The meeting of the Public Works and Safety Standing Committee was held on Monday, May 18, 2015, at 5:00 p.m., in the 5th Floor Conference Room of the Municipal Office Building. The following members were present: Commissioner Bynum, Chairman; Commissioners Philbrook, Markley, Kane, Johnson; and BPU Board Member Jeff Bryant. The following officials were also in attendance: Joe Connor, Assistant County Administrator; Gordon Criswell, Assistant County Administrator; Melissa Mundt, Assistant County Administrator; Jody Boeding, Chief Legal Counsel; Jennifer Myers, Senior Attorney; Emerick Cross, Commission Liaison; and Captain Michelle Angell, Kansas City, Kansas Police Department.

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

Approval of standing committee minutes for February 17 and March 16, 2015. On motion of Commissioner Markley, seconded by BPU Board Member Bryant, the minutes were approved. Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Bynum said next we have a blue sheet item for tonight’s agenda. It’s a new item and it’s added to the agenda as Item No. 4.

Committee Agenda:

Item No. 1 – 150117…RESOLUTION: OPERATION GREEN LIGHT TRAFFIC CONTROL

Synopsis: A resolution approving a cooperative agreement with Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) to fund operations of the Operation Green Light (OGL) Traffic Control System for 2015-2016, submitted by Lideana Laboy, Public Works.

Bill Heatherman, County Engineer, said I’m standing in for Lideana Laboy, our City Traffic Engineer. This is a renewal of an ongoing contract that we’ve had. It’s a partnership amongst a
whole large number of cities on both the Kansas and Missouri side facilitated by the Mid-
America Regional Council. They work together to make sure that traffic signals across
jurisdictional lines, as well as along corridors within our own city, are coordinated. It gives us
access to a real-time control center that’s manned in Lee’s Summit. It also leverages about 50%
of the cost through federal funds that are allocated through the Mid-America Regional Council.
We’ve been very pleased with the performance and the assistance we’ve gotten. This is just a
routine re-authorization. The money is already budgeted in cash accounts under the CMIP.

Action: Commissioner Kane made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Philbrook, to
approve and forward to full commission. Roll call was taken and there were six
“Ayes,” Bryant, Philbrook, Markley, Kane, Johnson, Bynum.

Item No. 2 – 150102…RESOLUTION: MERRIAM LANE, WEST 36TH ST. TO 24TH ST.
IMPROVEMENTS

Synopsis: A resolution approving an agreement with the City of Overland Park, KS, for the
public improvements on Merriam Lane, West 36th to 24th Street, submitted by Bill Heatherman,
County Engineer. The UG initiated this project and will pay all costs.

Bill Heatherman, County Engineer, said this pertains to the second Merriam Lane project
which is under design right now. It’ll begin construction in about a year that extends the
improvements west from 24th Street to the county line. The very edge of that project around 34th
Street actually spills into Overland Park. The county line is on a diagonal. We’re bringing our
project to a nice clean close right past the intersection, but because we’re technically off our
jurisdiction, we need to have a city-city agreement in place that just clarifies that this is a Unified
Government project. We’re the primary. Overland Park really doesn’t have a whole lot of
interest in it other than to assist us in any right-of-way or other matters.

I will say that we are asking that you approve this tonight with the amendment that the
final text of the agreement, once it is finalized between the two city law departments, will be
presented to the full council.

There are just some minor technical and legal issues. We’ve been going back and forth
about the specifics of how we say it, and we just weren’t able to get all of that finished up today.
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We will bring the proper text once it comes to the full commission, but the spirit of the agreement is as shown tonight and we’d ask for the committee’s approval.

**Action:** Commissioner Kane made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Philbrook, to approve and forward to full commission. Roll call was taken and there were six “Ayes,” Bryant, Philbrook, Markley, Kane, Johnson, Bynum.

**Mr. Heatherman** said I’ll just take note that that is with the stipulation that we amend the language before coming to commission.

**Item No. 3 – 150121…OVERVIEW: EMERALD ASH BORER SOLUTIONS**

**Synopsis:** Overview of programs and possible options available for Wyandotte County residents in dealing with the problem of the Emerald Ash Borer (EAB) affecting all ash trees in the metropolitan area, presented by Mike Tobin, Interim Public Works Director.

**Mike Tobin, Interim Public Works Director**, said this is an effort that has spanned across a couple of departments, notably Parks and Public Works. Staff has been working on it and I'm going to let Kurt Suther here from our Public Works Department, Jack, the Deputy Parks Director, and Tim Nick from Public Works staff, explain all the details to you. After they finish up, I’ll come back in on the end and we’ll talk about it because we’re kind of getting into a policy area here as to what goes with this program. We’re part informational and then direction from you as to how we proceed from this date. Having said all of that before I ruin it, I’ll let staff take over.
Kurt Suther, Neighborhood Resource Center, said as many of you probably are aware, the Emerald Ash Borer has killed millions of ash trees in the United States in 24 states and 2 Canadian provinces. It was discovered at Wyandotte County Lake in the summer of 2013. One important note to take is that it just impacts ash trees. It’s not going to impact other trees. It attacks the ash trees.

**Impact Emerald Ash Borer: Toledo, OH.**

This shows the impact of it on a residential street in Toledo, Ohio. It came in 2002. It was discovered in Detroit, Michigan. They believe it came from the Pacific Rim countries. At this point, there are no natural predators for it either. It does have quite an impact on the streetscape.
An estimated count studied them with the Mid-America Regional Council sponsored through the Kansas Forest Service, 6.5 million trees in Wyandotte County. Of that amount, if the average 2.6 in the metropolitan area for ash trees, that shows you how many ash trees would be available if it was 2.6, 170,000. If it’s 1.3 it would be 85,000. It’s estimated in the metropolitan area that there’s close to 6.5 million ash trees. We have been working with all of the different cities in the region working on this also.

There are really four locations that the ash would be located in. One would be your wooded areas which most people let the wooded areas alone and let nature take care of its course. Then you have the government property, you have right-of-ways, and then you also have private properties.

Commissioner Philbrook said whoa, stop. Go back to the last one. I’m confused. An estimated 6.53 million trees in Wyandotte County, an estimated 6.43 million in the metro. Mr. Suther said in the metro of ash trees. Commissioner Philbrook said I know. Mr. Suther said the top was all trees. Commissioner Philbrook said the top one is all trees. Mr. Suther said correct, in Wyandotte County. Commissioner Philbrook said still, you can’t have more in Wyandotte County than you have in the whole metro. Mr. Suther said we have a maximum of 170,000 in Wyandotte County and 6.49 million in the metro.
Mr. Tobin said one thing Kurt forgot to mention here is that’s the actual size of the insect that’s causing all this damage. I just wanted to note that as he moves forward. Mr. Suther said very destructive little thing.

### U.G. Ash Tree Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.G. Location</th>
<th># of Ash</th>
<th># to Cut</th>
<th># to Treat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.G. Totals</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other includes UG parking lots, medians, and miscellaneous properties.

