

**RILEY COUNTY LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY
SPECIAL LAW BOARD/BUDGET MEETING
County Commission Chambers
115 N. 4th Street
Manhattan, KS
March 8, 2012 5:30 p.m.
Minutes**

Members Present: Karen McCulloh Jim Sherow (left at 6:43 p.m.)
Barry Wilkerson Loren Pepperd (arrived at 5:37 p.m.)
Dave Lewis John Matta (arrived at 5:37 p.m.)
Wynn Butler

Absent: Assistant Director Doehling

Staff Present: Director Schoen Captain Nelson
Captain Hooper Captain Hegarty
Captain Moldrup Captain Fink

I. Establish Quorum: By Chairman McCulloh at 5:30 p.m.

II. Pledge of Allegiance: Led by Director Schoen

III. General Agenda:

A. Public Comment: None.

B. 2012 Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws (EUDL) Grant: Director Schoen explained that in previous years the Department has participated in the Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws (EUDL) Grant. The grant funds overtime expenses for officers to enforce underage drinking laws and there are no matching fund requirements. The grant amount is \$29,321.28. He requested approval from the Law Board to submit the grant application.

Sherow moved to approve the 2012 Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws Grant application. Lewis seconded the motion. The motion passed 5-0.

C. 2013 Budget Development: Members of the Law Board were provided copies of the Riley County Police Department 2013 Budget Narrative as part of their packets. Also provided was 2013 Budget Drafts 1A, 1B, 1C, 1D and 1E. Director Schoen briefed the Board on each of the budget lines.

Account 1: Full Time Salaries: Account 1 funds salaries for all full time employees. The Department recommends budgeting \$11,218,300 for 2013, a 6.47% increase over the 2012 approved budget. The increase includes all merit increases for approximately 84% of all personnel and a Cost of Living Allowance (COLA) adjustment of 3.2% for all personnel as well as an estimated payout for potential retiree leave accumulations. Additional personnel include 1 non-sworn Public Information Officer (PIO) and 3 Sworn Police Officers.

Matta stated that the proposed COLA and merit increase results in a 7.2% increase for RCPD employees which is much higher than those in the private sector.

Sherow inquired if all RCPD employees receive a merit increase.

Schoen responded that all employees would receive a COLA, but not all would receive a merit increase. Employees who are topped out on the salary schedule do not receive a merit increase. The Department anticipates that there will be 32 employees who will be topped out on the salary schedule in 2013. As a result of the salary survey conducted for the Department some years ago by Dr. Victoria McGrath of McGrath Consulting Group, Inc. more employees are staying with RCPD rather than going to another department or the private sector. That saves money as there is less employee turnover. The net effect of that is the Department has more people who will top out on the salary schedule. Schoen noted that Dr. Victoria McGrath cautioned that once the salary schedule was set it should be left alone. In addition, the Department recently implemented a new merit based evaluation system and Administration is seeing more of a realistic curve with respect to the evaluations which impacts the merit increases. He estimated that there will be approximately 6 to 10 employees who, based on the new evaluation system will not receive a merit increase in 2013.

Matta said that the same would occur in the private sector. There are employees in the private sector who receive unsatisfactory evaluations do not get merit increases. There are also those who max out on the salary chart and do not receive any increase. He asked if a salary comparison between RCPD, City and County employees has ever been conducted.

Schoen said the City and County used the same consultant when they conducted their salary survey. To the best of his knowledge the salaries for those positions were pretty close. When the salary survey was conducted for RCPD, the Department decided to pay employees at the 50th percentile. The County decided to pay their employees at the 60th percentile. He is not certain what level the City decided to pay their employees as a result of the survey.

Assistant City Manager Lauren Palmer stated that a survey was conducted for the City; however, they have not fully implemented the results of the survey at this time.

McCulloh stated that the County did enact the suggestions provided by McGrath and their staff is paid at the 60th percentile.

