

Approved: 2-25-97
Date

MINUTES OF THE SENATE ELECTIONS AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Janice Hardenburger at 1:40 p.m. on February 19, 1997 in Room 529-S of the Capitol.

All members were present.

Committee staff present: Dennis Hodgins, Legislative Research Department
Mike Heim, Legislative Research Department
Theresa Kiernan, Revisor of Statutes
Bonnie Fritts, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee: Mike Harris, State Senator, District 27
Carla Stovall, Attorney General of Kansas
Jim Denney, Director of Public Safety, University of Kansas
Mike Hall, Chief of Police, Pittsburg Police Department
Judith Siminoe, General Counsel, Kansas Board of Regents
Dave Yearout, Planning Director, Butler County
Marvin Krout, Planning Director, Sedgwick County

Others attending: See attached list

Chairperson Hardenburger opened the hearings on **SB 256**.

SB 256 **Concerning law enforcement; relating to university police officers; jurisdiction**

Senator Mike Harris explained the bill. He stated this bill is part of a package that a task force, led by General Stovall, put together with the goal of keeping our children safe on campuses.

Attorney General Carla Stovall testified in support of the bill (Attachment 1). She stated this is one of three bills in a package designed by the Task Force on Campus Awareness Makes for Protection and Ultimate Safety (C.A.M.P.U.S.). She said the task force was comprised of people from all walks of life who would have impact on college campuses and bring awareness of campus safety issues to the forefront. The task force held a series of meetings to share ideas and concerns which resulted in specific recommendations. She submitted a copy of the task force report (Attachment 2). University police officers and municipal law enforcement officers brought to the task force their concerns regarding the difficulty for university police responding to students and faculty when the property on which the offense occurred was not university property. This bill expands the jurisdiction of the police officers when there is an agreement between the governing body of the city or county and the chief executive officer of the university. She asked the committee for favorable consideration of the bill.

Jim Denney, Director of Public Safety, K.U., appeared before the committee in support of the bill. He testified that the bill leaves in place existing jurisdictional boundaries of campus police but adds a component where authority may be expanded depending on local needs and agreement between the university and the city. He submitted several reports of incidents that support these changes (Attachment 3). He testified that this measure would allow each city and university to determine the appropriate scope of law enforcement authority and jurisdiction beyond the existing statute needed for the campus police in their community. He urged the committee to pass this bill.

Mike Hall, Pittsburg Chief of Police, testified in support of the bill. He stated he works very closely with the Director of University Police at Pittsburg State University, and that it is critical for police agencies to work together today as no one has the resources to respond in the fashion they would like. He sees this bill as a natural extension of their ability to work together. Chief Hall testified that many times in a small community there are only three or four officers on the street at one time, and by policy, if there is a domestic call or an alarm at a bank, they send two officers which makes response time very slow in other areas. He stated overlapping jurisdiction would be best for his community.

Judith Siminoe, Associate General Counsel for Board of Regents, appeared before the committee in support of the bill.

There were no proponents to the bill. Chairperson Hardenburger closed the hearings on **SB 256**.

Senator Becker made a motion to pass the bill. Senator Lawrence seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Chairperson Hardenburger opened the hearings on **SB 232**.

SB 232 **Concerning cities and counties; relating to planning and zoning; relating to the powers and duties of the planning commission**

Staff gave an overview of the bill.

Dave Yearout, Butler County Planning Director and President of the Kansas Association of County Planning and zoning Officials, appeared before the committee and recommended amendments to the bill (Attachment 4). He testified these amendments provide greater flexibility in how local governments provide for planning and zoning matters for their jurisdiction.

Marvin Krout, Sedgwick County Planning Director, testified in support of the bill and submitted the testimony of Terry Boswell, Development Assistance Director (Attachment 5). This testimony outlines the mission statement adopted in 1995, by the City of Wichita Development Assistant Center for the purpose of streamlining the City's development processes and improving customer service.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for February 20, 1997.