As far as determining the Unified Government properties, we’ve left the wooded areas alone. If there’s any ash that might pose any type of a risk, we’ll be evaluating that and then cutting those down. We have looked at the other locations. We located all of the ash trees. We measured them, we rated them and that gives you an analysis of what we recommend. With the 391 ash trees, to cut down 74 and to treat 317. As we go through this process, we’ll be continually evaluating and re-evaluating the effectiveness.

### Right-of-Way Responsibilities

- Some Cities are responsible for ROW’s.
- Some Cities are not responsible for ROW’s.
- By ordinance KCK not responsible for ROW’s.
- “Potential” UG exposure to future dead ash. In house staff survey: 2,153 ash on private property & ROW could impact street & utility lines.
Secondly, I talked about the right-of-ways. In looking at research with different cities, some cities are responsible for right-of-ways, so they’ll actually be treating and/or cutting ash trees on the right-of-way. Some cities are not responsible for maintaining right-of-ways. Those cities, generally, have not done a whole lot as far as offering services to their community.

In KCK, the ordinance states that we are not responsible for the right-of-way. What I did then, knowing that we are not responsible for right-of-way, I did some surveying to determine the number of ash trees if the private property did not cut them down, if they were dead and they didn’t do anything, if they would fall into our streets or into our utility lines. I do have that all mapped out so it will give us an idea of where those locations are.

**Treatment of Ash**

- Treatment good for 2-3 years. More treatment required in future.

- Recommended treatment time: (May-June) and (September-October)

- KC. Mo. average tree size of 16” or $96 per tree for treatment good for 2-3 year period.

When you look at the treatment of ash, the treatment is generally good for anywhere from two to three years, but you’re going to have to re-treat it after that three-year period. A lot of cities will be treating the trees every three years.

The recommended time, the best time to treat them is between May and June and September and October. Those are the best times. Looking at Kansas City, Missouri, their average 16” tree that they’ve treated is $96 per tree for the treatment costs.
The options and assistance for our residents, if you take a look at that, basically there are a couple of different ash trees. That’s a white ash. They turn nice red fall colors. We have also a green ash which turns yellow in the fall time.

Currently we have educational information on the UG website. It will tell individuals what is an ash tree. A lot of people don’t even know what an ash tree looks like, but they can look at the pictures on the PowerPoint on the website and determine that. In addition, it shows some of the symptoms if their tree has been attacked by the bug. Thirdly, it gives other resources to help them make an educated opinion whether they should cut or should treat their tree.

Currently in Wyandotte County, a resident with a tree branch of 12” or less can take it to the yard waste drop off center and also to Deffenbaugh. So if they are cutting down some trees, those are some resources that we currently have in place.

In addition, after talking with some cities, I got the idea to get ahold of some contractors to see if we could get some pricing for treatment for our residents. We’ve contacted a company and got some bids trying to get a better price break for individuals in our community.
This gives an example of what the contractor has said. The first column is the tree size diameter. I don’t know I wasn’t familiar with it a few years ago until I got on the Tree Board, but a 10” diameter, you have to multiply that times a little over 3 so it’ll give you a 30” circumference. That just gives you a little idea with that.

The second column gives a price break if a homeowner’s association or a business has 50 or more plus trees. There’s so many dollars per tree according to the diameter of the tree. Then the last column is a price for just an individual tree.

When you look at that, the private contractors, they’re set up. They have the staff already hired. They have the chemicals. They have the expertise. It’s in place that the residents could be offered this type of a program.

**Summary**

- Unified Government Property.
- Right-of-Way.
- Private Property.
Going back over it, the Unified Government, we have identified our trees that we’re going to keep and treat and we’ve identified those which we are going to cut down. The right-of-way is the responsibility of the property owners. We do have some options that I’ve listed here about cutting and taking the branches to our two locations and then the possibility of utilizing a private contractor for treatment. That, basically, is also with the private property.

**Mr. Tobin** said, Jack, do you want to take a second here and explain how we’re going to do in-house on our own trees, please.

**Jack Webb, Deputy Parks Director,** said we have the option of contracting out or doing it in-house. On average, a 20” tree would be on a contractor would be $120. We could do it in-house for $85. That’s not saying we have the manpower to do it, but if we were to do it in-house, it’d be roughly $85.

**Chairman Bynum** asked how much manpower do you think it’s going to take because you know how many trees. **Mr. Webb** said well, we figure two guys. You’re limited to four months a year you can treat the trees, so it would probably take those two guys four months a year.

We’re planning on doing the golf course because those trees are worth saving. There’s a few we need to take out. We have up to 30” trees out there. We’re going to go ahead and treat them in-house.

**Commissioner Johnson** asked which parks have the most trees that need to be cut down. Do you know? **Mr. Webb** said probably be Wyandotte County Lake, but most of those are in the woods so nature will take care of that. We’ll go in when we can and take care of the trees that are ready to fall or dying. **Commissioner Johnson** asked would there be any scenario where we would need to replant any trees or anything like that. **Mr. Webb** said not in the park; it takes care of itself; Wyandotte County Lake, I mean.

**Chairman Bynum** asked primarily are you talking about treating trees, the cost that you’re talking about are about treating rather than taking them down. **Mr. Webb** said yes. **Chairman Bynum** said and then you would take them down if you have to, if they’re dead or dying. **Mr. Webb** said yes. There’s no guarantee that treating will—the tree could still die.
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Commissioner Philbrook asked how much to take a tree down. Mr. Tobin said depends on the size. Mr. Webb said it depends on the tree. A 20” tree, probably $400.

BPU Board Member Bryant said on the website you say that you’re going to have specific information for residents. Is there going to be a recommendation on whether or not someone wants to plant or should plant a new ash tree on their property? Mr. Tobin said well, Commissioner, that’s part of what we want to talk to you about and bring up for discussion. If I could point out a couple of details, I’ll come back to that.

The reason in-house that we could do it a $1 an inch cheaper in terms of treating the trees is because we can buy the equipment, which runs about $3,000, and then wholesale the material that we spray on them or spray in these holes that are drilled in there. That’s why it would be a little bit cheaper. However, doing that with the staff that we have right now, particularly as Jack is taxed because it’s mowing season and this all happens at the same time. You all are well aware that we’re behind on mowing as the weather has dictated.

When Kurt was talking about right-of-way, you know we mow a lot of right-of-way, but what he’s talking about are the trees that are located adjacent and in the right-of-way that actually belong to residents. They’re just sitting in front yards on nice tracks of grounds, etc., etc.

The thought that Doug had, and that we’ve discussed with staff, is that the long-term approach to this would be to provide a program that the residents could come to somewhat reasonably priced that would prevent all of these ash trees from being killed that are in the right-of-way, adjacent to the right-of-way, etc., because if not, we’ll probably be the ones end up taking them all down or picking them up as they fall down, or, Commissioner Bryant, they’ll fall on power lines and BPU will be involved in it.

