I. Call to Order / Roll Call

II. Approval of standing committee minutes from September 16, 2013.

III. Committee Agenda

Item No. 1 - PRESENTATION: FOG PROGRAM

Synopsis:
Presentation on current and future information as it relates to Fats, Oil & Grease (FOG) program, presented by Jim Larkin, Water Pollution Control.

For information only
Tracking #: 130346
IV. Goals and Objectives

Item No. 1 - GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Synopsis:
The Unified Government Commission conducted a strategic planning process resulting in specific goals and objectives adopted by the commission on May 17, 2012. Commission has directed that the goals and objectives appear monthly on respective standing committee agendas to assure follow-up and action toward implementation.

a. Infrastructure. Improve and finance infrastructure to comply with federal regulations, encourage private investment, and build community.

b. Environment. Ensure natural resources are protected to the maximum extent possible; opportunities for additional natural areas are pursued; and the park system is enhanced.

c. Public Safety. Provide the public's safety through best practices with results in lower crime rate, safer dwellings and businesses, and efficient court services.

d. Multimodal Transportation. Create a transportation system that moves people to where they want to go including work, services, and amenities.

Tracking #: 120155

V. Adjourn
The meeting of the Public Works and Safety Standing Committee was held on Monday, September 16, 2013, at 5:00 p.m., in the 6th Floor Human Resources Training Room of the Municipal Office Building. The following members were present: Commissioner Kane, Chairman; Commissioners Philbrook, Markley, Maddox, Walker and BPU Board Member Jeff Bryant.

Chairman Kane called the meeting to order. Roll call was taken and all members were present as shown above.

Chairman Kane said there is a blue sheet tonight regarding a communication seeking authority to dispose of nine ambulances.

Approval of standing committee minutes for August 12, 2013. Commissioner Philbrook made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Markley, to approve. Motion carried unanimously.

Committee Agenda:
Item No. 1 – 130318… 2013 Fireworks summary, submitted by Fire Marshall John Zimbelman. For information only.

John Paul Jones, Chief, Kansas City, Kansas Fire Department, stated the fireworks summary for 2013, in regard to calls for service, it was a pretty mild season. We had one EMS call with an injured ankle. Somebody was running away from fireworks that they lit and twisted their ankle. Just four grass fires, 17 miscellaneous fire calls, four citations were given to fireworks vendors and those cases are pending. In regard to the Police Department, I think they had 341 calls for service. A lot of them were just getting called out for complaints about illegal use of fireworks.
The fireworks season, I think a lot of the mildness compared to the year prior I think we had the busiest 12 hours in the history of the Fire Department last year because of the dry conditions. That was a very busy time for us.

Some of the changes we made in regard to the process maybe had a lot to do with—there were less fireworks vendors. I don’t think it’s because we make the process more cumbersome or anything. I think we’ve lent itself to where we can enforce the existing ordinances better. I know that there was a decrease in the number of licenses given this year and year over year from last year. We changed the process to where there is an earlier application period. Quite frankly, what that does is give us the opportunity to better scrutinize the site plans and the application itself. Those that don’t qualify do not get a license. I think that has a lot to do with the reduction in the number of licenses that are pulled for the fireworks stands that are issued.

Overall, as far as property loss, frankly we had zero dollar loss as far as property loss associated with calls for service related to fireworks this year. I know that the local emergency room at KU Hospital, I think they had 17 admittance to the emergency room where there were serious injuries related to fireworks, but those would be those that were transported by POV or walk-ins as opposed to being transported by EMS.

Overall, Public Works—they showed $41,000 associated with activities related to closure or clean-up of the streets during the Fourth of July holidays. I spoke about the Police Department, 341 calls for service. A lot of those were just complaints of illegal fireworks or those that they thought might have been illegal. The Sheriff’s Department really had no incidents reported related to fireworks. Public Health reported on the air quality and I don’t think that was anything significant as far as change in air quality. The code enforcement total number of stands declined in the last four years. City revenues from the stands were $47,700.00 in 2013. They did set a higher fee amount for the larger stands, with eight stands paying the higher license fee. It slightly mitigated the lost revenue from decline in the total number of stands this year. The total amount of revenue generated in 2012 from fireworks was $159,726.00. Parks and Rec reported that as far as summary of time, labor and expense incurred related to the Fourth of July of $2,224.33.

Overall, within this report I think it was a pretty mild season. Year over year there’s been a decrease in the number of firework stand licenses that have been pulled and a decrease in the amount of fire loss, structure fires and dollar loss associated with that. Now, whether or not there
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is a direct relationship remains to be seen. I’m happy to report that anytime I can say there is one EMS call that was very mild and no real fire loss and no structure fires related to the Fourth of July.

**BPU Board Member Bryant** said the only question I would have is you said you have more to evaluate them and the ones that didn’t qualify. Do we know how many didn’t quality, a rough number? **Chief Jones** said how many didn’t qualify; I think there was a handful that was turned down. I would defer to maybe Greg or Phil.

**Phil Henderson, License Division**, said actually the applicants that actually made application, there were a couple that were initially denied the initial setup they had, but during that initial process they had an opportunity to submit a revised plan. As long as they meet the revised requirements, to my knowledge there was no one that actually submitted a plan that was ultimately denied, that did not submit something that was subsequently re-accepted. I know there were a couple of locations that were denied the location because they were not current on their property tax. There were also a couple of individuals that were not able to get tax clearance from the Department of Revenue, so they were not even allowed to submit an application.

