
CHAMBER of COMMERCE

MEMO

TO	City Commissioners County Commissioners Lynn Parman, VP of Economic Development
FROM	
RE	KU PRI Biosciences Study
DATE	3/11/04
CC	Lavern Squier, President & CEO Ted Haggert, Co-Chair, Biosciences Task Force David Shulenburger, Co-Chair, Biosciences Task Force

After making a presentation before the County Commission on Monday, it became evident that the PRI biosciences study needed some further clarification to the City and County Commissions. The purpose of this memo is to summarize why the biosciences study is necessary and what the information with produce in the future.

As you are aware, the Lawrence Chamber of Commerce formed a Biosciences Task Force last fall to develop strategies to cultivate an environment in Lawrence/Douglas County to attract new life sciences investment and jobs. Task force members include over 35 community leaders representative of Kansas University, state and local elected officials, biosciences businesses, agriculture, Chamber officials and other local entities.

The Task Force is interested in contracting with KU's Policy Research Institute to perform an economic impact analysis. The purposes of the study are to understand the current economic impacts of the biosciences industry that currently exists, as well as predict what the future impacts would be if our community continues to cultivate the biosciences industry. The study will be a valuable planning tool for the community to ultimately know what initiatives must be undertaken to continue to cultivate the biosciences industry, as well as provide an understanding of infrastructure needed.

Specifically, the analysis would provide the following information:

734 Vermont, Ste. 101
Post Office Box 586
Lawrence, KS 66044

PH 785.865.4411
FX 785.865.4400
lawrencechamber.com

LAWRENCE•KS
CHAMBER of COMMERCE

MEMO

- Assess the economic impact of the biosciences industry that currently exists including the impacts of the biosciences research conducted by KU, biosciences companies and spin-offs from KU as other measurable factors. Impacts assessed include employment, wages, construction, commuters, etc. At the end of this analysis we'll be able to understand that the biosciences industry is an $(TBD) industry in Douglas County.
- Assess the economic impact of the biosciences industry that will exist in 10 years if the current trends continue.
- Assess the economic impact of the biosciences industry in 10 years if it was enhanced with a total of 5,000 new jobs created (HB 2647 supporting data acknowledge that as many as 40,000 new jobs could be created statewide over the next 10 years).

This study will be used by the Biosciences Task Force to develop a strategic plan for the biosciences and identify specific strategies that need to occur to continue to attract bioscience jobs and investment. Specific areas of focus within the strategic plan include:

- Business Attraction-marketing & buildings and sites inventory
- Business Resources - including access to capital, research resources, etc
- Workforce Development
- Obtaining Research Funding

This study will take a macro look at Douglas County's biosciences industry and determine how it will affect the economy over the next 10 years so that we can plan accordingly. It will serve as a road map for our efforts and is a necessary initiative to continue to secure biosciences jobs and investment.

734 Vermont, Ste. 101
Post Office Box 586
Lawrence, KS 66044

PH 785.865.4411
FX 785.865.4400
lawrencechamber.com

(2)

Douglas County

Department of Public Works

Keith A. Browning, P.E.
Director of Public Works/County Engineer

MEMORANDUM

To : Board of County Commissioners

From : Keith A. Browning, P.E., Director of Public Works/County Engineer KB

Date : March 9, 2004

Re : Approval of Agreement for Phase 2 Engineering Services
Bridge Replacement Project No. 23 C-3890-01
Bridge No. 09.24-16.00

As you are aware, Douglas County contracted with Finney & Turnipseed Transportation and Civil Engineering, L.L.P. to provide Phase 1 engineering services for the referenced project. The project includes replacing the bridge located on Route 1055 approximately ¾ mile south of Route 458 (near Cedar Hill Gun Club) and improving the approach roadway alignment. Phase 1 services consisted of a study to help determine the extent of the approach roadway improvements, determine the recommended bridge type and size, and determine a proposed approach roadway alignment that strikes a balance between improved road safety and minimizing the impact to neighboring property owners.

The Phase 1 study identified proposed alignments based on 55-mph and 60-mph design speeds. It has been determined that the 55-mph curve alignment through the bridge is appropriate for this location. The 60-mph alignment impacts neighboring property more significantly, and it is felt that a 55-mph design speed is more appropriate given the existing Route 1055 road geometry outside the project limits.

