

March 3, 2009

TO: Safety Committee

FROM: Chief Taylor

REF: March Safety Committee

I. Interim Safety Issues:

Much has changed over the last year as we have progressed through the city hall remodeling project. I am still confident that the council understands the concerns I have for the police department but I also recognize the economic reality facing everyone. With that understanding I have looked at the resources we do have and what can be done in the interim that is cost effective and transferable.

I have established a priority list of items that could be done to the current facility that addresses my major concerns.

#1. Access Control – The key/individual punch code system currently in place is no longer adequate. There are too many keys unaccounted for and the punch code system is a poor security setup. Installing a proximity card access control system is the most expensive part of my suggested interim improvements but the system components are also transferable to either new or remodeled construction. The heart of the system is computer software and control panels which could be used with any type of lock system. The majority of door locks could also be reused.

I've asked SEI (Security Equipment, Inc) to provide me with an estimate of costs for an access control system. SEI is the company that provided the access control for the Fairway Police Department and therefore is familiar with what our needs might be.

Their estimate includes controls for 16 doors and an improved video surveillance system for city hall. The system would have proximity card readers for the majority of the doors and a key pad reader for the back door. The key pad would be used by the tenants and would give them access to the main hallway. The proximity cards would be issued to all city employees/elected officials and double as an ID card. The cards can be programmed to allow access to specific areas and can be changed immediately if a card is lost or an employee changes an assignment.

One unique idea that came from my discussions with the security representative was a new use for the foyer area at the back door. Currently we have a 911 phone on the outside of the building for people that need assistance after hours. The phone is out in the weather, is not handicapped accessible and does not provide protection in the case of a disturbance. The suggestion was made to move the outside doors to the inside position thereby locking city hall at the second set of doors. We would move the 911 phone inside and replace it with an accessible panel phone (which could also be used later). A

panic button would be next to the phone that a person could push and lock the outside doors giving them a safe zone away from a potential threat. The outside door would need to have a touch unlock so the person could get out and not be locked inside. For those calling for none threatening events they would also be able to stay inside out of the weather while waiting for an officer to respond. The video surveillance component was included in the estimate because I would want a camera on the safe room setup and one for the front door.

The estimated cost for the access control/surveillance system is \$27,000.00. That number could change once specific bid specifications are developed and RFPs are received. The cost of the new 911 phone is not included and the specific equipment needs of the Safe Room have not been determined. The council may wish to discuss the inclusion of all the office doors on the second floor or other changes. I will have a diagram and specifics on the equipment involved at the Safety Committee Meeting. I request direction before moving to bid specifications concerning this plan.

#2. Space requirements – The first concern is for a larger evidence room. This is listed as #2 but could also be #1a. I propose that we take out the wall between the evidence room and the computer room making a 13' by 13' office. The computer/telephone equipment could be turned 180 degrees and enclosed in a closet in the sergeants office. The new office would be occupied by the detective and the detective's office could then be used as the new evidence room.

The benefits to this plan would be to move the detective into the secure main area of the police department and reduce the interruptions to events in the court room. The computer/phone equipment would still be secured and accessible for maintenance. And, we would gain necessary space for the evidence room.

Police department employees have moved the booking room and the armory and would be able to do this construction as well. The cost to the city would be for materials which I expect would be less than \$500.00. A climate control system needs to be included which could be a portable system.

#3. Video Surveillance – This item is partially included in #1 but I wanted to split it out for prioritization purposes. We currently have one camera in the hallway, one on part of the parking lot and one in the booking room. New additions would include two outdoor cameras on the parking lot, a camera for the front and back door and one camera on top of city hall for skate part surveillance.

#4. The other construction that would benefit the department would be the addition of an interview room in the lobby area outside the PD. I would like to construct a room by enclosing the area where the pop machine is now. The room would have a couple of chairs and a small table. There would still need to be access to the storage under the stairs but that should be no problem.

## II. JCCC Public Safety Training Center Membership

Larry Able is the director of the JCCC Public Safety Training Center (PSTC) and proposed a plan to the area police chiefs and sheriff to provide basic in-service training for a set fee. JCCC has become more involved in the continuing education field and has moved the Public Safety Training Center to work more closely with the Kansas Regional Police Academy. The Center provides classes on a sliding scale to area law enforcement agencies on a pay per class basis. Roeland Park PD takes advantage of these classes and spent approximately \$1,452.18 directly to JCCC for in-service training. Additionally the department sends officers to other training opportunities and has spent approximately \$500.00 on classes that would be provided by the PSTC.