**BPU Board Member Bryant** said so the process is working? **Chief Jones** said the process is also working to get better compliance up front so that everybody understands what the ordinance is, what that entails. Instead of us chasing a problem around and trying to solve it, it’s solved up front by a clear understanding that we will enforce the ordinance, so it has worked very well.

**Commissioner Walker** said do we need to toughen code requirements for firework stands? Totally different example, but there are several barbecue contests that I used to go to where if you built a structure it has to meet code requirements under the Uniform Code. Your electrical set up has to have a 10’ copper pole in the ground. You have to have, depending on your square footage, so many renewed fire extinguishers and other means of fire elimination, so much water on the premises. Rather tough just to barbecue. The question would be then, are we enforcing those kinds of code requirements and do we need to toughen them up for fireworks in the sense of eliminating the marginal operations. **Chief Jones** said I think the first step was to get better compliance with the ordinance as it exists. What we wanted to do was to make sure we’re enforcing the ordinances that we have now.
Every December we do a comprehensive review of that ordinance. I sit down with the Fire Marshall and we go through it. Quite frankly, our ordinances are pretty comprehensive. They’re pretty tough as they exist. We did make modification to the ordinance here recently. The sky lanterns was something that we wanted to make sure we addressed. I believe the state law now also prohibits the use of the sky lanterns. At the time we made it part of our ordinance to prohibit the use of sky lanterns while the state worked on passing a law that would prohibit it statewide. We review this every year, but I think step one was to improve the process to better enforce compliance with the ordinance as we have it now. We’re always looking it and if there needs to be improvement, we’ll definitely address that.

**Commissioner Philbrook** said number one, I want to make a statement and that is that all of the ones that I saw up and down State Avenue and other areas looked so much nicer now that they’re using instead of looking like a shack, a nice tent. That looks much nicer. It doesn’t look like we’re building shacks up and down State Avenue. Whatever you did, if you want to tell me how that happened to get them to look better I would appreciate that, however that was; Code Enforcement or whatever. Address that one first and then I’ll ask you the next one.

**Chief Jones** said as far as the tents, the idea of allowing tents, and for one I think it lends itself to better appearance, but also they can put them up and take them down a little quicker too. As far as storage, and a lot of the firework retailers will rent the tents, so they’re always in pretty good condition when they are delivered and put up.

We looked at the national standards involving tents, tent material, where they’re placed, and we made that part of the ordinance. We have Fire Department guidelines for that because we thought that was very important that out of the Fire Marshall’s office and the Fire Department that we have our own guidelines for tents. That’s really worked well as far as safety. I think Commissioner Kane had introduced the idea of the tents as far as better appearance and more conducive to having an operation within Kansas City, Kansas as far as fireworks retailers.

**Commissioner Philbrook** said you said something about the sky lanterns being illegal, is that what I heard you say? **Chief Jones** said yes. **Commissioner Philbrook** said where’s the closest they can buy those? The reason I ask is because I got to sit out in Piper and watch a whole bunch of them go across in front of me. That’s why I’m asking. **Chief Jones** said I believe what’s in the works is that’ll be illegal statewide. There was an issue with banning them in Kansas City, Kansas, but I think we found them in a Target, I believe, store in Johnson County.
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County. **Commissioner Markley** said Jeff’s right. You can order them by the six pack online and have them shipped to your house. **Chief Jones** said that’s a real problem. What the NFDA is working on is trying to get the word out on sky lanterns. Our ultimate goal in the Fire Service is to have a ban on sky lanterns that affects every state. We’re getting there.

**Commissioner Maddox** said I have a statement and it may be a question as well. I received calls, not just this year but last year, in regard to the new ordinance. The calls mainly came from individuals who own stores, but would put the shack looking fire stands on their lot. With the new ordinance, I guess, I don’t know if it has something to do with 100 feet or so many feet from the store that they can erect their fire stand that now creates an issue within the ordinance. What we have in the urban core is a lack of fireworks. They can drive out further to get the fireworks, but those traditional stores that have existed no longer exist according to the new ordinance.

Not only that, when they turned in their paperwork, they said that they didn’t receive adequate responses or correspondence, they would have to wait two weeks or they would call and then people wouldn’t get back with them. I just want to ask what is the exact procedure on that and how exactly does that work because there wasn’t just one group that said it, it was two or three groups and they shared the same stories. I believe that we had a roundtable discussion about it in which there were various staff members there who also heard the stories of those individuals who felt like they had been done wrong in the new ordinance process because they are not allowed now to have that actual fire stand they had on their property in the past.