The Phase 1 study also identified the effects of extending the project to include the second curve south of the bridge. The existing curve is a 45-mph curve. Improving this curve to a 55-mph design speed would require lengthening the existing vertical curve and lowering the existing road profile approximately 6.5 feet. While reconstructing the 2nd curve south of the bridge as part of the bridge replacement project would save costs over improving it a later date, there are still questions that should be answered prior to expanding the project. It is not clear at this time that federal bridge replacement funds could be used for expanded portion of the project. It may be possible to receive federal safety improvement funding for the expanded portion, but a detailed study needs to be conducted prior to applying for the funding.

1242 Massachusetts Street, Lawrence, Kansas 66044-3350 / Fax No. (785) 841-0943
Telephone No. (785) 832-5293 / E-Mail dgcopubw@douglas-county.com

The Phase 1 study considered three different bridge types for this location. A 60-foot simple span prestressed concrete beam bridge is recommended. The simple span means no piers will be required in the channel thereby significantly lowering maintenance costs. Construction costs are similar to a triple-barrel reinforced concrete box bridge and significantly lower than a standard 3-span reinforced concrete haunched slab bridge.

At this time, it is recommended to contract with Finney & Turnipseed for Phase 2 engineering design services to replace the bridge and improve the approach roadway alignment through the bridge including the first curve south of the bridge. Attached are three (3) original contracts. Finney & Turnipseed has proposed a lump sum fee of $43,200.00 for this work. The proposed fee is approximately 5.2% of the estimated construction cost of $832,150. The CIP includes $75,000 for engineering services for this project.

As stated earlier, further investigation and thought are needed before expanding the project to include improving the second curve south of the bridge. A final determination on possible federal funding for the expanded portion is needed from KDOT. It is felt that a public meeting should be conducted to obtain input on expanding the project. If it is determined that the project should be expanded to include the second curve south of the bridge, a supplemental agreement with Finney & Turnipseed will be required.

Action Required: Approve the agreement with Finney & Turnipseed Transportation and Civil Engineering, L.L.P. for Phase 2 consulting engineering services for Project No. 23 C-3890-01 at a lump sum cost of $43,200.00. The BOCC should sign all three (3) original contracts.

AGREEMENT

between

DOUGLAS COUNTY

and

FINNEY & TURNIPSEED
CONSULTING ENGINEERS
TRANSPORTATION & CIVIL ENGINEERING, L.L.P.
Topeka, Kansas

Agreement relative to site survey, design, and plans for the approaches and a bridge over a Branch of Coal Creek located on RS 210 between Sections 32 & 33 and in Section 33, T.13S, R 20E. in Douglas County, Kansas. (Bridge No. 9.24N, 16.00E) (PHASE II)

March, 2004

AGREEMENT

Agreement between Douglas County, Kansas and the firm of Finney & Turnipseed, Consulting Engineers, Transportation & Civil Engineering, L.L.P., 603 Topeka Blvd., Topeka, Kansas, relative to engineering services.

This Agreement, made and entered into this _____ day of March, 2004, by and between DOUGLAS COUNTY, KANSAS, Party of the FIRST PART and hereinafter called the COUNTY, and FINNEY & TURNIPSEED, CONSULTING ENGINEERS, TRANSPORTATION & CIVIL ENGINEERING, L.L.P., Party of the SECOND PART, hereinafter called the ENGINEER.

WITNESSETH:

RECITALS

That the County desires to have a field survey, design, hydraulic analysis and plans prepared compliance with current criteria of the Bureau of Local Projects of the Kansas Department of Transportation for approach grading and surfacing and a bridge over a Branch of Coal Creek located on RS 210 between Sections 32 & 33 and in Section 33, T.13S, R20E. in Douglas County, Kansas referred to as the PROJECT, the limits of which are shown in Figure 5 of the alignment study dated January 27, 2004.

ARTICLE I

The ENGINEER Agrees:

1. To review all data prepared by Douglas County for this Project.

2 To survey the Project.

3. To plot field surveys and alignment for the proposed improvement as set forth in the letter dated February 13, 2004 from the County Engineer.

4. To prepare preliminary plans for the project showing the proposed bridge and grading and to prepare preliminary cost estimates for the project.