Mr. Able set up a curriculum committee and asked area agencies to provide a representative. Sgt. Birdsong is our training coordinator and attended these meetings. The outcome was a list of topics that would provide a range of classes to fulfill the in-service requirement for most law enforcement officers. By participating Roeland Park would be able to send officers to a better selection of in-service classes that directly relates to police officer's training needs. Currently, we must look at a variety of training venues to find classes that are important for Roeland Park Officers. Finding basic retraining classes is sometimes difficult and often requires officers to travel to other locations. The PSTC would provide a one stop shop for basic officer in-service training.

The cost to the city would be an annual fee of \$3,000.00 which would allow any Roeland Park officer to attend any of the standard courses. There would still be fees for national level speakers that the Center might bring to town but these classes are normally attended by supervisory personnel and are not basic police skills. By participating in the program we would be able to attend these classes with a 50 – 60% discount.

The two main reasons to participate in this program are; one officers would have access to a more well rounded in-service curriculum where basic classes would be repeated so more officers can attend and two the police department would be better able to schedule training that meets the needs of the department.

Mr. Able is requesting an indication of commitment in order to move to the next step of preparing a formal contract between PSTC and each city. I recommend that the council give me the indication of commitment to participate in the program with the understanding that a final decision will be based on a contract for service.

III. Green Friendly police cars – Councilmember Art asked if the Safety Committee could discuss this issue. I have a lot of information about police vehicles that I will bring to the meeting. Generally, there are three vehicles marketed as police cars. The Ford Crown Vic is generally the most well known. The Dodge Charger is gaining support from many departments and the third is the Chevy Impala.

In the past I have evaluated police vehicles based on the requirements of police service. Of the three main police vehicles, “green” has not been one of the major evaluation considerations past fuel mileage and fuel mileage does not necessarily give us an equivalent on carbon emissions. I will be interested to get direction from the committee as to how we can include “green friendly” into our police vehicle purchase decision.

IV. Johnson County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan – FEMA requires a review and update of Local Emergency Operations Plans every five years. Johnson County Emergency Management has again taken the lead on updating the Johnson County plan and hired a private firm to assist with the update. Roeland Park is part of the Johnson County plan I attended a series of meetings with the area emergency managers to review the current plan and provide updated information.

The plan has moved through the process and will be sent to FEMA for approval. Once the plan is approved by FEMA it will be submitted to each participating governing body for acceptance. The updated plan that has been submitted can be found at [www.jocoem.org](http://www.jocoem.org).

V. Sidewalk criteria – As the council works on sidewalk criteria the Safety Committee will have a discussion on related safety issues that should be included in the criteria.

VI. Edward Byrne (JAG) Grant – The Bureau of Justice (BJA) has announced the allocation of funds for local government entities to receive a JAG grant. This grant will come directly from BJA and not through the Governor’s Grant Office. I have a call into BJA to get the criteria for the grant process. My first priority for a grant would be the security of the police department and according to the information I have received could be \$14,335. I have talked with the Governor’s Grant Office and will be notified when additional funding for grants comes to the State of Kansas.

VII. COPS Technology Grant – Johnson County has received a COPS Technology Grant that funded the purchase of new portable radios. As you may remember the county is improving the emergency radio system by upgrading to what is called a P25 standard. There is also an issue of rebanding where the 800 Mhz radio frequency range will be released for use by cell phone companies so law enforcement is required to move to another band. We have been putting aside money for the last two years with the expectation to purchase radios before the changeover in 2010. The four radios we receive from the county will reduce the number of radios the city has to buy.

I am scheduled to attend a meeting on Friday the 6<sup>th</sup> to get the final design and prices on the new radios. I should be able to have firm numbers for the Safety Committee meeting for our radio needs.



TO: Public Safety Agency Chief Executives

FM: Walter Way, Director

RE: FY 2008 COPS Technology Grant funded radio equipment

DT:

The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, U.S. Department of Justice, awarded the Emergency Communications Center (ECC) a grant in the amount of \$93,530 for the purchase of P-25 compliant radios for law enforcement agencies served by the Sheriff's Communications Unit and that utilize radio communication services through the Johnson County Communications System.

The ECC has a number of responsibilities as the grant recipient and as the fiscal agent under this grant. To ensure compliance with grant requirements, we need your agency's acknowledgement of the following conditions for acceptance of the radio equipment provided under this grant.