**Chief Jones** said a great deal of effort went into the communication process to make sure that anyone who had a fireworks stand previously was notified in advance. We were very proactive in having those discussions and making sure that everybody understood that. The ordinance itself did not change except for the sky lantern portion of it. What changed is the ability to enforce the existing ordinance by implementing a program to where the time line allowed us to better scrutinize those that were making application and also to require a site plan to be submitted so that we could ensure that the site plan would comply with the existing ordinance. But if somebody wanted to have a fireworks stand on a site that didn’t comply with the ordinance, then they would be denied. There was also an opportunity to choose a different site and then there was a time period to where they could get a new site plan at a different site. Within that is May 18 was the application deadline for the fireworks and then May 21-25 review
of the application, documentation. May 28 notification letters sent regarding approval status. June 8 was the deadline for submission of alternate site plans. We started this in advance so that we had the opportunity to work with the individuals too to give them another chance to choose a site. Notification letters were sent out in June in regard to an alternate site approval. June 18-27 approval permits were issued.

In the past we would get just a list of the sites a couple of days before the Fourth of July leaving no real opportunity for us to try to achieve compliance with the ordinance. It’s better managed through this process so those individuals know up front if they don’t comply initially with the site plan, then they are already in violation of the ordinance so that they are not going to get the license. We went to great lengths to improve the process, but we also went to great lengths to make sure there was a communication avenue involved so that everybody understood and we were all on the same page.

If that happened to where somebody felt like that they weren’t fully informed, gosh I don’t know what else we could have done because we really went to great lengths to make sure that took place. We worked closely with Phil because that’s one thing that we wanted to make certain, that everybody understood that the ordinance was going to be enforced and that this process was going to take place.

Commissioner Maddox said so the site list was that a list that you guys came up with sites and then you guys submitted as an alternative to the application they submitted or were they supposed to pick a site. Chief Jones said that’s up to the individual. If they applied for a fireworks license with a particular site in mind that did not comply with the ordinance, they were notified that that was the case. Then they had the opportunity to choose a different site and resubmit. Commissioner Maddox said I appreciate that and I appreciate your response to that. But it seems like if a person was denied a license upon a site, then they miss a whole season of fireworks if they just didn’t find a site that reached the requirements that you guys set. All I’m saying is that those individuals have been selling fireworks for years in front of their stores. There have never been fires. Never been a report of a fire at a location and that was a way that they received a little bit of money as a business owner within Wyandotte County. I guess I respect the ordinance. I don’t know it totally, but at the same time, I think the approach maybe should be tweaked a little bit to where you could show an individual what sites are available, then
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they pick a site and go put a location there. They already have it versus picking two or three places, being denied, and then having to go find another place.

Chairman Kane said, Commissioner, the reason the ordinance was changed was because people asked us to change it. That was all four corners that said we don’t like the setup, the buildings are not very good buildings. They were put up way too far in advance, not taken down. Actually taken down and lying on the ground. One of the things that we changed was not something that the Committee thought about. They said hey, why don’t you, so I added the tent part myself. That was from complaints across the city not liking what was going on. We had some other incidents and if we looked back at what he said, this is probably the safest year we’ve had, correct. Chief Jones said correct. Chairman Kane said we don’t want to put that stuff where it could cause an incident or accident either. If there is an issue, what they should do is contact you so we can talk to these folks to say alright, what do we need to do to put it in a close proximity of their business.

Chief Jones said the issue that the Fire Service has with-one thing I will say is the ordinance- we have a pretty good fireworks ordinance. If somebody was allowed in the past to have a fireworks stand that didn’t meet the ordinance requirements, and a lot of the issue was because the timeline was so tight that we couldn’t properly inspect them all within a timely manner. The issue still exists that if there is a fireworks stand, whether it’s a tent or a wood structure, etc., it really doesn’t matter, if it’s in close proximity to a dwelling where it has an occupancy where people are going to live in that occupancy, then we have a fire hazard that we really have to deal with it. It poses an unacceptable risk. That’s really what enforcing the ordinance is all about.

It may cause some heartburn to somebody that didn’t get to have a fireworks stand on the location that they wanted, but from a fire service perspective, it would be unacceptable to make those exceptions because it poses a risk to life and health within our community. Through the Fire Marshall’s office, who answers to my office, those situations are deemed unacceptable and that’s why the ordinance exists.

Mr. Henderson said if I could elaborate just one slight bit. The fact that they do allow the tents does not necessarily exclude the stands themselves. In fact, we did have at least one stand that I know of, the stand-stand. I mean the plywood and the 2X4s. They’re not necessarily excluded. It’s just the tents are much more convenient for those who choose to have them.
lack of some in the northeast, I know that one individual who typically had had a couple of stands, he choose to not have one of those stands, have just one. But the one that he had he actually put into a brick and mortar building this year and that stand was about four times the size of either of the two small ones that he had previously had that were just little stands. So, he actually had an opportunity, which in a brick and mortar building is going to be more safe than it would have been in the plywood stand that he previously had.

**Action:** No action.

**Item No. 2 – 130314**… Communication requesting the appointment of Matt Hendren as the Wyandotte County Noxious Weed Supervisor, submitted by Bob Roddy, Public Works Director.

Mike Tobin, Deputy Director of Public Works, said for years when I started here we always had a Noxious Weed Department and a Noxious Weed Director. Somehow or another that kind of fell through the cracks and we haven’t had one for awhile.

We have an employee named Matt Hendren and he works for Jack. Jack stand up, would you. This is the Deputy Parks Director, Jack Webb, for those who don’t know him. Matt has went through all of the schooling, all the qualifications he had to go through to make it to be declared the noxious weed person. I am here tonight to seek permission from the Standing Committee so that this could be forwarded to the Full Commission for the appointment.