5. To furnish to the County and the Bureau of Local projects of the Kansas Department of Transportation the necessary sets of prints and a preliminary cost estimate of the project for field check purposes.

6. To field check the plans of he Project with representatives of the Bureau of Local Projects, Kansas Department of Transportation and the County.

7. To revise the field check plans to comply with the recommendation of the field check and furnish one set of revised plans for the use of the company or firm to make the necessary subsurface geotechnical investigation.

8. To prepare drawings and documents for use by the County in obtaining permits from the Division of Water Resources of the Kansas State Board of Agriculture and from the Corps of Engineers.

9. To prepare office check plans on paper for the Project in compliance with the field check recommendations.

10. To submit prints of the office check plans for the project prepared under Article I, Section 9 to the County for their use.

11. To submit a set of prints to the Bureau of Local Projects for their use in office checking the plans.

12. To prepare the final plans on mylar in accordance with the recommendations of the office check.

13. To furnish one set of prints of the final plans, the final mylars and a construction cost estimate to the Bureau of Local projects and a set of the final plans and construction cost estimate to the County.

14. To review shop and construction drawings if submitted.

15. To accept compensation for services described in Article I, Sections 1 through 14 in the amounts and at such periods of time as hereinafter set forth and such compensation shall be complete and sufficient payment for all work, equipment and materials used and services rendered in connection with the described work.

ARTICLE II

The County Agrees:

1. To provide section corners, quarter corners and P.O.T.'s in the immediate vicinity of the bridge.

2. To make all plats and papers necessary for obtaining the right-of-way and easements, and to obtain the necessary right-of-way and easements for the Project.

3. To obtain approval and/or agreements from all companies, corporations, individuals and governmental agencies involved by the construction of the Project as required by statute.

4. To obtain rights of entry permits for field survey parties and for geology parties.

5. To pay to the Engineer for services described in Article I, Sections 1 through 14 in the lump sum amount of Forty three Thousand two hundred ($ 43,200.00) Dollars. The amount shall be due and payable within thirty days after proper billing, after completion of the described services, except that partial payments may be requested by the Engineer in the following amounts and at the following stages of completion:

Submission of field check plans ----------	$ 20,000
Submission of office check plans ----------	$ 16,000
Submission of final plans ----------	$ 7,200

ARTICLE III

The Parties Hereto Agree:

1. That the Engineer will begin work within ten days after receiving the signed Agreement and will complete all work in a diligent manner.

2. That services on public hearings and environmental statements are beyond the scope of services described in the Agreement, but, on written request by the County, the Engineer will provide such services at a mutually agreed upon lump sum amount or a mutually agreed upon hourly rates, plus one hundred percent, plus out of pocket expenses.

3. That if the Engineer is requested to perform services which are not within the scope of services described in this Agreement, such extra work shall be paid for at a mutually agreed upon lump sum amount or such extra work shall be paid for at a mutually agreed upon hourly rates, plus one hundred percent, plus out of pocket expenses resulting from such work.

4. That this Agreement and all contracts entered under this Agreement shall be binding upon the parties hereto and their successors and assigns: provided that neither party shall assign, sub-let their interest in this Agreement or contracts entered into under this Agreement, without written consent of the other.

WITNESSETH WHEREOF, the parties have caused this Agreement to be signed by their duly authorized officers on this day and year first written above.

THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
DOUGLAS COUNTY, KANSAS
Party of the First Part

_____
Chair

ATTEST:

_____
Commissioner

Date_____

_____
Commissioner

_____
County Clerk

FINNEY & TURNIPSEED
CONSULTING ENGINEERS
TRANSPORTATION & CIVIL ENGINEERING, L.L.P.
Topeka, Kansas
Party of the Second Part

Seal of County Clerk

Robert B. Thorn – Partner

ATTACHMENT A

Engineering costs ---- 800 hours at ave. cost $50.00 per hour - $40.000

Water Resources Permit ---------- $ 200

Geologic Information ---------- $ 3.000

TOTAL LUMP SUM FEE $ 43.200

(3)

DOUGLAS COUNTY
REGISTER OF DEEDS

To: Douglas County Commissioners
From: Kay Pesnell
Date: March 9, 2004
Subject: Technology Fund

Collections and expenditures of the technology fund from July 1, 2002 to December 31, 2003.