Therefore, that’s why this gets into a policy area and comes to you all for discussion. It’s an area where before we would expand, add people, add equipment to do this, it’s a decision that you all need to make. Whether that stops here or goes to the full commission, again, is up to you guys.

Doing it in-house would require more people. I would expect that that could be a part-time operation. The equipment, as I stated, is not overly costly, but there are very limited times when you can do this. There’s only those four months where they recommend treating the trees. As Kurt so aptly stated, you can still lose the tree even if you do this.
BPU Board Member Bryant said you were saying that the weather’s been affecting the mowing. Will weather impact your ability to treat the trees? Mr. Tobin said I don’t believe so. Is that correct, Kurt? Mr. Suther said in the very beginning if it’s a colder spring or a warmer spring, it will move the date a little bit, not significantly, but it will impact it a little bit.

Commissioner Philbrook asked so what did you figure out the two people for four months would be. Mr. Webb said we haven’t yet. Commissioner Philbrook said really, okay, if you say so.

Chairman Bynum said a couple of questions. One would be the budget implications on even another part-time position, if I’m understanding. I guess part of this question would be for staff to help me understand what could we vote on to move forward to the full commission. Secondarily, another piece of what you’ve brought us is about what we can offer the public in terms of pricing for private property. Would that be correct that you really have two things going on? Mr. Tobin said that’s correct, Commissioner, and well put.

The issue as it sits right now, according to ordinance, what we would do is go ahead and proceed and take care of the trees that are on UG property. Cut down or remove the ones that die that are in the right-of-way and we would try to put out a program to educate the public and say this is what’s available to you and this is what it will cost.

Chairman Bynum said May and June are two of the four months. Is that right? Mr. Tobin said May and June and September and October.

Chairman Bynum asked do you have ideas in place. I know, Kurt, you’re really good at putting together educational materials and marketing. Have you been working on in what way would you market this to the community and what channels you would use to do that?

Mr. Suther said I’ve got a little game plan put together that we could get it out to a lot of the neighborhood groups. By doing all the surveying, I’ve got a very good idea of some of the areas that have a large concentration of ash so I could get ahold of some of the particular neighborhood groups or businesses and let them know. By doing the surveying, it definitely has helped me to identify the areas that were at high risk. But yes, we could put something together.
Chairman Bynum said the contractor that’s giving us the price break is ready to go. Mr. Suther said correct.

Chairman Bynum said I guess I have two questions. It sounds to me like we’re still talking about is there an item that needs a vote in order to move this forward, and secondarily, a sub-item for agreeing to offer this price break to the residents of Wyandotte County. Am I right on this? Jody Boeding, Chief Legal Counsel, said I think they’re just looking for direction. I don’t think it actually has to have a vote. It’s an operational item that the County Administrator can take care of. If it seemed like a majority of this committee opposed it, they wouldn’t.

Commissioner Markley said just one more question, and I think Jeff was trying to hit on this. Do our planning and zoning requirements say anything about tree types? Hopefully, we’re not going to plant any more ash trees because we know what can be caused, but are we doing anything to prevent or encourage people not to plant more of these trees that are so susceptible. Mr. Tobin said well certainly our educational program as we move forward will state that. However, last year there was a tremendous amount of educational information put out in both the Kansas City Star and a number of the other smaller local papers because if you will recall, when the bore was first spotted at Wyandotte County Lake, the Johnson County Commissioners were not going to allow us to move our material to the Johnson County landfill. It did get a lot of publicity at that time. I would hope that no one was planting ash trees since that period. There are, though, however, there’s quite a number of them out at the Legends.

Mr. Suther said, Commissioner, in response to your question, Planning and Zoning has been told not to allow any ash trees when they’re going through the development review process. In addition, we will be coming back at another time in the near future. There are allowable street trees in our current street tree ordinance and one of them is the white ash, so we’re going to be coming back. We’ve talked with the Kansas Forester at K-State and she has come up with recommendations for some new street trees. An adjustment to the ordinance will be coming sometime in the near future.

Commissioner Philbrook said then it would be within our scope that we could make recommendations if we agree on them to the full commission that goes along with what you’re
asking for. One thing would be if we were to ask for two people for four months, that you’d give us the numbers with that when you bring it back so everybody knows what’s up. The other thing is how you plan on handling the number of cut downs you’re going to do for this. Is that already in the budget? Then, the other thing is that how we want to budget it forward for the next few years; how we see that impacting our budget over the next few years. These plants are going to be around for a while unless they fall over dead. The other thing is when we talk about the cut down, about how many of those trees that you guys did your survey on would end up falling over and being in our right-of-way that we would have to deal with?

Mr. Tobin said let me start at the first part of your question. An estimate for a budget for four people plus the new equipment and the chemicals required, basically for six months, roughly would be somewhere around $15,000 either way, depending upon the amount of chemical that had to be bought and how soon we could get it in place, maybe as high as $20,000 at the top end.

As far as the trees, there’s no way to estimate how many trees actually would fall. I mean, I guess you could go back to Kurt’s number in the report of the trees that are in the right-of-way, 2,100 ash trees. Again, that’s not an exact count, but that’s the best number. Commissioner Philbrook asked is that what you’re saying. 2,100 would be the high end. Mr. Tobin said yes. Commissioner Philbrook said I don’t know, just looking at him, he wants to say something. Mr. Suther said out of those 2,100, you’re going to have a majority of the people that will take care of their own trees. I would estimate over 50% of those people would take care of it at the very minimum. Commissioner Philbrook said you know where they are so that’s why I was asking.

Commissioner Kane said I think what we need to do is tell you guys to go ahead and hire the part-time people, get the equipment, get it going. We don’t want to miss the opportunity that we’re in right now, the window. Then we’ll figure out how to pay for it later because it doesn’t sound like it’s going to be that high of a deal. I don’t want to miss the two-month window that we have now. They can come back after they got their act together and say here’s how much it is, here’s how much we’re going to go.

Commissioner Johnson asked on the top end, do you see this being more $100,000. Mr. Tobin said oh, no. I wouldn’t think it would be anywhere near that. I’m thinking $20,000 would probably get us through this whole season. Commissioner Johnson said in totality, for
everything. That is to treat and to cut down? Mr. Tobin said no. The estimate on cutting them down, there’s really no way, I mean we could set aside a certain amount of money and say okay, that’s your pool to do this, but right now we don’t have a good estimate for that. Commissioner Johnson said if you all just took the number $400 roughly, we don’t know that, and there are at least in the parks 74 trees, that’s roughly about $30,000. It could potentially be more than that unless my math’s off.

Mr. Webb said the trees in the parks would be in-house. We’d take them down ourselves. Commissioner Johnson said and the cost to do that would be roughly. Mr. Webb said staff time and we’re paying it anyway.