**Action:** Commissioner Markley made a motion, seconded by BPU Board Member Bryant, to approve. Roll call was taken and there were six “Ayes,” Bryant, Philbrook, Markley, Maddox, Walker, Kane.

**Item No. 3 – 130316**… Communication requesting direction and input on policies and plans to carry out the mandates of the new concealed carry laws as they relate to handguns in municipal and government buildings, submitted by Jenny Myers, Legal.
**Jenny Myers, Senior Attorney**, stated I am here to talk about House Bill 2052 that was enacted July 1 of this year. This is the new concealed carry law. Basically, it is the intent of the Legislature to make sure that all state and municipal buildings are open to concealed carry licensees. This new act says that no state or municipal building shall restrict somebody who has a license from carrying it unless the building has adequate security measures to ensure that no weapons are permitted to be carried and to make sure that such building is so posted.

What we have done so far is the legislature gave us an exemption. On July 1 we got an exemption for six months until January 1, 2014. All UG buildings have been exempted. January 1 we have another shot at four years on buildings. We have an exemption for four years on those buildings as long as we have a plan in place to make sure that everybody who enters that building is safe.

What we’re doing right now, just an update, is we’re going through that list. There’s probably close to 400 UG properties that we had on that list. Mike Tobin is working on that. We have several people working on this list to determine what those properties are. At that point we only had addresses. We got them from the BPU meters, so we only have addresses. At this point we’re looking at the site to see what it is and then we’re going to, hopefully, put this into two or three categories.

Now, we have some buildings that are already okay. City Hall already has adequate, and what adequate safety measures are are metal detectors. So City Hall is going to be exempt. The Courthouse is exempt because it has courtrooms and courtrooms are exempt. I believe the Court Services building is also going to be exempt because Judge Lampson has signed an executive order saying there will be no weapons.

We have those buildings that already are exempt. Then we have another list of those that will never, the parks-there’s no buildings there. The water pump stations where there’s no public whose going in there will be on another list. Then we’re going to bring to you a list that has everything else such as Memorial Hall, the Annex, buildings like that that we’re going to need your input as to whether we should exempt for another four years or not.

**Chairman Kane** said is this a recommendation, do we need a motion, what do we need? **Ms. Myers** said we were hoping to come forward with recommendations as to what our lists were, but those lists have not been done yet. We’re still dwindling the list down to, hopefully,
about 20 actual buildings that we will. I wanted a recommendation to give you for a motion, but that’s not done, so at this point we’re just updating you.

Doug Bach, Deputy County Administrator, said it’s not an issue that we’ve had a lot of discussion with the commission yet. So, it’s making sure we’re proceeding down the same track that you want us to. That we are basically taking the list of all of the properties one, if they’re open space we can’t do anything with that, or it’s basically a work space where the public rarely, if ever, goes to. We’re not going to put together a plan for those. As Jenny said, we have our main buildings that seem fairly obvious, but there’s the gray area of those that are the rec centers and such like that that we’ll bring back on that list to say we think those are ones you’re wanting us to try and put together a plan for. It may be hard to enforce that four years from now depending on how things go. So is that the direction you want us to proceed in, unless you have different feelings that kind of how we’re putting the list together and will proceed in developing plans down that regard.

Chairman Kane said that’s what I understood. That you guys were coming up with a plan and you would tell us. Obviously, we’re not quite there yet. Ms. Myers said yes, but we’re just hoping that we’re going down the right direction of making it into several different lists to make it easier to determine which ones we’re going to go forward with.

I think at some point we’re also going to need to talk about policy for employees at each different building and who’s going to be allowed. Commissioner Walker said I thought under this new law the access had to be closed to everyone. Ms. Myers said no, it does differentiate between restricted access and access open to the public. The public has to have adequate security measures. If it has restricted access, right now the Attorney General is interpreting it that the municipality can have personnel policies that say no.

Commissioner Walker said well, I think if I were going to come in here, just on my own experience, and wreak mayhem, these employees they come in these doors and once they click that door, somebody walks up behind them, they don’t know every employee in the building. I never did. I’m not going to turnaround and push whoever it might be back out the door because I don’t know who he is, so he just follows you to the VIP door. You do you’re click and walk in and he walks in behind you. It would be very simple. I don’t necessarily want to have to go through metal detectors to get into the building at the VIP, but I don’t know how you’re going to make this building safe if you don’t do that. There may be other access to this building that I
don’t even know about through the basement. Ms. Myers said I think that will be part of our security plan that we have to have in place so we will look at each building, even the ones that do have metal detectors, look at each entrance and we’ll have to ensure that there’s a policy in place as our plan. Commissioner Walker said and the cost factor is no small item here in how far we’re going to be able to go.

Action: No action.

Item No. 4 – 130321… Communication seeking authority to dispose of nine ambulances which are no longer viable for use by KCK emergency operations, submitted by John Paul Jones, Fire Chief.