Total Collected =	$479,300.00
Total Interest =	+$ 3,212.18
Collections & Interest =	$482,512.18
Expenditures =	- $ 98,322.70
Balance as of 12/31/03 =	$384,189.48

Expenditures included the following:

- Equipment for Register of Deeds office (Staff Computers & Software)
- Existing machines maintenance agreements and repairs
- Microfilm supplies and duplication
- Supplies for maintaining index books, plats and storage
- Transfer of funds to IT department for storage of scanned computer images

Future expenditures will include:

- Replacement of Register of Deeds software program
- Replacement of older scanner
- Replacement of older computers and printers
- Enhancements for web services
- Storage for scanned images
- Ongoing machine maintenance agreements and repairs
- Supplies for maintaining index books, plats and storage
- Microfilm supplies and duplication

(4)

Douglas County

MEMO TO: The Board of County Commissioners
Craig Weinaug, County Administrator

FROM: Jackie Waggoner, Purchasing Agent
Division of Purchasing

SUBJECT: Reconsider Recommendation of Award for Storage Building

DATE: March 10, 2004

On March 1, 2004 I received Commission approval to award the contract for the design and construction of a new storage building at Public Works Operations. The award was made to Penny Construction in the amount of $51,474.37. Due to steel price increases their bid had guaranteed prices submitted until March 1, 2004 (this was verbally confirmed with Penny Construction).

Following the award, Penny Construction received notice from their building material supplier that they would not be able to honor their original quote. In the meantime, I received calls from other contractors who responded to our bid request. They too were receiving notice of the erratic steel market and the inability of the manufacturer's to guarantee prices. I have asked all contractors who submitted to our original request to resubmit cost adjustments with a guaranteed date they could honor their prices. The attached table reflects both the original and revised bids (revisions are in red).

As you can see, First Management did not revise their bid and has now submitted the low bid. Their bid will increase $2,050 after March 19th. I have reviewed the changes with our elevation committee and they concur with the new recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION: Due to the cost increases, it is our recommendation that the Board of County Commissioners amend their original award to Penny Construction in the amount of $51,474.37, and accept the revised low bid from First Management in the amount of $55,047.

PROPOSAL SUMMARY - STORAGE BUILDING (RFP NO. 04005)				
	FIRST MANAGEMENT	**PENNY CONSTRUCTION**	**HURTIG CONSTRUCTION**	**BA GREEN CONSTRUCTION**
Design & Construction Proposed Cost	$40,942.00	$44,872.50 $49,793.84	$38,220.00 $39,234.00	$47,660.00 $52,060.00
Alternate #1 - Fully enclose building w/ 12' wide by 14' high steel overhead doors	$13,355.00	$ 6,601.87 $7,746.20	$15,849.00 $15,971.00	$16,232.00 $17,182.00
Alternate #2 - (if alt. #1 accepted) provided & install pedestrian door to meet code	$ 750.00	Included	$ 665.00	$ 908.00
Combined Total (base & alternate)	**$55,047.00 No Revision**	**$51,474.37 $57,540.04**	**$54,734.00 $55,870.00**	**$64,800.00 $70,150.00**
Guaranteed Revised Date	**March 19th**	**Until Decision is Made**	**March 29th**	**Through March 17th**
Alternate #3 - (if alt. #1 accepted) furnish & install garage automatic door openers	$3,692.00 (does not include electrical service to building)			
Alternate #4 - fiberglass insulation with reinforced vinyl facing in roof.				$ 2,202.00
Alternate #5 - Add R13, 4" fiberglass insulation with reinforced vinyl facing in walls				$ 2,578.00
Add three 24"x 8" windows in each overhead door				$ 323.00
Time Line to Complete Schedule of Work	63-77 days	6-8 weeks after approved shop drawings. Erection 3 weeks. Erection 5 weeks if alternate accepted	9 weeks following award	60 Days - add 3 weeks if alternate #1 is accepted
Items to Consider	Prices good for 30 Days (from 2/19/04)	Due to steel price increase, prices submitted are good until March 1, 2004. After March 1, add 5% to proposed cost.		Excludes cost of building permit, geotechnical subsurface investigation, material testing & inspection, hazardous material inspections, testing & abatement, power for construction. No HVAC or plumbing or electrical.