Matta asked if a COLA is given to RCPD employees who receive unsatisfactory ratings on their evaluation.

Schoen said yes. The COLA is given to all employees.

Pepperd clarified that a COLA is not the same as a merit increase which is tied to employee performance. A COLA is applied across the board.

Matta wished to point out that quite a few businesses do not receive a COLA.

McCulloh explained that there are more regulations on what can be done compensation wise for employees in the public sector versus those in the private sector.

Schoen concurred that not all businesses give a COLA to their employees. The comparison between the public and private sector is good to an extent, but there are a number of people in the private industry who, when things go well get rather significant bonuses. The Department is unable to provide bonuses to employees and there are a number of employees who do significantly better than average work.

Sherow said that another thing to keep in mind is that police departments are in competition with one another across the state for quality employees and officers.

Matta responded that the private sector has that as well.

Sherow explained that in the private sector businesses are in competition with those in the same distribution. In his opinion, that is not the same. The Board has to factor how to keep the best officers at a pay rate that compensates them for the kind of work they do, the quality of work, and skills required to do it.

Lewis said that the County has also expressed some interest in employing a Public Information Officer (PIO). He wanted to know if the proposed PIO for RCPD would be a full time position. The possibility could exist for the County and RCPD to share a position.

Schoen said that one of the things the Board requested as an action item as part of the 2012 RCPD goals was to improve communications with the public. The Department plans to develop social media contacts and attempt to deal with the demographic with which he believes RCPD has the greatest misunderstandings which is those who are 18-29 years of age. The goal is to try to develop some interest among that age group in what the Department does. The current PIO spends approximately 3 hours preparing for daily reporting sessions with the media. Schoen envisions the PIO becoming a full time position fairly quickly.

Pepperd inquired about the number of civilian PIO's in the state of Kansas

Schoen said he is not certain. He will obtain the information and provide it to the Board at the next scheduled meeting.

Account 2: Part Time Salaries: The Department recommends budgeting \$79,500 for 2013, representing a 29.27% increase over the 2012 approved budget. The majority of the funds in this line are intended to fund part time Police Service Aides (PSA) for up to 100 hours a week.

Account 3: Overtime Salaries: The Department recommends budgeting \$320,000 for 2013 which is a 6.67% increase over the 2012 approved budget.

Account 4: Utilities: The jail expansion project increased the square footage to the Law Enforcement Center which resulted in an increase in utilities to heat, cool, and light the facility. Therefore a \$12,000 (6.74%) increase is recommended for 2013. The Department recommends budgeting \$190,000 for this line.

Account 5: Insurance: The Department maintains three insurance policies: General Business, Comprehensive Police Professional Liability, and Public Officials Liability Insurance. The Department recommends a mild reduction of \$10,000 (4.26%) to this line from the 2012 level.

Butler requested the Department look into the possibility of consolidating services with the City and County for insurance. He understands that there will likely be separate policies, but a discount might be offered if they use the same insurance carrier.

Attorney Michael Gillespie explained that there has been discussion in the past about adding City and County Commissioners to the RCPD Public Officials Liability Policy largely as a result of the Lowery litigation. He would have to confirm with Sunflower Insurance Group to determine if that was done, though he does not believe it was. The Comprehensive Police Professional Liability is a standalone policy which City and County employees could not be covered under. It is exclusively a law enforcement policy.

Gillespie explained that it might not be in the best interest of the 3 entities to tie themselves together as far as future litigation might go. He is not contemplating any particular case, but it could be argued that the City, County, RCPD and Law Board are the same. When tied together it can add to that argument. This option has been discussed in the past, but for one reason or another, the decision was made not to do it.

Matta clarified that it is one thing to tie 3 entities together and bid it as a single contract. It is another thing to seek a package deal with 3 contracts. Essentially each would have their own policy, but it would be one contract.