SENATE ELECTIONS AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT
COMMITTEE COMMITTEE GUEST LIST

DATE: 2/19/97

NAME	REPRESENTING
Stan Rogers	Sheridan Co.
Norman Thierer	Sheridan Co
Mike Hall	Pittsburg Police Dept.
Van Affalter	Lawrence Police Dept.
JIM DENNEY	UNIV. OF KS Dept of Public Safety
Darrell W. Masomer	Pitt State Union Police
Marvin Pmoris	Ks Board of Regents
Ronnie Guie	KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Sony Pettifohn	Washington University
David Yacost	BUTLER COUNTY
Judith Penned Sumner	Regents
Donna Albert	Pott County Treasurer
Doug FARMER	DOB
Becky Swanwick	League of KS Municipalities
Julene Miller	AG
Nancy Lundberg	AG
TERRY BOSWELL	City of Wichita, KS
Marvin Krout	Wichita-Sedgwick Co. Planning Dept
Ernie Hester	City of Topeka

SENATE ELECTIONS AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT
COMMITTEE COMMITTEE GUEST LIST

DATE: 2/19/1997

NAME	REPRESENTING
Julienne Mackin	AG office
Kelly Feigh	AG
Gregory Schmidt	S.O.S.
Dore Schmidt	Speak Out for Stephen Young
Anne Spiess	Peterson Public Affairs Group



State of Kansas

Office of the Attorney General

301 S.W. 10TH AVENUE, TOPEKA 66612-1597

CARLA J. STOVALL
ATTORNEY GENERAL

MAIN PHONE: (913) 296-2215
FAX: 296-6296
TTY: 291-3767

SENATE COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT
ATTORNEY GENERAL CARLA J. STOVALL'S
TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF
SENATE BILL NO. 256
February 19, 1997

Madame Chairwoman, members of the committee, thank you for this opportunity to testify in support of this bill.

Senate Bill No. 256 is a product of my C.A.M.P.U.S. Task Force. As you may know, I created the C.A.M.P.U.S. Task Force, composed of public and private university and community college administrators, university and municipal police officers, students, parents of students, and various individuals involved in student assistance services and the criminal justice system, in order to bring awareness of campus safety issues to the forefront. The Task Force accomplished this with a series of meetings to share ideas and concerns. Those meetings resulted in specific recommendations, one of which is the amendment before you.

University police officers and municipal law enforcement officers brought to the Task Force their concern regarding the difficulty for university police responding to students and faculty when the property on which the offense occurred was not university property. Currently, the municipal law enforcement agency must request assistance on a case-by-case basis for the university police to have jurisdiction on non-university property with limited exceptions. Often this significantly slows response time or places university police in the position of needing to respond without proper authority having been granted. The Task Force agreed that this was an untenable arrangement and so recommends Senate Bill No. 256. The bill does not automatically confer jurisdiction on university police officers, but would allow municipal law enforcement entities to enter agreements with university police departments providing for extended jurisdiction. Such agreements would require the approval of the governing body of the city or county involved and the chief executive officer of the university involved.

I appreciate your support of this bill. Thank you.

SENATE ELECTIONS & LOCAL GOVERNMENT
2-19-97
ATTACHMENT 1

REPORT OF
KANSAS ATTORNEY GENERAL
CARLA J. STOVALL

TASK FORCE

ON

*CAMPUS AWARENESS MAKES FOR
PROTECTION AND ULTIMATE SAFETY
(C.A.M.P.U.S.)*

1997

SENATE ELECTIONS + LOCAL GOVERNMENT
2-19-97
ATTACHMENT 2

INTRODUCTION

In order to find ways to ensure that college campuses in Kansas are as safe as they can be, Attorney General Carla Stovall created the C.A.M.P.U.S. (Campus Awareness Makes for Protection and Ultimate Safety) Task Force. Attorney General Stovall's stated objective was to explore efforts which are currently being implemented on college campuses across our state to address the concern of student safety and to discuss where such efforts can be improved. The Task Force had its organizational meeting in Topeka, Kansas, on May 21, 1996. Four additional meetings were held at college campuses in Wichita, Emporia, Manhattan and Hays.

Representatives of the Regents institutions, private colleges, community colleges, as well as students and parents, shared what schools have done to provide safer campuses. Safety enhancements such as increased lighting on campus grounds, escort services, blue phones, magnetic ID entry cards for campus residential halls, security cameras and landscaping changes to provide safer paths for students have already been implemented on many campuses. Besides structural features, all campuses provide educational programs on safety, rape awareness and alcohol and drug awareness. Twenty-four hour assistance numbers and other crime prevention programs have also been developed. Additionally, campus police and security departments provide bike patrols, peer officer patrol in residential halls, 24-hour assistance, crime prevention programs, and building checks, etc.

