

**RILEY COUNTY LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY
SPECIAL LAW BOARD/BUDGET MEETING
City Commission Meeting Room
1101 Poyntz Avenue
Manhattan, KS
March 15, 2012 5:30 p.m.
Minutes**

Members Present: Karen McCulloh Jim Sherow
Barry Wilkerson Loren Pepperd
Dave Lewis John Matta
Wynn Butler

Absent:

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

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

II. Pledge of Allegiance: Led by Director Schoen

III. Consent Agenda:

- A. Approve 2011 & 2012 Expenditures
 - a) 2011 Budget Expenditures
 - b) 2012 Budget Expenditures
 - c) Juvenile Transports
 - d) Seizure Expenditures

Lewis moved to approve the consent agenda as presented. Wilkerson seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0.

IV. General Agenda:

B. Public Comment: None.

C. 2013 Budget Development: As part of the packet the Board was provided RCPD 2013 budget drafts 2A, 2B and 2C for consideration. All 3 budget drafts include the addition of 2 Police Officers, 1 non-sworn Public Information Officer (PIO) and 1 non-sworn Crime Scene Investigator (CSI) Lab Technician. Each draft reflects a \$1,000 reduction in account 21 Community Services/Recruiting. Draft 2A includes a 2.2% Cost of Living Allowance (COLA). Draft 2B includes a 1.75% COLA, and 2C includes a 1.5% COLA for all Department employees. Budget drafts 2B and 2C were requested by Commissioner Lewis as they reflect what the City and County selected in 2012 as a COLA for their employees.

Prior to engaging in discussions concerning specific budget options, Director Schoen addressed a few questions that were posed by members of the Board at the March 8, 2012 Special Law Board/Budget Meeting.

The first question pertained to hidden costs associated with training a new officer. Director Schoen explained that the calculation is dependent on what is taken into account. Captain Fink researched the matter in great detail. His calculations include the time, money and effort spent conducting hiring actions, background checks, medical and psychological screening, to name a few. The ending figure also includes equipment issued to a new police officer, and the 28 week period in which the officer is in training status. His research revealed that it costs the Department \$37,160 to hire and train a new police officer who is on the Department's single health insurance plan and \$40,365 for an officer on the family plan.

Captain Fink applied the same criteria with respect to what it costs the Department to hire and train a correction officer. According to his calculations it costs the Department \$6,769 to train 1 correction officer on the Department's single health insurance plan and \$9,733 for a correction officer on the family plan. Schoen noted that a correction officer does not attend a 14 week academy like that of a police officer, which accounts for some of the cost difference between the two. A large amount of correction officer training is conducted internally.

Butler inquired about the Departments turnover rate for the position of police officer.

Schoen responded that over the last 10 years the average turnover rate for an officer was 9.15 officers per year.

McCulloh asked if the figures provided by Captain Fink include the cost to have staff train the new employee.

Schoen confirmed that the information was included in the figures provided.

At the previous Law Board Meeting members of the Board inquired about preliminary valuation totals for the County. McCulloh said that the appraisal value is 4.1% over last year. She cautioned that it is only a preliminary number and that assessed valuations are typically lower.

Another question had to do with the number of civilian PIO's in the state of Kansas. Schoen explained that a quick survey of the 25 cities of the first class in Kansas was conducted. The study revealed that there are 5 agencies that employ civilian PIO's. Lawrence, Kansas has 1 civilian and 1 sworn PIO.

Captain Fink also obtained information from the federal government website pertaining to the social security COLA for a 3 year period. Schoen reported that in 2009, 2010 and 2011 the COLA was 0.0%, 0.0% and 3.6% respectively. During that same period the COLA for RCPD was 0.0%, -0.3% and 2.0% respectively just by way of comparison. The same question was asked about what the military received for a COLA. In 2008, 2009 and 2010 they received a 3.5%, 3.9% and 1.4% COLA.

