



adequate security measures and adopted personnel policies prohibit such concealed carry by employees who are licensed. Wilson stated that the County has granted an exemption to the new concealed carry law giving the District Court until January 2014 to develop a security plan for the courthouse.

Wilson explained that security has been a priority for the District Court for some time. The Riley County Police Department currently assigns one officer to the courthouse. It is not possible for one officer to be in all of the courtrooms at the same time. The only logical solution would be to have one single, secure entrance into the courthouse. Wilson said it will be very difficult because the building has five entrances, but the details can be worked out and it can be accomplished. Other possible security measures include installing security cameras in each of the courtrooms and a panic button that would transmit directly to RCPD in the event of an emergency.

Schoen said that given that the 2014 budget for RCPD has been set, a possible short term solution would be for the City or County to contract with RCPD for the provision of additional police services (e.g., security screener) at the courthouse. He clarified that the City or County could choose to contract with a private vendor for this service, or they could choose to contract with RCPD.

Boyd suggested the formation of a working group comprised of representatives from the Law Board, RCPD, District and Municipal Courts with the charge of identifying short term and long term solutions to courthouse security. Boyd volunteered to serve on the working group as representative of the County Commission, and Butler volunteered to serve as a representative from the City Commission.

**G. Public Comment:** Commissioner Jankovich addressed the Law Board on behalf of Manhattan resident Lenard Reid who had planned to speak during public comment, but was unable to. Mr. Reid met with Director Schoen, Assistant Director Doehling, Lieutenant Quintanar and Commissioner Jankovich the morning of July 15, 2013. At the meeting Reid expressed his belief that he has been targeted by certain community members. Although he does not feel that he has been treated unfairly by RCPD, he does continue to experience problems as a Manhattan resident. During the meeting Reid expressed a desire to get along with everyone. He is trying not to come across as confrontational to those he encounters. Jankovich said that overall the meeting was productive, and he thanked those who attended.

**H. Laser Point Initiative Assessment:** L. Susan Williams, Associate Professor of Sociology at Kansas State University provided to the Law Board a presentation entitled “Making Gloves that Fit: Micro Hot Spot Initiatives in a Non-urban Police Agency.”

In the report Williams explains that the Riley County Police Department has engaged in evidence-based policing strategies for several years. In early 2010, RCPD implemented Operation Impact, an initiative to reduce crime in Riley County by targeting certain areas susceptible to high crime rates. The university research team of Williams and Kurtz (2011) assessed a segment of Operation Impact with regard to three categories of burglary: residential, commercial, and automotive. Four zones were selected for concentrated crime reduction and prevention efforts by patrol officers, while two additional high crime areas were held as control groups. Data from 2005 to 2010 were incorporated to establish baseline and trends over time, with attention to patterns identified within the targeted impact zones and control areas.

Results revealed a statistically significant reduction in total burglaries from 2009 to 2010 within each of the four impact zones. Burglary went down in the targeted impact zones as compared to control areas, despite significant population growth, economic instability, and shifting mobility. Since 2010, burglary rates have continued to decline. These results strongly support the effectiveness of hot spot policing with respect to burglaries in Manhattan.

The project most recently under study was referred to as Initiative: Laser Point (ILP), reflecting the idea of increasing precision in identifying and implementing policing strategies in the “right place at the right time.” While several proactive initiatives have been implemented by RCPD, this particular project was designed to ask whether micro hot spot policing will further reduce crime in Manhattan.

The study focused on two primary research questions:

- Do 15-minute treatments of increased patrol in identified micro-hot spots in a non-urban area (specifically, Manhattan, Kansas) lead to a decrease in calls for service, Part I crimes, and Part II crimes?
- Do 15-minute treatment areas differ in effective crime control depending on visibility only of officers, or visibility plus officer-initiated actions?

Officers visiting the control group were instructed to park their patrol car in the most visible spot in the area, remaining there for 15 minutes, not engaging in any proactivity unless necessary in the line of duty. The officer was instructed to clear the area once the 15 minutes had expired, moving to the next area.

Officers visiting the treatment areas were instructed to park their patrol car in the most visible spot in the area, get out of the car, and proceed with several activities during the 15-minute treatment period. Activities included public contacts and/or engagement with code, parking, noise, or alcohol-related violations.