The Task Force discussed current federal law with respect to campus crime reporting. The Federal Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act of 1990 and the Student Right-to-Know Act were passed by Congress to provide access to campus crime information. The federal law requires statistical reporting of campus crime and campus security policies. Each institution is required to prepare, publish and distribute the statistical information through appropriate publications or mailings to all current students and employees.

The Task Force acknowledges the value of statistical crime data and believes that students and parents should have access to community and campus crime information. While certainly not the exclusive remedy, the Task Force also believes that continuing educational efforts are essential in the area of crime prevention. The Task Force realizes the importance of support programs for crime victims and encourages the establishment of such programs on college campuses throughout Kansas.

Members focused their attention on and proposed various ideas to assist colleges and universities in making their campuses safer. During the final two meetings, the following recommendations were voted on and adopted by the Task Force members:

Recommendation 1:

Authorizing expansion of Regent university police and Washburn University Police jurisdiction, amending K.S.A. 76-726 and K.S.A. 22-2401A.

Regent university police expressed the concern that in certain instances, university law enforcement officers do not have authority to respond to requests for assistance from students, faculty, or university staff in surrounding areas off campus. The Task Force supported an idea presented by Darrell Masoner, Director of the Pittsburg State University Police Department and President of the Kansas Board of Regents Directors of Police, and Jim Denney, Director of the University of Kansas Police Department, that would allow expanded jurisdiction of university police departments when approved by the president of the university, the city or county commissioners, and the chief or sheriff of the local law enforcement agency.

On October 18, 1996, the Kansas Board of Regents gave its unanimous support to the initiative. The Task Force and the Attorney General applaud the Kansas Board of Regents for its favorable vote.

Draft Legislative Proposal amending K.S.A.s 76-726 and 22-2401a:

Section 1. K.S.A. 76-726 is hereby amended to read as follows:

(a) The chief executive officer of any state educational institution may employ university police officers to aid and supplement state and local law enforcement agencies. Such university police officers shall have the power and authority of law enforcement officers on: (1) Property owned or operated by the state educational institution, by a board of trustees of the state educational institution, an endowment association, an athletic association, a fraternity, sorority or other student group associated with the state educational institution; ~~and~~ (2) on the streets, property and highways immediately adjacent to the campus of the state educational institution; *and* (3) *within the city where such property is located, as necessary to protect the health, safety and welfare of students and faculty of the university, with appropriate agreement by local law enforcement agencies. Such agreements shall include provisions defining the geographical scope of the jurisdiction conferred, the circumstances requiring the extended jurisdiction, the scope of the law enforcement powers and the duration of the agreement. Any agreement entered into pursuant to this provision must be approved by the governing body of the city and/or county and chief executive officer of the state educational institution involved before it may take effect. Additionally, when there is reason to believe that a violation of a state law, a county resolution, or a city ordinance has occurred on property described in provisions (1) or (2), such officers, with appropriate notification of, and coordination with, local law enforcement agencies, may investigate and arrest persons for such a violation anywhere within the city where such property, streets and highways are located. University police officers ~~at the university of Kansas medical center~~ shall also have authority to transport persons in custody to an appropriate facility, wherever it may be located. ~~and to make~~ University police officers at the university of Kansas medical center may provide emergency transportation of medical supplies and transplant organs.*

(b) In addition to enforcement of state law, county resolutions and city ordinances, university police officers shall enforce rules and regulations of the board of trustees and rules and policies of the state educational institution, whether or not violation thereof constitutes a criminal offense. Every university police officer shall, while on duty, wear and publicly display a badge of office, except that no such badge shall be required to be worn by any plainclothes investigator or departmental administrator, but any such person shall present proper credentials and identification when required in the performance of such officer's duties. In performance of any of the powers, duties and functions authorized by this act or any other law, university police officers shall have the same rights, protections and immunities afforded to other law enforcement officers.

Draft Legislative Proposal amending K.S.A. 22-2401a:

Section 1. K.S.A. 1996 Supp. 22-2401a is hereby amended to read as follows:

(1) Law enforcement officers employed by consolidated county law enforcement agencies or departments and sheriffs and their deputies may exercise their powers as law enforcement officers:

(a) Anywhere within their county; and

(b) in any other place when a request for assistance has been made by law enforcement officers from that place or when in fresh pursuit of a person.