John Paul Jones, Chief, Kansas City, Kansas Fire Department, stated when we took the EMS transport service back over in 2004, we bought ambulances in order to do so. Here we are in 2013, we’ve replaced a lot of those ambulances. We have nine of them in mothballs out at the Fleet Center. A lot of them we use for parts. Some of them are missing parts, tires missing or fenders or lights. To make a long story short, we put over 1,000,000,000 miles on that group of ambulances and they are completely wore out and used up. They’re probably not worth about $2,000 a piece, especially the four that we were going to donate to Mexico. We’re going to try and sell two on Purple Wave at auction, try to get what we can out of them. I’m not so sure that anybody will buy them.

The three others we were going to donate one to the Police Department, one to the Sheriff’s Department and one to the Community College. They’re not in really good shape, but we were hoping maybe they could utilize the Technical Education Center to try to fix them up so that they could have some use.

That’s what we’re proposing to dispose of these nine ambulances. Are there any questions? Commissioner Walker said these are so far gone that no municipality could overtly or covertly buy these, utilize them, retro-fit them and make them viable? Chief Jones said it would be cost prohibitive for us to try and do that, as far as somebody, no. Commissioner Walker said I don’t want anybody buying an ambulance on the cheap and using it for municipal
Chief Jones said no, no, that’s not going to happen. These are beyond having any residual value as far as I’m concerned.

The three, the one that’s going to go to PD, one to the Sheriff’s Department and one to the Community College are in a little better condition, but they’re still pretty far gone also.

**Action:** Commissioner Markley made a motion, seconded by BPU Board Member Bryant, to approve. Roll call was taken and there were six “Ayes,” Bryant, Philbrook, Markley, Maddox, Walker, Kane.

**Goals and Objectives**

**Item No. 1 – 120155…** The Unified Government Commission conducted a strategic planning process resulting in specific goals and objectives adopted by the commission on May 17, 2012. Commission has directed that the goals and objectives appear monthly on respective standing committee agendas to assure follow-up and action toward implementation.

a. **Infrastructure.** Improve and finance infrastructure to comply with federal regulations, encourage private investment, and build community.

b. **Environment.** Ensure natural resources are protected to the maximum extent possible; opportunities for additional natural areas are pursued; and the park system is enhanced.

c. **Public Safety.** Provide the public's safety through best practices with results in lower crime rate, safer dwellings and businesses, and efficient court services.

d. **Multimodal Transportation.** Create a transportation system that moves people to where they want to go including work, services, and amenities.

Assistant Chief Colonel Terry Ziegler, Kansas City, Kansas Police Department, said at the last meeting Chief Armstrong sent a copy of the department’s strategic plan and goals to all the
Commissioners. The Police Department, we are confident that we’re on course to obtain the goals that we have listed. We track them quarterly. We are entering the third quarter. As of today’s date, we are on track with the things like the nightly enforcements with the strategies for engaging the juveniles in the community. Those things are all on track and we don’t see any problem with us obtaining the goals that we have listed in the document that was sent to you all. If you have any specific questions I’d be more than happy to try and answer them for you.

Chairman Kane said I don’t have any questions on that, but could you give us some information on the school resource officer update. Assistant Chief Ziegler said on the school resource officer update, I don’t have the figures with me as far as how many calls for service they’ve answered, how many arrests they’ve made, and the type of violations. I can get that for you, but I don’t have it this evening.

I work in the Bureau of Operations, that is my area of responsibility. I can tell you that the school resource officers have continued to address calls for service, complete reports, effect arrests, that have reduced the number of calls for service that our district patrol officers have to make at the high schools. We have eight school resource officers. We have five in District 500, one in Piper, one in Ward and one in Turner. An additional duty that we gave to the school resource officers last year was we implemented the Junior Police Academy.

What that is is that every week, every Friday, or when the school allows the time for it, which is typically one day a week, but it varies from school to school, the school resource officers go in and they teach the freshman class why policemen do the things they do. Now, it seems like that probably isn’t that important, but the belief is that if we can engage the juveniles at freshman, we might be able to impact the graduation rate among kids in high school as well as improve their citizenship and improve their relationship with the Police Department. They’re teenagers, they’re going to become highly mobile in the community, they’re going to start going to movies, to parties, hanging out, and we want to make sure that we try to prepare them in case they do encounter the Police Department. It’s a great program in that the kids are allowed to share experiences that they’ve had with the Police Department and then we explain to them why things happen the way they did.

District 500 has been very appreciative of the program. I go to District 500 typically twice a year to give them an update on that and on the OK program which we have at Schlagle. Coronado is a feeder school for that program. That is a program in which we work with black
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males who are identified at Coronado who are at-risk and not graduating. I gave the report in May to the school board. One of the most exciting figures that came out of that was that we’re tracking our interaction with those kids. We’ve seen a 34% reduction in disciplinary problems with the kids that are participating in that program. The good thing is that they get identified in Coronado. Then when they move over to Schlagle, Officer Simmons continues to work with those kids, mentors them, acts as a role model, father figure, counselor. We’re hoping within the next three years we’re going to have some statistics on how many of those kids are graduating as a result of that program.

Those are two programs that involve the school resource officers that we’re very proud of and very optimistic about. The OK Program, Officer Simmons that’s his primary task, is running that program. But he works hand-in-hand with the school resource officer, Elaine Moore, at Schlagle. She provides what assistance she can to him.