Mr. Tobin said, Commissioner, if I could, certain sized trees that are in the right-of-way, the Street staff can take down. It’s the really big trees where we have to go outside and get a contractor. That’s why that $400 number gets in there. It’s usually from that dollar amount and above that we try to contract out.

BPU Board Member Bryant said I would make one recommendation that when you come up with a decided plan for the public and educational piece, discuss with the BPU as a bill stuffer since it’s going to affect the BPU if the trees do not get taken care of. Mr. Tobin said thank you. Mr. Suther said we can do that. I just want to mention that we have been working with BPU all along with Phil Musser.

Commissioner Kane asked, Jody, do we need to make this a motion or we’re just giving them direction. Ms. Boeding said you don’t have to for direction. If you’d like to, you can.

Action: Commissioner Kane made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Philbrook, to direct Public Works to go through with the process and return to the committee with details at a later date. Roll call was taken and there were six “Ayes,” Bryant, Philbrook, Markley, Kane, Johnson, Bynum.

Item No. 4 – 150132…GRANT: BODY-WORN CAMERA PROGRAM
Synopsis: Request to submit a grant application to the Department of Justice to implement a Body-Worn Camera (BWC) Program, submitted by Terry Zeigler, Police Chief.
Gordon Criswell, Assistant County Administrator, said, Commissioner, we discussed this, I guess, a week ago in strategic planning and the direction that we got from you all was if we had an opportunity to move forward, so that’s what they’re presenting tonight. They have an opportunity. If we get the grant, we’ll work it, budget it in. If we don’t, we’ll tell them we don’t have the money.

Chief Terry Zeigler, Kansas City, Kansas Police Department, said we wanted to come and give you guys an overview kind of the Body-Worn Camera project. There’s been a lot of discussion about it, a lot of inquiries from community groups.

We started working on this project. We started last year. We’ve kind of identified a vendor that ties into our current in-car camera video system, which is L-3. Just about a week ago, two weeks ago, we learned that the federal government’s made available some funding to be able to pay for 50% of the camera project.

What I’d like to do, Colonel Garner is with me this evening. He’s going to go through and give you an overview of the project as we kind of see it rolling out. We think this is a pretty good strategy in implementing this. It gives us adequate coverage so that any officer involved in any type of enforcement activity or contact with the community would be wearing a camera. I’ll turn it over to Colonel Garner and I will speak about the grant specifically.
Colonel Tyrone Garner, Deputy Chief of Police, Operations Bureau, said I’m going to briefly talk about our proposal. It’s relative national trans-questioning and demanding improved transparency in regards to police/citizens interactions. Police body cameras offer a technological resource that can better meet the demands of this societal call to action. In response to heightened local awareness from citizens and some of our elected officials for police officers to utilize body cameras, we believe that taking a proactive approach to meeting those growing expectations should be priority for the Kansas City, Kansas Police Department.

As a means to maintain our organizational standards of keeping in tune with best practices and standards in law enforcement, the purpose of the police body camera proposal is to facilitate an increase in public trust and to provide an improved investigatory tool relative to police/citizen interactions.

The police body camera can be an effective tool to gather evidence, enhance managerial oversight, discourage misconduct, and provide a visual perspective when an officer or citizen is accused of engaging in questionable activity. Deploying police body cameras will be a valuable resource our organization can utilize to maintain an improved level of accountability, professionalism, transparency and organizational awareness as it pertains to police conduct and the delivery of services to our citizens. Consistently seeking to utilize viable technological advancements to improve the public trust perceptions and expectations, as well as the confidence of our community, will continue to be priority for the Kansas City, Kansas Police Department.

**Body Worn Cameras (BWC)**

- In Car Video Cameras – L3 Mobile Vision
- We will use two cameras per district, one charging one being used.
- Other units will have one issued per officer.
- Working on a policy at this time.
- Submitting as a Capital Project.
As the Chief spoke about, our body camera project is going to involve L-3 Mobile Vision. That’s currently what we use in our in-car vehicles at this time. There are approximately 19 vehicles that have in-car cameras. We can have seamless interaction with the technology and the systems. We’re looking at sticking with L-3 Mobile Vision.

When we talk about police body cameras, we’re going to use two cameras per district. There are 19 districts in our city. One will be used for charging and the other will be used for transition during shift change with the officers. Other units that I’ll mention here shortly, we’ll just have one camera and charging station. Currently, we’re working on a policy at this time. I’ll talk about that a little later in the presentation as well as submitting it as a capital project.

These are the 19 districts that I talked about. When you talk about four patrol stations, we’re talking about East station, Midtown station, West station, as well as South station, 19 districts, three shifts, approximately 174 officers, and that includes relief officers as well that go into manning these 19 districts throughout the city.
When we talk about the deployment, we’re looking at 148 cameras just for our patrol stations, including the extra relief positions. When I talk about extra relief, those are the relief officers that are needed to maintain an adequate level of staffing for the delivery of police service during any given time on one of the three shifts. 29 community policing camera units, 13 special operations units, which some of you may know as our SCORE unit, our SWAT team, 3 K9 unit cameras, 8 animal control, 14 motorcycle enforcement unit cameras, as well as 20 spare cameras just in case of any kind of breakdown or malfunctions. So we’re talking about 235 cameras total.
This was a spreadsheet that was basically developed and is actually a tool kit. It’s automated to basically come up with the figures that you’re looking at as far as pricing. If you look at 2016, in purchasing 235 cameras and the amount of cameras that are used in a 24-hour period, and then the amount of cameras for that same time by the specialized units, the average number of minutes recorded, which is 360, and then our short-term duration, which is the amount of time that we actually keep video on hand before it’s erased over or purged, as well as long-term storage percentage which we figure to be about 20% looking out into the future. 2017, 2018 we wouldn’t do any purchases, but as you can see, ongoing licensing and maintenance still equates to about $15,000 for 2017 and 2018.

2019, we would purchase an additional 118 cameras to replace the cameras that we initially purchased as well, again, as in 2020 another 117. Those figures are there. They speak for themselves. Basically, those figures tie into the cost of approximately $475 per camera. What’s not shown there is that for this project to work effectively and seamlessly with the technology that’s out there, fiber will be needed. The information we got back is that that will be a $520,000 cost to get fiber through the Board of Public Utilities.

**Body Worn Cameras (BWC)**

- **Total cost 1st Year = $1,419,626**
  - President Obama offering $600,000 to 12 PD’s.
  - Less than 1,000 officers, but more than 250.
  - Pays $1,500 per camera deployed. Cost covers: camera, software, storage, licensing fees, etc.
  - It is a 50% match grant.
  - Submission due: 6/16/2015

The total cost for one year is $1,419,000 for our cameras. President Obama, and I know the Chief is going to talk about this here shortly, is offering a grant and that speaks for itself.

**Chief Ziegler** said here are the highlights of what the President’s offering. He’s offering $600,000 match grant to agencies, but there’s only going to be 12 of these grants given
nationwide. The stipulation is that you have to be a police department that has somewhere between 250 and 1,000 police officers. We fall into that category.