The radio equipment received through this grant will become the property of your agency which will assume full financial responsibility for its maintenance, repair, software upgrades, and overall usage of the equipment. Johnson County and the ECC will have no operational or financial responsibility for the equipment once it is received by your agency.

The equipment obtained through the COPS Technology Grant will have a unique identifier affixed to the equipment to facilitate federal monitoring and audits. Your agency will be required to maintain a current and complete inventory of all grant provided equipment and its current location, and to present such inventory to federal personnel charged with auditing grant compliance. The grant conditions require retention of the equipment for the life of the grant which should be until January of 2011. As the fiscal agent for the grant, we ask that you please forward a written notification to the ECC prior to removing or disposing of grant provided equipment prior to January 2011.

Attached to this document is the inventory of equipment provided through the ECC by the COPS Technology grant to your agency. The signature of the agency head or designee on this document indicates acceptance of the equipment listed on the inventory page and acceptance of the above conditions required by the Department of Justice.

If questions should arise, please do not hesitate to contact me or our Financial Services Manager Zandra Hurtado at (913) 826-1021 or [Zhurtado@jocogov.org](mailto:Zhurtado@jocogov.org). Thank you for your participation and assistance in helping the ECC comply with the requirements of this grant program.

---

Agency Executive Signature	Agency Name	Date
----------------------------	-------------	------

State	Jurisdiction Name	Government Type	Eligible Individual Allocation	Eligible Joint Allocation
KS	ALLEN COUNTY	County	*	
KS	IOLA CITY	Municipal	\$26,555	\$26,555
KS	ATCHISON COUNTY	County	*	
KS	ATCHISON CITY	Municipal	\$22,325	\$22,325
KS	BARTON COUNTY	County	\$11,750	
KS	GREAT BEND CITY	Municipal	\$103,400	\$115,150
KS	BOURBON COUNTY	County	*	
KS	FORT SCOTT CITY	Municipal	\$27,495	\$27,495
KS	CLAY COUNTY	County	*	
KS	CLAY CENTER CITY	Municipal	\$10,575	\$10,575
KS	CLOUD COUNTY	County	*	
KS	CONCORDIA CITY	Municipal	\$11,750	\$11,750
KS	COWLEY COUNTY	County	\$28,905	
KS	ARKANSAS CITY	Municipal	\$52,405	\$81,310
KS	CRAWFORD COUNTY	County	\$23,500	
KS	PITTSBURG CITY	Municipal	\$79,430	\$102,930
KS	DOUGLAS COUNTY	County	\$19,505	
KS	LAWRENCE CITY	Municipal	\$278,240	
KS	EUDORA CITY	Municipal	\$10,340	\$308,085
KS	ELLIS COUNTY	County	*	
KS	HAYS CITY	Municipal	\$41,830	\$41,830
KS	FINNEY COUNTY	County	\$27,025	
KS	GARDEN CITY	Municipal	\$105,985	\$133,010
KS	FORD COUNTY	County	*	
KS	DODGE CITY	Municipal	\$101,520	\$101,520
KS	FRANKLIN COUNTY	County	\$31,960	
KS	OTTAWA CITY	Municipal	\$46,060	\$78,020
KS	GEARY COUNTY	County	*	
KS	JUNCTION CITY	Municipal	\$107,865	\$107,865
KS	GOVE COUNTY	County	*	
KS	PARK CITY	Municipal	\$13,395	\$13,395
KS	GRANT COUNTY	County	*	
KS	ULYSSES CITY	Municipal	\$11,045	\$11,045
KS	HARVEY COUNTY	County	*	
KS	NEWTON CITY	Municipal	\$68,150	\$68,150
KS	JOHNSON COUNTY	County	\$66,505	