The results of the analysis demonstrates that micro hot spot policing, using the 15-minute treatment period resulted in a decrease in calls for service and Part I and Part II crimes. Results further suggest specific officer behavior does not exert significant differences in crime incidents. These two findings combined, one can conclude that a visible presence, specifically the 15-minute dosage, is associated with an average decrease in crime incidents.

Williams concluded that the future of hot spot policing looks promising. In her report Williams states that as procedures are adjusted, and as research bears out what works and what does not, policies and practices can become more finely tuned. As demonstrated by this study by a police/university team, evidence-based policing such as hot-spot strategies may address containment, proactivity, and cost-efficient policing practices, while fostering community connections.

Matta thanked Williams for her thorough analysis.

**I. Review of Non-Sworn Disciplinary Actions:** Assistant Director Doehling explained that in the interest of equal treatment for non-sworn personnel, it is the recommendation of the Department that policy be modified to require the Director to report any suspension or dismissal of any employee, sworn or non-sworn, to the Law Board. The language indicating that the Board will, as soon as possible, fully hear and determine the matter and either affirm or revoke the action will

remain and likewise be applicable to all employees. This modification will bring applicable policy concerning non-sworn personnel in line with the current applicable policy concerning sworn personnel. Upon approval of the recommendation, the policy will be modified and submitted to the Board for final approval.

The Board had no objections to the proposed policy change.

**J. Red Light Cameras:** The Riley County Police Department was asked to consider the issue of red light cameras in Manhattan. Captain Hegarty stated that the first question to consider is whether Manhattan has a problem with motorists running red lights. Based on the data available, red light violations are not a significant contributor to motor vehicle accidents. The top three causes of motor vehicle accidents in Manhattan are following too closely, inattentive driving, and failure to yield.

The second question to consider is whether or not red light cameras reduce the number of accidents at intersections. Hegarty noted that research results are inconclusive. Assuming that there was a problem in Manhattan with accidents resulting from red light violations, recommendations from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) advises against red light cameras as the preliminary or primary solution. The FHWA states that to be successful in combating the problem, a holistic approach should be taken. To focus on one aspect is not a good approach and will likely fail... looking at 'engineering' countermeasures should be a step taken before increased enforcement.

Based on available data and research, the Department does not recommend installation of red light cameras at intersections within the city limits of Manhattan. Without a compelling need, such a system might be perceived by the public as a source of revenue. If the Law Board desires further exploration of this topic, the Department will need to engage City staff. The appropriate course of action would be for the Law Board to consider a request to the City Commission enlisting the assistance of Public Works and the City Attorney in working with the RCPD to determine if there is a problem with intersection related accidents, and then to analyze appropriate solutions.

Butler clarified that his original recommendation was to explore the possibility of installing automated traffic enforcement systems in an effort to reduce traffic accidents and improve public safety. Conversations between RCPD and the Law Board have focused specifically on the installation of red light cameras. Butler said that his original recommendation was much broader than that.

Butler went on to explain that the RCPD budget is driven largely by personnel costs. Each year there is a need for additional police officers. In an effort to reduce that need and reallocate resources, he suggested the Department research automated traffic enforcement systems such as intelligent traffic control systems on lights, message boards, and fixed and mobile speed enforcement units. The Department could experiment with a couple of these systems, collect data, and determine if they have a positive impact on traffic accidents and public safety.

After considerable discussion the consensus was that the Board did not wish to entertain red light cameras as an option for Manhattan and Riley County. However, the Board members will discuss the matter with their respective governing bodies. The topic will be readdressed at a future Law Board Meeting at which time RCPD staff will provide information on the various systems that are available as well as associated costs.

**K. Executive Session:** At 1:50 p.m. Jankovich moved to go into executive session for the purpose of discussing attorney client privilege and non-elected personnel matters not to exceed 20 minutes. Lewis seconded the motion. On a roll call vote, motion carried 7-0.

At 2:10 p.m. the open meeting reconvened.

**L. Affirmation or Revocation of Discipline:** Wilkerson moved to affirm the Director's disciplinary actions. Jankovich seconded the motion. On a roll call vote, motion carried 7-0.

**M. Adjournment:** The July 15, 2013 Law Board Meeting adjourned at 2:10 p.m.