The cost that they’re giving you is basically the federal government said we’re going to give you $1,500 per camera. Now, the federal government realizes that the camera is only about $450-$500, but they’re adding in some additional costs to help cover the storage, the licensing, the training, and those things. With this, it’s a 50% match, which our project is about $1.4M, so we wouldn’t have a problem matching it. If we were able to get this grant, our cost would be about $800,000.

What I’d like to do is just hit real quickly on fiber, and I’m not an expert on it, but initially we thought that we were going to get Google Fiber to headquarters and all of our substations. The reason fiber is so important to this project is currently we don’t have a way to transfer video from all of our substations back to headquarters where it’s stored. Without that connectivity, there’s no way for us to move the video. For example, right now we have in-car video cameras. So we pay a sergeant, he’s about a $75,000 employee in our substations to remove a media card, a little media card out of the back of the car, take it down to headquarters, give it to Casey who’s his administrative assistant, she puts it in, downloads it, erases it; the sergeant comes back, picks it up, takes the little media card and puts it back in the camera. It is totally inefficient to do it that way but that’s what we’ve been doing for the last ten years.

Currently, we have Wi-Fi stations at our headquarters building so when a patrol car pulls into east patrol, the car pulls into the basement and everything is automatically downloaded while they’re at roll call; a great way to do the video. We have no corruption issue with files doing that. We believe that in order to do this program and do it right, we have to have the fiber. The reason we look at BPU was if we can’t get Google, what’s another option. BPU seemed to be the next best option for us. If you were able to take away the fiber cost, we’re looking at about $900,000. If we were able to get the federal grant and it was a match, so 50%; we’re looking at about $450,000 for this project. That’s a big difference. I just wanted to clarify that. We have to have our grant submissions—our grant has to be submitted before June 16th.

Colonel Garner said I want to back up a little bit just to piggyback on what the Chief said. You’re looking at these costs and when you say $475 per camera and then you look at the total cost that we talked about, the reason why that cost is so high isn’t the initial camera, it’s the storage. The storage is basically sand storage space which are racks storage that is going to be
needed and the terabytes that come with that. That infrastructure alone is why the cost to actually implement this camera project is so high. It’s just the infrastructure that goes along with the camera as well as the long-term storage that’s required.

**Body Worn Cameras (BWC)**

Better quality than in-car cameras.

We’re also looking at the type of camera that L-3 has available, which is the vendor. As you can look to your left, standard definition gives you a somewhat cloudy picture. It’s literally what you get in our patrol cars. What L-3 provides is more of a high definition picture which gives you more clarity and gives you a better perspective, a visual perspective, of what the officer may have been seeing.

**Body Worn Cameras (BWC)**

Worn on chest
Here are some of those perspectives. The body camera, as you can see, is something similar to the picture on your top right which is worn in the middle of your chest. Those are some of the perspectives that you can see that an officer would have with the body camera.

Some of the limitations is the camera doesn’t follow the officers’ eyes so what the officer may see as far as turning his head is limited by the camera being on his chest. It does give an additional enhanced view of what the officer may have seen but it doesn’t give a 3-D total view that the officer may have seen in regards to whatever he may be dealing with on a call.

We’re also looking at policy considerations. Some of the things we're looking at and we're really looking at best practices that are out there. When you talk about PERF and the U.S. Department of Justice, some of the things should the camera be on all the time? Those are policy considerations that were taken into account. What things should the officer record? Should he get consent from victims? Should the officer have to articulate on camera or in writing why he failed or did not turn on his camera, and then clearly identifying under which circumstances in cooperation with our union on when supervisors can review what is picked up by the camera basically to audit the officers. Then training is going to be key to anything that we roll out in
concert with the body cameras in our policy. Those are things that we’re looking at and those are things that are going to be forthcoming.

The value again, I mentioned earlier, but when you look at Rialto Police Department, which is in California, they use body cameras and here is some of the impact that they’ve had when you talk about use of force complaints and just complaints overall. This was issued in US News and World Reports. As you can see, it’s gone down since the implementation of body cameras.

**BPU Board Member Bryant** said I have a question about sustainability. I was looking at the costs and it looks like there is about a three-year period after the initial investment, it’s not too bad, but then it starts rising again which I’m guessing is replacement. **Chief Ziegler** said yes. **BPU Board Member Bryant** asked how sustainable would this program be for long-term. Same way with the historical storage? I saw the initial investment, but with all servers, they have a lifespan. Maintenance of the system and the body units, when one gets broken, the replacement cost and then the manpower to manage the historical records.

**Chief Ziegler** said let me start with the last question. Currently we have one administrative assistant who has other duties in the Bureau of Operations but she does manage all of the in-car video camera requests that come in. It’s a tedious process when something is tagged as evidence, but we would put this as one of her responsibilities. I do have some personnel inventory numbers, one in particular that I would probably look and submit to the County Administrator to be reclassified. I think this is going to be a huge impact on the Police Department with the number of videos and I think it will require a fulltime position.
The cost of this program goes into perpetuity. It goes forever. Every three years you’re going to have—every third and fourth year you’re going to spend $100,000, every year we will spend $15,000 for license and service agreements. As long as we’re constantly replacing them, all the cameras should be under warranty all the time. One problem that we’ve ran into with our in-car video camera project was the cameras go out of service. We didn’t renew our contracts. We didn’t replace them. In the first part of 2014, we began taking them out of the patrol cars because we just didn’t have funding to keep it going. I would recommend that if this is something that we’re allowed to move forward, we need to make sure it is properly funded every year. If not, it will become a program that’s broken and we will lose evidence. The public will begin to expect it, and I think it would be bad business if we didn’t plan on this being a long time investment for the Unified Government.

**Commissioner Kane** asked do you think we need them. **Chief Ziegler** said I would tell you that I think they would be valuable to the Police Department. I think that anytime that we have a shooting, a use of force, Internal Affairs complaint, we could get a perspective of what the officer was seeing, I think that’s good. We do know from the research that’s been done that use of force goes down and complaints go down. Officers’ conduct is improved as well as citizens’ conduct is improved so I think they are valuable. They do have a place in law enforcement, yes.

**Commissioner Kane** said I guess this is kind of around the horn thing, we can apply for this and then if we sit down as a group and realize we can’t pay our half, then we could decline the grant. Is that right? **Chief Ziegler** said yes. We did the COPS Grant that way. We applied for it and realized there were some funding issues. We notified the federal government and withdrew our application. **Commissioner Kane** said I think that’s what we should do here. **Chairman Bynum** said thank you for that because I wanted to clarify before I asked if there was public comment or questions that what we’re being asked for tonight is to move approval to the full commission to apply for the grant. **Commissioner Kane** said correct. Then as we were going through our budget, we can figure out if we can pay for it. But if we don’t apply for it, we’re not going to get it.