KS	GARDNER CITY	Municipal	\$35,250	
KS	LEAWOOD CITY	Municipal	\$31,960	
KS	LENEXA CITY	Municipal	\$60,630	
KS	MERRIAM CITY	Municipal	\$34,075	
KS	MISSION CITY	Municipal	\$23,735	
KS	OLATHE CITY	Municipal	\$295,395	
KS	PRAIRIE VILLAGE CITY	Municipal	\$16,450	
KS	ROELAND PARK CITY	Municipal	\$14,335	
KS	SHAWNEE CITY	Municipal	\$74,965	
KS	OVERLAND PARK CITY	Municipal	\$267,195	\$920,495
KS	LABETTE COUNTY	County	*	
KS	PARSONS CITY	Municipal	\$54,050	\$54,050
KS	LEAVENWORTH COUNTY	County	\$31,020	
KS	LEAVENWORTH CITY	Municipal	\$213,850	
KS	LANSING CITY	Municipal	\$18,330	\$263,200
KS	LYON COUNTY	County	*	
KS	EMPORIA CITY	Municipal	\$70,735	\$70,735
KS	MCPHERSON COUNTY	County	*	
KS	MCPHERSON CITY	Municipal	\$16,920	\$16,920
KS	NEOSHO COUNTY	County	*	
KS	CHANUTE CITY	Municipal	\$23,500	\$23,500
KS	PAWNEE COUNTY	County	*	
KS	LARNED CITY	Municipal	\$15,040	\$15,040
KS	RENO COUNTY	County	\$19,975	
KS	HUTCHINSON CITY	Municipal	\$141,940	\$161,915
KS	RICE COUNTY	County	*	
KS	LYONS CITY	Municipal	\$11,750	\$11,750
KS	SALINE COUNTY	County	\$12,925	
KS	SALINA CITY	Municipal	\$95,880	\$108,805
KS	SCOTT COUNTY	County	*	
KS	SCOTT CITY	Municipal	\$10,340	\$10,340
KS	SEDGWICK COUNTY	County	\$104,575	
KS	WICHITA CITY	Municipal	\$2,195,133	
KS	DERBY CITY	Municipal	\$26,320	
KS	HAYSVILLE CITY	Municipal	\$21,150	\$2,347,178
KS	SEWARD COUNTY	County	*	
KS	LIBERAL CITY	Municipal	\$98,465	\$98,465
KS	SHAWNEE COUNTY	County	\$64,860	
KS	TOPEKA CITY	Municipal	\$486,450	\$551,310
KS	SUMNER COUNTY	County	*	
KS	WELLINGTON CITY	Municipal	\$16,685	\$16,685

KS	THOMAS COUNTY	County	*	
KS	COLBY CITY	Municipal	\$11,750	\$11,750
KS	MONTGOMERY COUNTY	County	*	
KS	COFFEYVILLE CITY	Municipal	\$56,635	
KS	INDEPENDENCE CITY	Municipal	\$36,660	\$93,295
KS	AUGUSTA CITY	Municipal	\$12,925	
KS	BONNER SPRINGS CITY	Municipal	\$14,570	
KS	BUTLER COUNTY	County	\$38,540	
KS	CHEROKEE COUNTY	County	\$18,800	
KS	EDWARDSVILLE CITY	Municipal	\$10,810	
KS	EL DORADO CITY	Municipal	\$26,790	
KS	JACKSON COUNTY	County	\$17,860	
KS	JEFFERSON COUNTY	County	\$17,625	
KS	MIAMI COUNTY	County	\$19,740	
KS	OSAGE COUNTY	County	\$17,390	
KS	OSAWATOMIE CITY	Municipal	\$13,160	
KS	POTTAWATOMIE COUNTY	County	\$25,850	
KS	RILEY COUNTY	County	\$165,910	
KS	STEVENS COUNTY	County	\$10,340	
KS	WINFIELD CITY	Municipal	\$30,315	
KS	WYANDOTTE COUNTY AND KANSAS CITY UNIFIED GOVERNMENT	Municipal	\$840,124	
	<b>Local total</b>		<b>\$7,317,192</b>	
	<b>State of Kansas</b>		<b>\$12,660,141</b>	
	<b>Grand total for Kansas</b>		<b>\$19,977,333</b>	

<sup>^</sup> Counties that have an asterisk (\*) under the "Eligible Individual Allocation" column are ineligible for a direct FY 09 Recovery Act - Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) award from BJA. For JAG purposes, these counties remain a partner with the jurisdictions receiving funds and must be a signatory on the required Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). A sample MOU is provided online at: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/recoveryJAG/09JAGMOU.pdf>.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Shaded allocation amounts for disparate jurisdictions appearing in the "Eligible Individual Allocation" column are suggested amounts based on what each jurisdiction would have been eligible to receive if there was no identified disparity. Disparate jurisdictions are responsible for determining individual allocations and documenting individual allocations in the MOU. Additional JAG Frequently Asked Questions can be found on the BJA JAG web page at: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/recoveryJAG/09JAGFAQ.pdf>.