Schoen said the Department is getting a pretty good deal with Sunflower Insurance Group, now known as Assurance. Riley County Police Department Administration has had preliminary discussions with the County concerning this topic. For a variety of reasons there was not much interest in pursuing it further because the County feels they are getting a pretty good product with their current provider. It is something he can continue to check into. He noted that the insurance broker for the City is also Assurance.

Account 6: Legal & Accounting: The Department recommends budgeting \$45,000 for 2013, a slight increase of \$5,000 (12.50%) from the 2012 approved budget.

Account 7: Training & Travel: Training is allocated by division based on the need. When available, free training or online training is sought, as is the opportunity to conduct training internally. However, out of town training continues to be necessary on topics that simply are not available locally. The Department proposes budgeting \$85,000 for 2013 which is an increase of \$5,000 (6.25%) from the 2012 approved budget.

Account 8: Postage: The Department does not recommend a change to this account and recommends budgeting \$8,000 for 2013.

Account 9: Printing: Once again, the Department does not recommend a change to this account and recommends budgeting \$8,000 for 2013.

Account 10: Rentals-Maintenance Agreements: Expenditures in this account rose slightly in 2011 and are expected to remain fairly consistent through 2013. The Department recommends budgeting \$40,000 for 2013, a modest increase of \$2,000 (5.26%) over the 2012 approved budget.

Butler said with respect to copiers this might be another area where consolidating vendors with the City and County might result in cost savings.

Matta concurred with Butler and urged the Department to research areas in which cost savings might be achieved through consolidation of services/vendors with the City and County.

Lewis suggested a task force be developed to identify areas where the City, County and RCPD could consolidate services in an effort to reduce costs.

Schoen said he would make preliminary overtures to the City and County to determine if it would make sense to consolidate certain services and/or vendors.

Account 11: Building & Grounds: Minor repairs and replacements to Department facilities will continue to increase as the facility ages. Therefore, the Department recommends budgeting \$15,000 for 2013 which is a \$2,000 (15.38%) increase from the 2012 approved budget.

Account 12: Equipment Repair & Maintenance: The Department does not recommend a change to this account and recommends budgeting \$65,000 for 2013.

Account 13: Vehicle Maintenance: The Department recommends budgeting \$75,000 for 2013, a \$10,000 (15.38%) increase from the 2012 approved budget.

Account 14: Telephone: The Department recommends budgeting \$55,000 for 2013 which is a \$5,000 (10.00%) increase from the 2012 approved budget.

Account 16: Medical Fees: The Department does not recommend a change to this account and recommends budgeting \$10,000 for 2013.

Account 17: Prisoner Food & Care: Costs in this line are directly tied to inmate population, which has stabilized somewhat since late 2010. The Department does not recommend a change to this account and recommends budgeting \$161,000 for 2013.

Account 19: Computer Contractual Services: Expenditures in this line include maintenance and service agreements for a number of computer and technology related software and hardware utilized by the Department. Much of the expenditures in this account in 2011 were paid to an outside computer systems consultant for the management of the Department's network. Those costs were eliminated in 2012 when the Department added the position of a Computer Systems Administrator; however, costs associated with the maintenance and service agreements inherent in the operation of the Department's network remain significant. The Department proposes budgeting \$150,000 for 2013, a \$70,000 (87.50%) increase over that of the 2012 approved budget for this account.

Account 20: Other Contractual Services: The Department does not recommend a change to this account and recommends budgeting \$110,000 for 2013.

Account 21: Community Services: Once again, the Department does not recommend a change to this account and recommends budgeting \$5,000 for 2013.

Butler noted that the average expenditure for this account is approximately \$4,000. For 2013 the Department recommends over budgeting by \$1,000.

Schoen said he will have Accountant Annette Moran reduce the proposed amount by \$1,000 to be more in line with the average.

Account 22: Books, Papers, Memberships: The Department recommends budgeting \$10,000 for 2013 which is a \$3,000 (42.86%) increase from the 2012 approved budget.