**Commissioner Markley** said someone in administration please tell me someone is going to call Google and ask about the fiber. **Joe Connor, Asst. County Administrator**, said we’ve been in
constant communication with Google about this site and some of the other sites that were promised. We’re working through those legally now and so I don’t think that’s totally off the table. For his planning purposes, he has to let you guys know what the program cost as it stands today and that’s what it would be today.

Chief Ziegler said just one more thing I would like to add. Senate House Bill 18, if you’re interested in reading it, if that was to pass, it does make it mandatory that law enforcement agencies in the State of Kansas will have a body-worn camera project for what it’s worth. Commissioner Kane said and then they’re going to tell us how we’re going to pay for it. Chief Ziegler said exactly.

Commissioner Philbrook said I just believe with Commissioner Kane that we should move this on right in front of the full commission. Chairman Bynum asked is that a motion. Commissioner Philbrook said yes.

Action: Commissioner Philbrook made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Kane, to approve sending this item to the full commission.

Chairman Bynum said I do have a point of order question because there is an opportunity for public comment. Jody Boeding, Chief Legal Counsel, said you can go ahead and ask for comments. Chairman Bynum said if there is a member of the public that has a question or would like to make a comment, you can come forward. If not, we’ll proceed with roll call on the motion.

Janet Golubski, 5349 Webster Ave., said a couple of things. Yes, I’m all for this. I’ve talked about it with my group and with the Ferguson deal and the other areas in the country; we’re definitely all for it. We think it would be a good deal for our Police Department to have it; backup for anything that’s going on.

Secondly, I’m glad Commissioner Markley brought up Google because I worked my tail off to get Google in my neighborhood on the assumption that by Station 18 would be covered, they would also have Google; and my church, Christ the King, the school would have Google Fiber and neither one have done that yet. I’m in the process too of getting with Google in trying
to figure that out so I think that you should still work with Google and try to figure out if that’s going to be a cheaper route to go than to BPU.

My other question was grants. When we get the grant from President Obama, would this be an ongoing grant that we could get every three or four years or is it just a one-time only grant? Chief Ziegler said currently it’s a three-year grant in order to help police department’s implement the Body-Worn Camera Project. After that, it’s up to the individual departments to sustain the program as it’s written now. Ms. Golubski said thank you, Chief, for bringing that up and going for the grant.

Marcia Rupp, 2816 N. 46th St., said I just want to say that I think this is something that we need not overlook. We really need to think about this because this is so important. We have seen what has happened on the news to all of the communities. It affects everyone, everyone that’s involved, not just the police department and the community, but the businesses, everyone. Let’s just—as the commercial says, let’s get it done.

Roll call was taken on the motion and there were six “Ayes,” Bryant, Philbrook, Markley, Kane, Johnson, Bynum.

Measurable Goals:
Item No. 1 – 150122...UPDATE/PRESENTATION: ANIMAL OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Synopsis: Update on work accomplished by the Animal Control Oversight Committee and goals for the next 12-18 months, presented by Jenny Myers, Senior Attorney.
Jenny Myers, Senior Attorney; said I have Katie Bray-Barnett and Captain Michelle Angell with the Police Department with me.

**Animal Control Oversight Committee**
- Mayor's Office
- Commissioner Philbrook
- County Administrator's Office
- Legal
- Animal Control
- Livable Neighborhoods
- Health Department & Healthy Communities Wyandotte
- Public Information Office
- Humane Society of Greater Kansas City
- Unleashed Pet Rescue
- Spay & Neuter Kansas City

Katie Bray-Barnett said thank you for having us. I think this is the third or fourth time we’ve been here, but we’re going to keep coming until we get this city safe and humane. I am here right now to give the presentation on the Animal Control Oversight Committee and an update on the strategic plan that we have been working on. As a side, today marks the first day of National Dog Bite Prevention Week. We don’t have any events planned this week in Kansas City, Kansas, but hopefully next year we’ll get something planned and we’ll have some mass education on keeping people safe from dog bites.

The Animal Control Oversight Committee was formed, I believe, 1.5 years ago to address some of the concerns of the public and city staff on animal issues. We involved several stakeholders at that time. We met several times to draft an animal control ordinance that would achieve the goals of a safer, more humane community.

After we enacted the ordinance, we also added a few people to the committee and the committee continued to meet because it’s important that we continue on this process. The ordinance changes aren’t going to change everything. We added—The Humane Society of Greater Kansas City was already there. Unleashed Pet Rescue, which is a non-profit organization that takes a lot of the animals from the animal shelter, Animal Control, and adopts them out through their organization so the burden is not on the city or Animal Control to get those dogs adopted out and cats. We then added Spay & Neuter Kansas City. Spay & Neuter Kansas City is opening up a location over here on the Kansas side. Currently they’re on the Missouri side with a
contract with the city of Kansas City, MO. They do a lot of outreach and they also provide food pantry and resources for the most underserved communities so those people who really need the help to maintain their pet so that pet isn’t impounded just because of neglect because they didn’t have a doghouse and that was all that they needed.

They are also teaming up with The Humane Society of Greater Kansas City to offer a vaccination clinic. I’m sure you guys are aware of the food deserts that exist in some of the areas of Kansas City and it’s the same with veterinarian clinics so those people who really would get help for their pet are unable to seek any kind of care treatment because there is no veterinary clinic. It’s all on the west side. There’s nothing really in the heart of Kansas City, Kansas, so if you come to them, if you go into the neighborhoods and provide that service to them, you’ll achieve a higher ratio of wellness for those pets and those people. That’s kind of what the Oversight Committee is hoping to do.

We also added the Public Information Office. They’ve been coming to our meetings because it’s important that we’re disseminating all of the new information and all of the changes that we’re making so people are aware of not only the ordinance changes but the policy changes and the small successes we have every month or every few months. We’re making a difference and we want the public to know what we’re doing so hopefully we’ll have a little bit more aggressive approach in the dissemination of our information to the public.

Animal Control Oversight Committee

MISSION

“To achieve a healthy, safe, and humane community”
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The mission of the Animal Control Oversight Committee we came up with is we want to achieve a healthy, safe and humane community and that’s what we’re going to work towards over the next 12 to 18 months.

We’ve met several times since our last meeting here which I think was in November or December. We’ve continued to meet after the ordinance passed and we will continue to meet because there is still a community need.

The community need is there and it’s evident by the survey that was given. I’m sure you guys are all aware of the results of this survey, but most importantly, Animal Control ranks number one in the importance to satisfaction rating meaning it was high importance and low satisfaction with the general public which made it the top public safety priority or a very high priority as your analyst noted.

What we worked on last year were ordinance changes and we got that done, but now we need to work on training for Animal Control making sure they have the proper training and education and tools that they need to be effective in the community.

We need to work on policy and budget changes at Animal Control and then we’ll start to work on public education. Maybe by this time Dog Bite Prevention Week next year, we’ll have a plan in place and we’ll be out there educating the public.