Chairman Kane said when we get the numbers back, can we expand that to the other schools? Assistant Chief Ziegler said the deal with the OK program, it’s a staffing issue for us. We were able to get one officer in there. District 500 was clear that they want that available to any, not just black males, but any student that we identify as at-risk. We’re working on that. If we had the staffing it would be nice to expand that to other schools, but I would tell you that Officer Simmons is very, very busy day in and day out with that program.

The Junior Police Academy, we’ve offered it to the schools, but it’s up to them whether or not they want to allow us to do it. District 500 has been the most supportive of that program. It makes our school resource officers actually interact with the students. I think it’s a good program and hopefully it’s going to produce some real nice results for the school district and the community as a whole as it goes through.

Action: No action.

Doug Bach, Deputy County Administrator, said you asked us to get a hold of the Sheriff’s Department. I talked at Sheriff Ash and looked at the accreditation. This was stimulated from the Police Department moving through with the accreditation last month.

Basically, they had not looked into it. They had, but they looked into the further details of it. The cost to do it is about $10,000 annually, plus about a $5,000 on-site accreditation fee that
you would have to pay each year coming on. Probably the bigger expense that the Sheriff sees in association with it is, he does not have, really, an established planning and research department, which if you look at the Police Department, that’s largely what they use to run their accreditation program. Then they’ll try and add a staff member to that as they work through the program.

So, the Sheriff would assign his lieutenant. Basically that department has other duties. He said she could work on it, but we would probably need to hire an additional deputy and then some general office supplies. In the end, your annual cost would probably be about $75,000 a year just in your out-of-pocket expense, and most of that being for personnel cost, to go through accreditation.

I think they said 189 different points that you would look at from an accreditation perspective that they would go through and establish and work on it. Obviously, the first year you do it, you have 36 months to go through and meet all of the standards required to do this. If you’re not able to do it within that time period, then you could apply for an extension. Most likely we’d be able to do it within that time frame if you commit to it. **BPU Board Member Bryant** said the position that would have to be added would be 100% dedicated to that only and not have time for other duties? **Mr. Bach** said yes. Yes, I think that would be, clearly in your first 36 months and I could probably even ask Colonel Ziegler to come back, when you start into the accreditation process, it takes a lot of time because you’re going through all of the standards that you currently have in operation and you’re crossing them over to what the federal department has brought in for the accreditation protocol in place.

**Commissioner Maddox** said you said $75,000, is that for the position? **Mr. Bach** said it’s a position. You’ve got a onetime $10,000 fee up front, then you’ve got to have on-site accreditors come out and they’ll charge you back about $5,000 for expenses. But then we will have a position of hiring a deputy, that will be an annual cost and that’s probably right in there what we’ll be paying.

**Commissioner Maddox** said my other question is how does the accreditation process work? I know you kind of talked about the 36 months. **Mr. Bach** said what you would do is begin to gear up for the operation for it. You would submit application. Colonel I’d probably let you speak, though, a little bit better. We could ask the Sheriff’s Department, but since the Police have been through it, it’ll be similar for the Sheriff’s Department if they were to start it. Could you speak as to how the startup process goes and what goes into it.
Assistant Chief Ziegler said through CALEA, what happens is there’s a set of standards they have and I think we’re looking at trying to get reaccredited at some point. There’s a 177 standards for law enforcement. Those standards impact policies that we have. These are the best practices that have been identified by CALEA for law enforcement which helps prevent litigation and lawsuits. If you do get sued, you can come in and say we are accredited. Here are the standards. Here’s how we meet it.

What we’ve been doing as we prepare to move forward with accreditation at some point, we’ve got a copy of the standards and we have been going through every policy the Police Department has and changing what needs to be changed so that we can come in compliance with CALEA. It’s a lengthy process. We have two people in the Chief’s office in the Planning and Research unit who also do the PIO stuff that you sometime see on TV. One of their jobs is to take care of those CALEA files and maintain them. As updates come through, they have to notify Policy Review. Then we go through and change policies and adjust anything and everything inside the organization.

I will tell you that it is beneficial when you’re litigated to walk in and say we’re in compliance with industry standards. I think that it would probably take a position to do it. We’re using two officers and it keeps them pretty busy. The timelines, I’m not sure about the timelines, but once you become ready and you say we’re ready to go forward with being accredited, you have to go forward. Actually the assessors come in, they check your files, they check your policies, they do interviews to see if you’re actually in compliance with the standards. Then you have to make a trip to one of their conferences. At that point, answer questions for a committee or a body of individuals. Then they determine whether or not you’re in compliance with the standards and will receive your accreditation. It is time-consuming personnel wise and there is a financial cost.

Commissioner Maddox said I wanted to know, the $75,000, where would this come from? Mr. Bach said you would have to add it to the Sheriff’s Department budget. Chairman Kane said there’d be no grant. We would have to fund it ourselves. Mr. Bach said right. They haven’t come forward with any requests. There’s no money in their budget for it. We’d need to add an additional person to them and then add funding for the application costs and such like that.
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BPU Board Member Bryant said it wasn’t actually asked by them. I think at our last meeting I brought up that is the Sheriff’s Department the same. They were just doing the research to find out what the cost, if it’s feasible.

Action: No action.

Doug Bach, Deputy County Administrator, said this committee is charged with three areas. We’ve heard from public safety which is one of them. That’s information that is there. You have environment and you also have infrastructure which are the three areas of the nine goals that you’re assigned to Public Works and Safety. It’s whether or not you would like to do anything in working through those goals. I know we’ve had that.