(2) Law enforcement officers employed by any city may exercise their powers as law enforcement officers:

(a) Anywhere within the city limits of the city employing them and outside of such city when on property owned or under the control of such city; and

(b) in any other place when a request for assistance has been made by law enforcement officers from that place or when in fresh pursuit of a person.

(3) University police officers employed by the chief executive officer of any state educational institution or municipal university may exercise their powers as university police officers anywhere on:

(a) Property owned or operated by the state educational institution or municipal university, by a board of trustees of the state educational institution, an endowment association, an athletic association, a fraternity, sorority or other student group associated with the state educational institution or municipal university; ~~and~~

(b) The streets, property and highways immediately adjacent to the campus of the state educational institution or municipal university; and

(c) *Within the city where such property is located, as necessary to protect the health, safety and welfare of students and faculty of the university, with appropriate agreement by local law enforcement agencies. Such agreements shall include provisions defining the geographical scope of the jurisdiction conferred, the circumstances requiring the extended jurisdiction, the scope of the law enforcement powers and the duration of the agreement. Any agreement entered into pursuant to this provision must be approved by the governing body of the city and/or county and chief executive officer of the state educational institution or municipal university involved before it may take effect. Additionally, when there is reason to believe that a violation of a state law, a county resolution, or a city ordinance has occurred on property described in provisions (a) or (b), ~~this~~*

~~subsection,~~] such officers with appropriate notification of, and coordination with, local law enforcement agencies or departments, may investigate and arrest persons for such a violation anywhere within the city where such property, streets and highways are located. Such officers also may exercise such powers in any other place when in fresh pursuit of a person. University police officers [~~at the university of Kansas medical center~~] shall also have authority to transport persons in custody to an appropriate facility, wherever it may be located and ~~[to make]~~ *may provide* emergency transportation of medical supplies and transplant organs.

(4) In addition to the areas where law enforcement officers may exercise their powers pursuant to subsection (2), law enforcement officers of any jurisdiction within Johnson or Sedgwick county may exercise their powers as law enforcement officers in any area within the respective county when executing a valid arrest warrant or search warrant, to the extent necessary to execute such warrants.

(5) In addition to the areas where university police officers may exercise their powers pursuant to subsection (3), university police officers may exercise the powers of law enforcement officers in any area outside their normal jurisdiction when a request for assistance has been made by law enforcement officers from the area for which assistance is requested.

(6) As used in this section:

(a) "Law enforcement officer" has the meaning ascribed thereto in K.S.A. 22-2202 and amendments thereto.

(b) "University police officers" means university police officers employed by the chief executive officer of: (1) any state educational institution under the control and supervision of the state board of regents; or (2) a municipal university.

(c) "Fresh pursuit" means pursuit, without unnecessary delay, of a person who has committed a crime, or who is reasonably suspected of having committed a crime.

Recommendation 2:

The Task Force discussed the changes made during the 1996 Kansas Legislature session that makes possession of a fictitious identification card (ID) a felony offense. Currently it is a felony to possess a fictitious ID but only a misdemeanor if a fictitious ID is used to purchase liquor. The Task Force suggests that the penalties for these laws be consistent.

The Task Force recommends graduated penalties for second and subsequent offenses of possession of a fictitious ID card. In addition to criminal penalties, community service is also highly recommended.

The Task Force also recommends that businesses that sell alcohol and cereal malt beverages to an individual who possesses a fictitious ID or who is underage should be subjected to stronger penalties than the law currently provides. Penalties should be graduated for subsequent convictions.

Draft Legislative Proposals amending K.S.A. 1996 Supp. 8-260, K.S.A. 21-3610 and K.S.A. 21-3610a:

Section 1. K.S.A. 1996 Supp. 8-260 is hereby amended to read as follows: 8-260. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person, for any purpose, to:

(1) Display or cause or permit to be displayed ~~or have in possession~~ any canceled, revoked, suspended, fictitious or fraudulently altered driver's license *with intent to defraud or induce official action.*

(2) Lend any driver's license to any other person or knowingly permit the use thereof by another.

(3) Display or represent as the person's own, any driver's license not issued to the person.

(4) Fail or refuse to surrender to the division upon its lawful demand any driver's license which has been suspended, revoked, or canceled.