Douglas County, KS

Draft

MEMO TO: Agencies Applying for Douglas County funds

FROM: Craig Weinaug, County Administrator

DATE: Thursday, March 11, 2004

SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2005 Appropriation Requests

Introduction

This memorandum provides guidelines for the preparation of your agency's 2005 budget request to the Douglas County Commissioners. If your agency or program will not be requesting county funding in FY 2005, please advise us at your earliest convenience.

Your base budget request should reflect the resources required for your agency to provide a "status quo" level of service. Additional or new services should be submitted as a separate supplemental request. Any requests for additional revenue from the County which would replace revenue lost from other sources (state, federal, or private) should be labeled as such.

At last year's budget hearings, the County Commission asked each of the outside agencies receiving funding from the county to explore the feasibility of developing alternative sources of funding, including fundraising, state and federal grants or contracts, fees for service, and/or private foundation funding. In your written request submittals to us, please discuss your efforts in these areas, or why one or more of these alternatives are not feasible for your agency.

See the attached schedule for your budget review meeting. If you have a conflict with the time assigned, please call Debbie Sparkes at 832-5287.

Budget Timetable

5:00 P.M.	Friday	**April 16**	**Budget requests due in Budget Office.**
		May 3-14	Budget review process with County Administrator
9:00 A.M.	Friday	June 4	Preliminary funding levels recommended to the Commission by County Administrator
8:30 A.M.	Monday	June 28	Budget review process with County Commissioners
	Friday	July 9	Budget review with Commissioners completed
6:35 P.M.	Wednesday	August 11	2005 Budget Hearing

Requested Budget Information

The following information should be submitted with your request.

(1) **Your agency revenues and expenditures for:**

the previous fiscal year,
the current fiscal year budget,
and the forthcoming fiscal year.

This should include information on all revenue sources (both firm and soft) and expenditures by major categories and individual line items.

(2) **An analysis of your Agency's beginning and ending balances, including any dedicated cash reserve, for the three fiscal years mentioned in paragraph (1) above.**

Explain the purpose(s) of any restrictions on any dedicated cash reserves.

The meetings will be held in Craig's office, located on the 2nd floor of the Courthouse, 1100 Massachusetts.

(3) **An analysis of the potential for alternative sources of revenue for your agency, including state and federal grants, private foundation funding, private fundraising efforts not currently utilized, or fees for service. Include a discussion of new funding sources that you have recently added.**

Please submit six (6) copies, all copies three 3-hole punched, of your budget request to Debbie Sparkes, our Budget Specialist, for distribution. She is located on the second floor of the Courthouse, by the Personnel Office.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Memo

To: County Commissioners

From: G. Craig Weinaug, County Administrator

Date: 07/23/03; revised on the following dates: 08/27/03, 9/4/03; 9/8/03; 10-3-03; 10-9-03; 10-20-03 based on 10-20-03 discussion of County Commission; 1-22-04; 2-2-04; 3-11-04

Re: Issues and Objectives Update

Issues and Objectives Update

1) (updated on 3-11-04) Initiative to assist school districts in county by calling an election to consider a sales tax to support schools at the local level. The Kansas Senate defeated the bill that would have authorized the County Commission to call an election, and the School Superintendent has informed me that the school board was unlikely to ask the Lawrence City Commission to call a city election. This issue will be deleted from future revisions of this report.

2) (Updated on 3-11-04) At the 10/8/03 meeting, the County Commission directed staff to begin an application process to enable the county to demolish or remove the county's vacant house on Rhode Island. At that time the Commission decided to delay the decision on the use or disposition of the county's lots on Rhode Island once the house is removed.

   The planning staff has discouraged us from submitting an application for removal of the house without information specifying what the lot will be used for. Based on this advice, we have scheduled a county commission agenda item for April 7th to get further direction from the County Commission. Representatives from the neighborhood have been informed of this meeting.

3) (Updated on 3-11-04) Marion Township Fire Issues: The Commission reached a consensus on 10-8-03 that the county does not want introduce legislation which would provide a statutory means to force deannexation of fire district territory with an initiative petition and election.

   After our discussion on 10-8, Commissioner McElhaney had several conversations with persons involved with this effort. As a result, he has gotten verbal commitments from the Osage District to provide a satellite station in Marion Township on land that would be donated by Jere.