Account 23: Uniforms & Accessories: The Department does not recommend a change to this account and recommends budgeting \$55,000 for 2013.

Account 25: Maintenance Supplies: The Department recommends budgeting \$24,000 for 2013, a modest increase of \$2,000 (9.09%) from that of the 2012 approved budget.

Account 26: Fuel & Lubrication: The Department recommends budgeting \$275,000 for 2013, an increase of \$25,000 (10.00%) from that of the 2012 approved budget.

Account 27: Vehicle Tires: The Department recommends budgeting \$16,000 for 2013, a modest increase of \$1,000 (6.67%) from the 2012 approved budget.

Account 28: Office Supplies: The Department does not recommend a change to this account and recommends budgeting \$23,500 for 2013.

Account 29: Replenishment Supplies: The Department recommends budgeting \$40,000 for 2013, an increase of \$10,000 (33.33%) from the 2012 approved budget.

Account 30: Communications Equipment: The Department does not recommend a change to this account and recommends budgeting \$33,000 for 2013.

Account 31: Guns & Crime Equipment: In 2011 the Department made a bulk purchase of Electronic Control Devices (ECD) causing an overage in this account. A return to a normal level is expected in 2012 and a \$5,000 reduction in this line is suggested. The Department recommends budgeting \$38,000 for 2013, an 11.63% reduction from the 2012 approved budget.

Account 32: Furniture: The Department does not recommend a change to this account and recommends budgeting \$10,000 for 2013.

Account 33: Equipment: The Department recommends budgeting \$125,000 for 2013 which is a \$25,000 (25.00%) increase from the 2012 approved budget

Account 34: Vehicles & Equipment: Although expenditures have exceeded the budget line each year, credits to the account generally reduce the actual expenditures below or very near the authorized funding level. Therefore, the Department does not recommend a change to this account and recommends budgeting \$200,000 for 2013.

Account 35: Emergency Reserve Fund: The Department does not recommend any additional funding in this line for 2013.

Account 36: Kansas Police & Fire: State legislature and KPERS actuaries determine the Department's rate for KP&F retirement benefit payments. The Department proposes budgeting \$1,268,300 for 2013.

Account 37: KPERS: The Department proposes budgeting \$440,800 for Account 37, Kansas Public Employment Retirement System (KPERS), which is a \$53,300 increase over the 2012 approved budget.

Account 38: Social Security: The Department proposes budgeting \$449,100 for Account 38, Social Security, a \$33,600 increase over the 2012 approved budget.

Account 39: Health Insurance: The Department proposes budgeting \$1,870,000 for this line, a \$65,500 increase from the 2012 approved budget.

Account 40: Workers Compensation Insurance: The Department proposes budgeting \$567,600 for this account, a \$95,100 increase over the 2012 approved budget.

Account 41: Unemployment Compensation: The Department proposes budgeting \$18,600 for this account, a \$7,600 increase over the 2012 approved budget.

Matta and Butler requested the County provide the Board with preliminary valuation totals to be presented at the next Law Board Meeting.

McCulloh said she would obtain the figures on the increase in appraisals and report back.

Matta voiced his preference to stay with a budget option around or below a 3.5% increase.

Lewis said he would like to consider a budget option with a 2.2% COLA, which would keep the overall increase to the budget around 4% after applying the carryover.

Pepperd inquired about the military and Social Security COLA for 2013.

Schoen said typically the Social Security figure is not released until later in the year, but he will do some research and report back to the Board.

D. Executive Session: At 8:00 p.m. Lewis moved to go into executive session for the purpose of discussing attorney client privilege not to exceed 10 minutes. Wilkerson seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0.

At 8:10 p.m. Matta moved to return from executive session. McCulloh seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0.

E. Adjournment: Matta moved to adjourn the meeting. Butler seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0. The March 8, 2012 Special Law Board/Budget Meeting adjourned at 8:11 p.m.