Those are the three things we’re hoping to work on between the next 12 to 18 months.
These recommendations—I know a few of you have seen this slide a couple times, but these recommendations are not just animal welfare organization recommendations and they’re not just recommendations made by Animal Control or city staff. These are recommendations made by the professionals in the subject matter experts in the field of animal control public safety and humane treatment of animals and those are the guidelines we’re hoping to follow. The recommendations are coming from these organizations, but they’re targeted. They’re brought up by the community. That’s whose interest we’re working for.

Goals

- Track data and report annually
- Annual residential survey: Annual community partnership survey
- Increase in vaccinated pets and general wellness
- Increase in outdoor activity
- Prepare and execute plan for roaming dogs: decrease roaming dogs
- Measurable use of free ride home: decrease animal impounds
- Decrease in community cats
- Increase Animal Control Officers in the field
- Increased adoptions from Animal Control
- Training for ACO’s, law enforcement, prosecutors, staff
- Increased community engagement
- Increase same-day response time on animal control calls
- Prepare and disseminate information on ordinances, general safety, animal welfare
- Measure impact of ordinance changes
- Increased revenue from licensing increased licensing locations (including online)
- Safe routes to schools and humane education
I know this is a long list of goals, but it’s taken several months for the community to narrow down what exactly we’re going to do and the goals that we want to achieve. We obviously want to track our data and report it. We also are hoping to do an annual residential survey, and I’ll get to some of the things that will cover shortly. We want to have an increase in vaccinated pets and general wellness because that’s important. Vaccinating your pets, although we haven’t had a rabies outbreak in quite some time, it is critical to vaccinate pets because they are the only barrier between rabies and a raccoon or a squirrel; all those additional wild animals, they’re the only barrier between those wild animals and us. So vaccinating your pets is still critical.

We want to increase outdoor activity. We really want to work on the Mayor’s Healthy Communities Initiative, increase the outdoor activity and prepare—and I think that’s kind of a subsection of that is prepare and execute a plan for all of the roaming dogs and decrease the amount of roaming dogs in the community.

We want to have a measurable use of the Free Ride Home Program and decrease animal impounds, and I’ll talk about that also. Decrease in community cats, which we talked about when you all passed the community cat trap neuter and return ordinance, and increase the number of Animal Control officers in the field, increase adoptions from Animal Control, like I said, training for not just Animal Control, but law enforcement in general. Law enforcement and the Police Department should help in prosecuting felony animal cruelty cases. Collecting evidence, a lot of the Animal Control officers aren’t necessarily trained on some of those critical roles so if we can get the information to the Police Department and officers in the field, that could help. Also, training for prosecutors and city staff to enhance prosecution of animal related crimes.

We also want to increase community engagement and we’ve done that already by adding several community partners. We want to increase same day response time on animal control calls, prepare and disseminate information on ordinances, general safety, and animal welfare, measure the impact of the ordinance change instead of just enacting it and hoping everything goes well. We really want to take a look at what changed and how is it affecting the community and is it effective; and increase revenue from hopefully increased licensing of animals.

We really want to round out a safe routes for schools and humane education for the schools and the community.
So how are we going to reach those goals? These are a matrix that we hope to track monthly, quarterly, and annually. Obviously demographics, how the city’s growing, how the pet population is growing, animals licensed, animal intake, animal outcome, which means the animals that come through the shelter and the animals that leave the shelter and whatever the disposition.

The number of reported animal bites. You all approved a nuisance animal portion of the animal control ordinance so we’d like to see how that goes. Is that preventing or preempting dog bites and dangerous dog encounters as we were hoping? How many people are being cited for that? How many people are convicted? The same as dangerous animals, vicious animals.

Then we want to know how many, with the community partners, animal neglect calls we’re getting. Are we getting convictions on the new tethering ordinance that we suggested and was approved? How many early forfeiture petitions are filed and awarded in criminal cases where the animals had been seized and they’re just awaiting disposition when we can get those animals out into a rescue, we can get early forfeiture just like you would on other property seized.

The number of pet limit permits issued—and I think you guys can kind of see all the other number of hours of training that are done and then the three issues we’re hoping to address in the community survey annually: neighborhood vaccination clinic, as I mentioned, and then the number of attendees to all the different humane education programs.
We fortunately have some data from Kansas City, MO, from Kansas City Pet Project, who faced a similar kind of conundrum several years ago. You can see from the chart, in 2006 and 2007, the city was issuing incentives and they were giving quotas for the number of citations issued by animal control officers. So you saw a rise in the impound of animals coming through the shelter.

With the new change in 2008 of their animal control director, some of that changed. Also what we saw similar to when Captain Angell took over is they wanted to decrease the euthanasia numbers. They kind of reduced the number of animals they were taking in by saying we’re not going to take owner surrenders. If you found a dog, you need to prove that you found it within the city and several other limitations instead of just taking everything that people brought into the shelter like an open admissions shelter. The result of that was that people didn’t want to go through the rigmarole of surrendering a pet and signing their name and all of that stuff and several other issues, but then the animal impounds decreased. We saw a high number of free roaming feral dogs and cats in the city, which is maybe familiar to what you guys are seeing now.

They noticed the problem. They wanted to address it. They contracted with KC Pet Project, which is a private shelter, and that’s not something that this city is, my understanding is, is not interested in doing but they noticed a problem and they sought help and they went in a different direction. I think that Captain Angell and Jenny will talk to you all a little bit today about changing direction here, the Unified Government, and they saw a huge increase in animal impounds. That comes from a couple of things. It’s a positive change to have. When you enlist positive changes and you enlist help, people start to trust your animal shelter and people start to feel comfortable bringing their animals there.
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What you see is, you see a higher rate of animal surrenders or owner surrenders to those animal shelters. We have a lot of data that shows what we can expect over the next 12 to 18 months and the next 5 years. The data that they have shows, I think, a 39% increase above 2012 intake and a 56% increase in 2011 intake. You’re going to see more animals impounded and we need to have a plan for that if we’re going to be an effective animal control agency. We have all that information.

The owner surrenders we have, it’s gone up 255% of cats at least. There are a couple of important distinctions between Kansas City, KS, and Kansas City, MO. There are several distinctions, but a couple of important ones that affect this. Kansas City, KS, still has a ban on Pit Bull type dogs. Kansas City, KS, also has mandatory spay/neuter of all animals so those are two important distinctions that may contribute to a little bit of a different take here. We won’t know until we try. Importantly, Kansas City, KS, now has enacted a way of dealing with community cats, or feral cats, which Kansas City, MO, is still spinning their wheels on. We might see a not so high of an increase in community cats and cat intake as the city of Kansas City, MO, has seen.
The fun stuff here, resources and revenue. We hope to see increase licensing revenue from raising the pet limit and then here you can all just read the resources and revenue we expect. The expenditures that we expect over the next 18 months, unfreeze and fund two additional field officers. As some of you may remember, we are highly understaffed in the Animal Control Division. There’s supposed to be, I believe, 21 animal control officers for a city the size of Kansas City, KS, and there are 7 currently. There should be more officers in the field and more officers at the shelter, but a solution that has been brought to the attention of the Animal Control Oversight Committee is to hire 2 to 3 kennel technicians at Animal Control versus hiring a full-time Animal Control officer. Those officers who are trained should be out in the field.