One is I do believe I’ll have Fairfax Industrial Association come back, probably in the next month. We’re working through our debt financing. Last year we worked the goal, this committee worked on it, actually it was more budget. They were to bring back a specific project before we issued debt. We’re looking at some different options with them that we’ve talked through with Chuck Schlittler down there and worked on what kind of projects could be. We have to identify those now for any project we issue for 2014 debt. We have to have all of those turned in and we have to be fairly specific.

So it’s a combination between whether right now working through between maybe some grind and overlay work in that area in addition to what is typically done in District 1. I know they have some railroad crossing work; however, we think there might be better advantages for us to leverage money with Union Pacific if we put those out in front and then they pay for the cost versus if you come in and say we’re doing this, then not as likely to get money from them.

They have a number of maintenance costs which are not debt eligible. We have $100,000 in the budget that you all set aside and said that’s for that area. It’s not in their control. They had to come back and present. We will try to be here next month at this committee to talk about the specific projects they’re recommending.

Chairman Kane said that’s infrastructure. Can we have one from each one, environmental and public safety? Mr. Bach said we can. What would you like us to bring? Chairman Kane said well, like what’s environment working on now and the thoughts. Mr. Bach said say
environment, items we discussed last year and probably are closely related, we had issues regarding John Garland Park and the conversion of that back to a park. That was an initiative that was worked on through this committee and has moved forward. I would also probably say what we’re doing on the combined sewers is a pretty big environmental issue that’s kind of ongoing. You see that in budget. That was an issue addressed by this committee. If there’s something else that you’re thinking about as a potential goal or objective...Chairman Kane said can they give us an update of what they are working on? Mr. Bach said I think you saw most of the CSO stuff at special session last month.

I think is a little bit of the evolution, just kind of working through it as what we want to do with our goals and objectives in these specific areas. The goal for environment, I’ll just read it here: “Protect natural resources and comply with state and federal regulations to the most cost effective manner to improve environment in our region.” I mean, as a staff, we have different regulations that we abide by. We’ve changed things for drainage and development and how we regulate that. We’ve continued to, the CSOs is the biggest money area as we’re moving forward. I think it’s whether or not there’s a different direction we need, or is there something the commissioners are thinking about in that area that we should be addressing.

Commissioner Markley said I think when it comes to these goals and objectives, something that we’re going to be discussing because Commissioner McKiernan and I have been discussing it, so we’re going to bring it up at our strategic planning, is that we did a great job of coming up with these general goals, but they’re not specific enough for us to measure them at the end of the year and say did we protect natural resources. We, as commissioners, need to be bringing forward those more specific goals. Instead of saying, we’re going to promote social services, we need to be saying how we’re going to accomplish this individual goal. Instead of saying we’re going to work on housing, we need to say we want this many more housing units in our urban neighborhoods by the end of X year. We need to be more specific about what we’re looking for because we’re not giving staff, we gave staff some pretty words but we’re not really giving them the guidance they need to know exactly what we want them to do. I think the charge to all of us is to come to that strategic planning prepared to give those individuals very specific goals. What do we actually want to see done to meet this larger, broader objective?

Commissioner Maddox said I agree. I had a question. I don’t know what meeting I sat in where I approved or we talked about John Garland Park, but since you brought it up, I just
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wanted to ask while it’s fresh on the table, what’s going on with John Garland Park. I rode by there just the other day and it’s got a walking path, but it has things that are in the ground that have a fence around them. So it still seems like there’s something going on in the park that would cause an issue for kids or children to be there, that there’s a gate around, but a walking path for people to still walk there.

**Mr. Bach** said I could probably bring Bob Roddy in and he could answer this better, but what we’re required to do when we closed it, John Garland Park, we were supposed to put air monitoring devices in the park. That’s what I believe you’re seeing that are fenced in. We still have to continue to monitor the air quality that comes out. I believe for a number of years there’s been no issue with the air quality that comes out, but we are required to continue to do this. That’s one measure that we do to come back to the residents that may use the park or use the walking path to be assured that it is a safe environment to be in. That is what you’re seeing. I don’t know that there’s any end date that we can ever pull them out even though our air quality levels have been good for years.

**Commissioner Markley** said one of our specific goals that we have under this environment objective should be dealing with John Garland Park and telling staff what we want to see and by when so that they have sort of a target to look at. Now we can’t necessarily control things like when we can stop monitoring the air, but we can say what we think the plan should be going forward with that land and that should be one of those individual goals. **Commissioner Maddox** said I don’t know what Area 51 looks like, but it looks like that’s what the park looks like it has. Things that are gated but are in the ground, but people are supposed to walk around it. That’s weird to me because it’s not people friendly. It’s not kid friendly. If we’re going to put something in the ground because we’re required to because we don’t know 100% that the air quality is clean, then I question the fact that it’s even deemed a park where kids are supposed to walk or supposed to have fun. I just wanted to be on the record as saying that. I don’t remember the conversation about it, but I have seen the park. I advise any commissioner to ride by there, and I know that you guys would be like they want people to walk around this, they want kids to play around this. It’s kind of a weird scenario.