Lastly, the Board inquired about a salary comparison between RCPD, City and County employees. Schoen said that a number of years ago the RCPD, City and County hired Dr. Victoria McGrath of McGrath Consulting Group, Inc. to conduct a salary survey. It was determined that each department

had some positions that were underpaid and some that were overpaid. The RCPD and County implemented the results of the survey and froze salaries for positions that were deemed overpaid until they were in line again. The RCPD and County implemented a step program to bring up those positions that were identified as underpaid. At that time RCPD agreed to pay employees at the 50th percentile. The County chose to pay their employees at the 60th percentile.

Schoen said that in reading the survey for the City it was clear that costs to implement the salary survey were going to be considerably more than that of the RCPD or County. The City decided to implement 1 phase of salary survey. Out of the 3 entities, the City was in the worst position with approximately 60% of their employees deemed to be underpaid by 30% or more.

Schoen said that when looking at how the positions line up now with respect to wages there is a certain degree of consistency between RCPD and the County. As for the City there are some positions that are paid in line with what one might expect to see, but there are other positions that are way off. There are positions that are paid a little over, or more typically, a decent amount under. Unfortunately, a salary comparison between RCPD, City and County employees is not as useful as he would like by virtue of the fact that the results of the McGrath survey were not fully implemented by the City.

Matta expressed his desire to think outside the box and identify ways to cut costs, consolidate staff and/or services between the RCPD, City and County. He had hoped not to see an increase in the mil levy for 2013. One of the things that frustrate the public is when salaries continue to rise for various branches of government while those in the private sector experience a salary freeze. The RCPD has a number of employees who are topped out on the salary chart. He offered an option in which merit increases would be given to RCPD employees who receive a satisfactory or above evaluation, no COLA and a 3% increase for employees who are topped out on the salary chart.

Schoen said that to do that would essentially warp the salary chart. The Board and RCPD were cautioned by McGrath Consulting Group, Inc. that once finalized the salary chart should not be altered. In the long run, the Department would find itself back to where it was prior to the salary survey with fairly significant discrepancies within the pay scale.

McCulloh & Sherow concurred with the comments made by Director Schoen. McCulloh stated that the City and County spent a considerable amount of money to conduct the salary survey. The Law Board and RCPD were urged not to change the salary chart once completed.

McCulloh expressed an interest in knowing if there is a way to compare per capita officer ratios with similar jurisdictions, specifically those with universities.

Schoen said he could obtain the requested information and report back to the Board at the next meeting.

Sherow wished to point out that Manhattan is unique in that there is a university and a post nearby which could prove to be a complicating factor when doing the comparison.

Wilkerson wanted to know which of the budget options Director Schoen felt would address the needs of the Department and maintain the current employee retention rate.

Schoen said that RCPD staff has done a good job reviewing current positions within the Department, and identifying ways to streamline the Department's organizational structure by converting a few positions filled by sworn employees to civilian positions. Schoen maintained that the addition of 2 police officers, 1 non-sworn PIO and 1 non-sworn CSI lab technician are needed. A number of the budget drafts provided are the result of meetings between RCPD Administration, Staff and members of the Budget Committee. He added that he does not feel that the Board needs to do anything outrageous in terms of pay in order to retain employees. However, he attributes that in large part to the implementation of the McGrath Salary Survey results and the fact that the Department is now paying employees at the 50th percentile.

The City and County were asked to translate assessed valuation increases in to dollars for future discussion. Butler said that the growth of the community should fund any growth in RCPD. He further stated that he does not want to see a 0.0% COLA for RCPD employees, but he is not certain at this time what it should be.

Sherow said that Director Schoen came to the Board with his recommendation of what is needed for RCPD in 2013. The closer the Board can come to meeting those needs while taking into account the revenue projections, the better off the City and County will be budget wise. The goal is to bring those as close together as possible.

D. Executive Session: An executive session was not needed.

E. Adjournment: Lewis moved to adjourn the meeting. Matta seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0. The March 15, 2012 Special Law Board/Budget Meeting adjourned at 6:47 p.m.