(5) Use a false or fictitious name in any application for a driver's license, or any renewal or replacement thereof, or knowingly conceal a material fact, or otherwise commit a fraud in any such application.

(6) Permit any unlawful use of a driver's license issued to the person.

(7) Photograph, photostat, duplicate or in any way reproduce any driver's license or facsimile thereof in such a manner that it could be mistaken for a valid driver's license or display or have in possession any such photograph, photostat, duplicate, reproduction or facsimile unless authorized by law.

(8) Display or possess any photograph, photostat, duplicate or facsimile of a driver's license unless authorized by law.

(9) *Display or possess any canceled, revoked, suspended, fictitious or fraudulently altered driver's license.*

(a) Violation of paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (6), (7), ~~or~~ (8) or (9) of subsection (a) is a class A misdemeanor. Violation of paragraphs (1) or (5) of subsection (a) is a severity level 9, nonperson felony.

(c) It shall be unlawful for any person to:

(1) Lend any driver's license to or knowingly permit the use of any driver's license by any person under 21 years of age for use in the purchase of any alcoholic liquor.

(2) Lend any driver's license to or knowingly permit the use of any driver's license by a person under the legal age for consumption of cereal malt beverage for use in the purchase of any cereal malt beverage.

(3) Lend any driver's license, nondriver's identification card or other form of identification to aid another person in wrongfully obtaining a driver's license or replacement driver's license.

(4) Display or cause to be displayed or have in possession any fictitious or fraudulently altered driver's license by any person under 21 years of age for use in the purchase of any alcoholic liquor or cereal malt beverage.

(d) *Upon first conviction of a ~~V~~ violation of any provision of subsection (c), a person shall be guilty of a class B, nonperson misdemeanor and sentenced to not less than 100 hours of public service, and fined not less than \$200 nor more than \$500. On a second or subsequent conviction of a violation of any provision of subsection (c), a person shall be guilty of a class A nonperson misdemeanor.*

(e) The provisions of this section shall apply to any driver's license, nondriver's identification card or other form of identification whether issued under the laws of this state or issued under the laws of another state or jurisdiction.

Sec. 2. K.S.A. 21-3610 is hereby amended to read as follows: 21-3610. (a) Furnishing alcoholic liquor to a minor is directly or indirectly, selling to, buying for, giving or furnishing any alcoholic liquor to any minor.

(b) *Upon a first conviction of ~~F~~ furnishing alcoholic liquor to a minor is a person shall be guilty of a class B person misdemeanor for which the minimum fine is ~~\$200~~ \$500. On a second or subsequent conviction of furnishing alcoholic liquor to a minor, a person shall be guilty of a class A person misdemeanor for which the minimum fine is \$1,000.*

(c) As used in this section, terms have the meanings provided by K.S.A. 41-102 and amendments thereto.

(d) It shall be a defense to a prosecution under this section if: (1) The defendant is a licensed retailer, club, drinking establishment or caterer or holds a temporary permit, or an employee thereof; (2) the defendant sold the alcoholic liquor to the minor with reasonable cause to believe that the minor was 21 or more years of age; and (3) to purchase the alcoholic liquor, the minor exhibited to the defendant a driver's license, Kansas nondriver's identification card or other official or apparently official document, containing a photograph of the minor and purporting to establish that such minor was 21 or more years of age.

Sec. 3. K.S.A. 21-3610a is hereby amended to read as follows: 21-3610a. (a) Furnishing cereal malt beverage to a minor is buying for or selling, giving or furnishing, whether directly or indirectly, any cereal malt beverage to any person under the legal age for consumption of cereal malt beverage.

(b) *Upon a first conviction of furnishing cereal malt beverage to a minor, a person shall be guilty of a class B person misdemeanor for which the minimum fine is \$200 \$500. On a second or subsequent conviction of furnishing cereal malt beverage to a minor, a person shall be guilty of a class A person misdemeanor for which the minimum fine is \$1,000.*

(c) This section shall not apply to the furnishing of cereal malt beverage by a parent or legal guardian to such parent's child or such guardian's ward.

(d) It shall be a defense to a prosecution under this section if: (1) the defendant is a licensed retailer, or an employee thereof; (2) the defendant sold the cereal malt beverage to the person with reasonable cause to believe that such person was of legal age for consumption of cereal malt beverage; and (3) to purchase the cereal malt beverage, the person exhibited to the defendant a driver's license, Kansas nondriver's identification card or other official or apparently official document containing a photograph of the minor and purporting to establish that such person was of legal age for consumption of cereal malt beverage.