**Mr. Bach** said I think it was an area that we had a lot of discussion on this one for years even before you came, Commissioner. I know that was an issue of somewhat a debate, you know, because we’re going to be required to monitor that air quality for years, but I think it came
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down to Commissioner Barnes where we kept noting how it was clean air. Clean air, clean air, no issue, then why can’t we go back in and start to use the park. That’s where we’ve proceeded to today that we have clean air, but we are required to continue monitoring that air. We have alarms on them that will set off if there is an issue. Through the EPA we’re going to have to continue to leave them out there for many years to come, but I think the decision finally came down to just because we’re monitoring the air doesn’t mean we can’t use the park. There’s nothing that would indicate that it’s not safe.

**Commissioner Maddox** said I’ve received a lot of negative calls about it. Some people are concerned that we’ve allowed the park to open and it seems it still may be hazardous to people who go there. **Commissioner Walker** said this thing goes back to the mid to late 70’s when our wonderful EPA gave us a grant under KDHE to build a demonstration landfill that we could then convert into a park. Then, once that was done, they started cracking us because it was giving off methane gas and made us ameliorate the problem. That, again, cost a lot of money. Now, as I recall, the people in the area wanted to have use of that as a park because they didn’t have any other place to go that was close. But I would bet you the air is no dirtier there around that park than it is right outside this building. We just don’t have a thing in the ground that makes us worry about it. Perhaps it’s because we haven’t done a good enough job of educating the neighborhoods that hey, this is safe. That alarm goes off, get out of there, but otherwise it’s safe. Maybe we all ought to go down there as commissioners and have a game of kickball or something and invite the neighborhood. If we’re going to go down there, I mean something, that might be ridiculous.

**Mr. Bach** said why I don’t look into some signage. Because I don’t believe we did put anything there. At least somebody could read something that says why these monitors are there. **Chairman Kane** said monitors are here. If they’re making a noise, get out. **Mr. Bach** said I was going to say why they’re there and explain it more from a positive, reuse of the park. **Commissioner Walker** said the alternative is just to keep it perpetually closed with warning and skull and crossbones around it and that’s not very good for the neighborhood either. I don’t know what the right answer is.

**Mr. Bach** said on your infrastructure, one objective that this committee could work on would be, in looking at your CMIP Projects Plan, you know we get that each year. As we say, going
through it at the budget time of year, it’s too hard for you to spend as much time on it. But if you were to take a look at some of your future year projects now, and you could do that from an objective as this committee and say okay, here’s a road we’re going to be working on, it’s planned for 2015-2016, what are some other issues that we as a community should be thinking about and addressing around that road. Our intersections or whatever that are out there, and really look at it from a project basis and what are the things you see as hot spots or concerns on that. That could be an active, ongoing thing for this committee to work on this time of year. Do we approve or not this time of year. Do we change it or whatever? **BPU Board Member Bryant** said I have requested a copy of that plan and have not seen one. **Mr. Bach** said it is online if you go to our budget document, but we can make a separate copy if you would like one. **Chairman Kane** said send him just that one little thing. **BPU Board Member Bryant** said that’s fine, then I can put it in my binder.

Adjourn

**Chairman Kane** adjourned the meeting at 6:00 p.m.
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Unified Government Of Wyandotte County & Kansas City, Kansas Public Works Department

FOG Program Update to Board of Commissioners

OCTOBER 14, 2013
FOG History

• Fats Oil and Grease dumped down the sewer have caused sewer blockages and overflows

• FOG & Septic waste has been received for years at Kaw Point WWTP at a receiving station

• Partial Consent Decree (PCD)-requires formal and documented FOG Program
Who’s in the FOG Program?

• FOG Generating Businesses, including:

  – Restaurants, food courts, delis, snack bars

  – Food processing and packaging plants

  – Schools, hospitals, nursing homes
Program Purpose

• Require FOG Generators to have grease interceptors (GIs) and follow Best Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize FOG Discharges
  – FOG materials plug sewers, cause overflows and basement backups
FOG Program Basics

• FOG generators required to have:
  – FOG Permit (no cost initially)
  – Grease Interceptor (GI)-New FOG generators only
  – Submit Annual Grease Report- (O&M of GI)

• Existing FOG generators w/o GI:
  – Granted conditional waiver
  – GI not required until traceable grease problem occurs
Change to Hauled Waste Policy

• On Jan. 1, 2014, UG still accepting septic waste, but not grease at Receiving Station

• Grease is a revenue source, however:
  – O&M costs are making it revenue neutral
  – Local KCK business is actively seeking grease for recycling beneficial use
  – JOCO accepting grease for beneficial reuse
Ordinance Changes Ahead

- Include FOG Program definitions
- FOG Permitting and Reporting requirements
- Transfer certain ordinances to WPC from Health Dept.
- Revise Enforcement action language
- Appeal process available at any step
Future Action Items

• Roll-out FOG Program Jan. 1, 2014
  – Send out FOG Program Letters & Questionnaires to FOG Generators
  – Schedule FOG Program Meetings-FOG Generators
  – Revise Hauled Waste Policy-Discontinue accepting grease
  – Ordinance revisions to Commissioners for approval
  – Public Education to Residents-BPU bill inserts, Neighborhood Newsletters