As I said, we’ll probably see a temporary increase in impoundment of stray and feral dogs. We need to have some formal education and training for Animal Control officers and updated animal control equipment to increase efficiency. I just left this one in here from last time because this is something that Captain Angell was able to do.
The intended result is a healthy, safe, and humane Kansas City, KS. You’ll notice that that’s not a Unified Government employee. That’s a Lawrence Police Department officer. We want to change that. We want all of these officers who have the compassion and the drive and the dedication to helping the animals in this community to have a public face. We need to do a much better job of showing their compassion and their dedication to this community. We hope to have pictures and really work with the PIO on getting a positive change going with Animal Control and the image.

Captain Michelle Angell said some of you may know as Chief Zeigler took over, he had the idea to bring in a civilian manager for Animal Control so that we would have consistency down there. Also, when we’re looking at that, we’re looking at hiring somebody who has experience, who has turned around shelters, they can bring in their expertise and we could really move forward at a quicker pace than we have here in the past. We have during the last week been interviewing for that position. We have at least one that is qualified that we’re going to continue through the process and we are definitely dedicated to bringing the right person onboard. If it’s not in this process, we’ll look again. I think that would be a positive move for our community to get somebody with experience and somebody that has a vision and can really bring our city up-to-date and above and beyond maybe some of the other cities in the metro area.

Some of the things that we have accomplished in this last year since we brought on the Advisory Board, first of all was the ordinance changes that have been mentioned. We’ve also
done a lot of shelter updates at the shelter that’s brought us into state compliance so that we are passing our inspections. We have brought The Humane Society on as our contract vet. It has a surgical suite onsite at Animal Control so that they’re able to spay and neuter the animals that we move over to our adoption which saves us money because we’re paying an hourly vet bill versus a buy the spay/neuter. That has helped us increase our numbers of adoptable animals and we have increased adoption numbers through that process and saved money. That’s been very positive.

The Humane Society being down there also helps us because they’re in and out of our facility almost daily so there’s nothing to hide. We’ve been very translucent. They’re able to dispel myths that we’re hiding things and killing dogs that we’re not reporting and that kind of thing. That’s been very helpful in what the other animal welfare agencies in our metropolitan area think about our shelter. It makes them more willing to try to assist us as we move forward with some of these projects like Katie mentioned with the Spay & Neuter KC and trying to do some of these clinics for our poverty level areas that can’t afford to take care of their pets.

They’re already out here doing outreach in our city along with Unleash Pet Rescue. They’re going out there weekly and finding locations of people that just need a little bit of assistance. Sometimes just a little bit of guidance on what proper pet care is and it is definitely helping us. We hope to really expand on that and educate our citizens that it’s not proper to let your dog run the neighborhood and that they need to be put up and they need to have their shots and be licensed and that kind of thing.

We also want to look at doing the online pet registration so that saves a person a trip down to Animal Control. During the past year, we purchased Chameleon software that has a dispatch component to it so we’ll be able to better track, again, these updated policies and ordinances will be doing. We’ll have better resources to go back and look at. All of the Animal Control officers out in the field have tablets. They have wireless connectivity to the software so as this data is implemented, obviously it will be better a year from now than it is today because it will have data to draw from. If they go out, they’ll be able to pull up the history of the location that they’re at and code the offense correctly. We were seeing time and time again somebody that got three or four tickets for the same thing but they were never upped in the violation. It was always a first-time offense because it was different officers seeing that.

Another thing we’d like to do is if we could get a couple of more Animal Control officers, we would like to go back to where we have them stationed in east patrol, the east station and the
midtown station. Right now, they go all over the place. I know that we’re losing out on drive time. I’d rather them have an area that’s a little bit smaller that they would have less drive time, hopefully get to know the community, be more engaged because they’ve got a smaller area that they’re responsible for and see what that does. That’s going to take more officers unfortunately than what we have now.

Also, with our Chameleon software, it just kind of went live last week. I got a look at it for the first time today. On petharbor.com, our citizens will be able to go to that website and they can kind of put in some perimeters or they can view every single animal we have in our shelter. Wichita saw a 15% increase in owner reclams when they brought this onboard so we’re hoping that will assist people because they can look right there instead of just calling in saying I have a black and brown dog; do you have it. They can actually go on there and take a look. We’ll see what that gives us in results over the next year. I’m excited. I think it’s going to help us, I really do.

**Jenny Myers, Senior Attorney**, said finally, we are in the process of contract negotiations with Katie and Katie’s going to handle some of the in-house training for the Animal Control officers. We’ve looked at—training is very important that they know the law, they understand it. We’ve looked at training. The problem is, is a lot of it is not in-state so that’s travel expenses and we don’t have enough Animal Control officers to waste them, to let them go to training for a few days. By being able to provide it in-house with Katie’s expertise, it will give our officers creditability in the field; make sure we’re doing it right to get rid of any potential liability we may have. Also, in the courts, it will give them a little bit more creditability.

Katie can also help train maybe the prosecutors in Municipal Court. As Captain Angell was saying, sometimes it gets lost—the first conviction and second convocation, but we also know that the court system sometimes the prosecutors might miss out on that too. We increase the penalties and the severity of the fines so we want to make sure that those are being upheld in court so she can work with Municipal Court, the prosecutors.

She’s also already arranged for training of the District Attorney’s office which is unheard of really for animal control at the felony level. She’s also going to work on securing grants for us that will help with all these. We are in the process of that also.

**Chairman Bynum** said so Katie’s busy. **Ms. Myers** said Katie is very busy.

*May 18, 2015*
Commissioner Philbrook said there’s no way that I can express my gratitude. These ladies are really the backbone of this standing committee that we put together. Katie has a nice way. She’s so sweet about cracking the whip. Captain Angell is so nice about telling the commissioner to back off. She’s good. Poor Jenny, she has been through the wringer on this thing and I just want to thank her for all the hard work.

We’ve only gotten two types of animals taken care of so far. We have two more rounds to go the next, please help us, anybody who wants to join the committee to deal with chickens and rabbits. The next one after that will be the larger animals. It’s just a never ending process but it’s something that has to be taken care of. We appreciate your hard work. I know at sometimes it can be kind of boring for everybody else to listen to, but if you have an animal that’s ever been picked up or you had someone bitten by a dog or attacked, all of this becomes very, very close to you so thank you.

Chairman Bynum said this item was for information. We appreciate very much your time and all of the information and updates you brought. Thank you.

Action: For information only.

Adjourn
Chairman Bynum adjourned the meeting at 6:20 p.m.