   (added on 1/22/04) Construction of the fire station will require three acres to meet county regulations. Jere is still in negotiations with the planning department to find a way to get this accomplished. There is a possibility that the issues may not get resolved and we may have to go back to square one. (added 3-11-04) Nothing further has developed on this issue in the last month.

4) (Updated 3-11-04) Adequate Public Facilities Issues: The County Commissioners discussed the APF recently and directed staff to schedule a joint discussion with the Lawrence City Commission, school board and planning commission on this topic. Since that meeting, I have talked to Linda and Mike Wildgen. We agree that this discussion should be scheduled in September which should give the Mayor's task force on the APF study time to complete its recommendations. We are therefore postponing further discussion of this until September, unless I receive different direction from the County Commission.

5) (updated 3-11-04) Unit Road Alternatives: At their 10-8-03 meeting, the County Commission directed staff to provide some analysis of the economics of changing to the a unit road system, or a rural highway system. The Commission also wanted some information about the number of counties in Kansas that operate under each of the different road systems in the state. The Commissioners directed staff to schedule a meeting with the Douglas County township trustees to discuss the issues involved. After the analysis has been discussed by the Commission, and the meeting has been held with the township officials, the County Commission will decide whether they want to proceed with consideration of this issue.

   I have assigned analysis of this issue to the KU intern. I have a meeting scheduled with her on March 16th to begin this project. The County Commission may want to schedule a tentative date for the discussion of this.

6) (Updated 10-9-03) Wells Overlook Park Development (Jere) Work is proceeding as planned.

7) (Updated 10-9-03) Development of Fairgrounds Master Plan (Jere) Work is proceeding as planned.

8) (updated 3-11-04) Lone Star Lake Park Issues including the use of marina building, improvements/repairs to marina building, ADA access improvements to park facilities, and safety improvements to park facilities. On these first four topics, the County Commission asked staff to reopen the discussion with the City about possibility of the City of Lawrence taking over responsibility for Lone Star Lake, or any other type of cooperative arrangement with the city. This topic will be scheduled for discussion with the Lawrence City Commission in April. Keith B. and I met with the City Manager, Fred, and other representatives of the City Parks Department on February 24th. The City was interested in discussing the possibilities of an agreement with the city to provide services at Lone Star. The City staff is preparing a laundry list of ideas for that can be used as a basis for a joint City County Commission meeting to explore whether there might be a consensus of the City Commission and County Commission to pursue any of the ideas presented. We are hopeful that we will be ready for this discussion in April.

   Waste treatment for Lone Star private lots and county facilities: At the 10-8-03 meeting, the Commission was informed that Health Department will be making recommendations on this topic sometime in the future. I spoke with Richard Ziesenis on March 11th, and he indicated that he hoped to have recommendations for the County Commission to consider in April or May. He is currently exploring the legal basis for county moratorium on the issuance of any addition water meters to properties adjacent to the lake.

9) (Updated 3-11-04) Discussion of shortfall in Sales Tax revenue. The County Commission recently completed a restructuring of our sales tax bonds which included a refinancing to take advantage of lower interest rates and a lengthening of the pay out schedule. As a result of these two actions, the risk of a shortfall occurring in three years is now virtually eliminated. This item will be eliminated from future revisions of this report.

10) (Updated 10-9-03) Impact of new CAMA system to be implemented by the State of Kansas on county operations. Marion Johnson informed the Commission that the state might expect some fiscal

participation in the changeover that was not budgeted or anticipated when the 2004 budget was prepared. (We have no further information on this yet (3-11)).

11) (Updated 3-11-04) Impact of HAVA (federally mandated election reforms) on Douglas County (Patty Jaimes) (We are not in a position to do anything on this until we get further directions from the State of Kansas. We will probably not get that direction this year.)

12) (Updated 3-11-04) Differing versions of a bill which would impose an E-911 tax on wireless customers have passed both houses of the Kansas legislature and the issue been referred to a conference committee. As soon as a bill actually becomes law, we will schedule a follow up discussion with the County Commission.

13) (Updated 3-11-04 to revise work session date from March to April) GIS issues (Jim Denney) (Verbal report given to the commission on 10-8-03). A Monday work session in April is to be scheduled to discuss this item.

14) (Updated 3-11-04) Initiatives from 2004 Budget work sessions

- Schedule work session to discuss various local programs that support juvenile justice (CASA, Children's Shelter operation of juvenile intake, the county's role in coordination of local utilization of state juvenile justice funds, etc). Are these services appropriately coordinated? Does the county's role need to be reevaluated? On 10-20-03, the County Commission decided to assign a lower priority to this discussion, meaning that it will probably be scheduled for discussion in 2005, instead of 2004.
- Schedule work session to discuss roles of Health Care Access, the City-County Health Department, Visiting Nurses Association, Bert Nash and the Hospital in delivery of health care services to low income residents. Are there gaps? Are these services appropriately coordinated? Would any efficiency be gained if health care services for low-income citizens were organized differently? On 10-20-03 the Commission instructed the Administrator to start discussions with the administrative heads of the various health care agencies, and develop a strategy to address the question of whether our current health agency structure is the best available to meet the anticipated financial challenges that these agencies will face. (1-22-04) The administrator has not done this yet, and would either like further discussion of this item or postponement of this issue.

- (Updated 3-11-04) A development person with significant experience has recently begun work for the Watkins Museum on a contractual basis.

- (updated 10-21-03) Three agencies were given additional revenue on a declining two-year basis to help them adjust to drastic losses in state revenue as specified below. These additional amounts are to be accounted for as separate line items in the county budget.

-

Agency: (add'l $)	2004	2005	2006 & beyond
Bert Nash (150,000)	100,000	50,000	0
VNA (150,000)	100,000	50,000	0
Ind., Inc. (90,000)	60,000	30,000	0

- (Revised 3-11-04) Schedule a work sessions with Senior Service Agency to explore feasibility of shifting their reliance for revenue away from the county to other external sources and/or fees for service. The County Commission may want to discuss this issue to set a deadline for this discussion
- (Updated 3-11-04) The Commission directed the Administrator to get an update on the plans of the Extension Service to hire a position with fund development responsibilities when turnover of personnel occurred over the next year. That turnover has occurred and the Extension Service now has a new position (that is a replacement of another position, not an additional employee) that

started in February who has the responsibility for grant writing. The position has actually started applying for grants. The extension service also recently held a work session with the County Commission including a discussion of their programs and sources of funding.

- (updated 10-21-03) The Commission has directed the Administrator to schedule a work session before the 2005 budget preparation work begins, to discuss what directions to give the outside agencies in preparing their budget requests. The intention is to do everything possible to encourage outside agencies to reduce reliance on county funding by finding efficiencies and alternate sources of revenue.

-

14) (Updated 3-11-04) Home Occupation loose ends: The County Commission was updated on this in a work session last week.

15) (Updated 3-11-04) The economic element of HORIZON 2020 has been updated by both governing bodies in the form of a text amendment to the comprehensive plan. Planning staff was also recently been given the assignment to identify future industrial park sites in the county. The Commissions are not expected to receive these recommendations until late 2004. The planning staff will be prepared to present on the progress on the industrial chapter in April.

16) (Added 11-12-03; updated 2-2-04) The County Commission plans a discussion of how we classify our rural road system. What constitutes an arterial, collector, etc? The determination of which roads are maintained by the county and which are maintained by the townships would probably be part of this discussion.

    In January of 2004, the Commission directed staff to schedule a Wednesday evening work session in May, with invitations to the township boards, to discuss this topic. The Public Works Director was asked to meet with the Planning Director to plan this meeting so that the recommendations are compatible with Horizon 2020.

17) (Added 2-2-04) The County Commission has been exploring the concept of cluster development as a means to promote a denser development of the urban growth area surrounding the city of Lawrence, in a way that would be consistent with the eventual plans and needs of the City (including road layout, and utility provision), and which would also be consistent with County Health Department regulations for the appropriate disposal of sanitary sewage for the time period before the city's growth reaches the rural subdivision. Planning staff has agreed to have a specific proposal for the County Commission to consider in April.

18) (2-2-04) The permanent implementation of the prohibition on issuance of building permits on minimum maintenance roads will be included in the new subdivision regulation that will come before the commissioners in May or June.

19) Other issues that the Commission may want to add to this tacking memo.