(e) As used in this section, "cereal malt beverage," "retailer" and "legal age for consumption of cereal malt beverage" have the meanings provided by K.S.A. 41-2701 and amendments thereto.

(f) This section shall be part of and supplemental to the Kansas criminal code.

Sec.4. K.S.A. 1996 Supp. 41-2615...

Recommendation 3:

Most members of the Task Force believe that for those who have been convicted of felonies, further formal education may be one factor necessary for rehabilitation. All colleges and universities endeavor to provide a safe and healthful learning environment for their students. Nevertheless, it was recognized that colleges and universities do not have access to an individual's criminal record or to his/her record in regard to any mental health treatment, alcohol /drug counseling and sex offender counseling. Faculty and advisors on campuses cannot determine whether those convicted of crimes have been rehabilitated since this information is not available to them.

The Task Force recommends that the Department of Corrections and Court Services Officers develop a procedure to closely review a parolee's or probationer's ability to achieve at the college level. A compelling factor in the review should be that of public safety. The safety of the public should be considered before directing any parolee or probationer to further his or her educational opportunities. If the public safety so demands, the probationer and parolee should also be restricted from residing near a college or university during the term of his or her supervision.

It should not be presumed that an individual who has committed a violent offense should be allowed to attend educational institutions immediately upon commencing the period of supervision.

Draft Legislative Proposals amending K.S.A. 1996 Supp. 22-3717, Sec. 1., and K.S.A. 21-4610, Sec. 2:

Section 1. K.S.A. 1996 Supp. 22-3717 is hereby amended to read as follows: 22-3717.

...

(i) In those cases involving inmates sentenced for a crime committed after July 1, 1993, the parole board will review the inmates proposed release plan. The board may schedule a hearing if they desire. The board may impose any condition they deem necessary to insure public safety, aid in the reintegration of the inmate into the community, or items not completed under the agreement entered into under K.S.A. 75-5210a and amendments thereto. *In determining the conditions of parole, the board shall specifically consider whether the inmate should be able to attend secondary or post secondary educational institutions immediately upon commencing the period of supervision, or whether, in view of the crime or crimes the inmate was convicted of, the public safety demands that the inmate be restricted as one of the conditions of release from attending or residing near such an institution during the term of postrelease supervision.* The board may not advance or delay a inmate's release date. Every inmate while on postrelease supervision shall remain in the legal custody of the secretary of corrections and is subject to the orders of the secretary.

...

(n) Whenever the Kansas parole board orders the parole of an inmate or establishes conditions for an inmate placed on postrelease supervision, the board:

...

(2) *subject to the provisions of subsection (i) and to the extent practicable, shall order as a condition of parole or postrelease supervision that the parolee or the person on postrelease supervision make progress towards or successfully complete the equivalent of a secondary education if the inmate has not previously completed such educational equivalent and is capable of doing so; and*

...

Sec. 2. K.S.A. 21-4610 is hereby amended to read as follows: 21-4610.

...

(b) The court services officer or community correctional services officer may recommend, and the court may order, the imposition of any conditions of probation, suspension or sentence or assignment to a community correctional services program...

(c) The court may impose any conditions of probation, suspension of sentence or assignment to a community correctional services program that the court deems proper, including but not limited to requiring that the defendant:

...

(e) In determining the conditions of probation, suspension of sentence or assignment to a community correctional services program, the court shall specifically consider whether the defendant should be able to attend secondary or post secondary educational institutions immediately upon commencing the period of probation, suspension of sentence or assignment to community corrections fixed by the court, or whether, in view of the crime or crimes the defendant was convicted of, the public safety demands that the defendant be restricted as one of the conditions of probation, suspension of sentence or assignment to a community correctional services program from attending or residing near such an institution during the period of probation, suspension of sentence or assignment to a community correctional services program.

Recommendation 4:

The Task Force strongly recommends that the Kansas Sex Offender Registration Act be broadened to include persons convicted of murder in addition to the crimes for which registration is now required: rape; indecent liberties; aggravated indecent liberties; criminal sodomy; aggravated criminal sodomy; indecent solicitation of a child; aggravated indecent solicitation of a child; sexual exploitation of a child; and aggravated sexual battery.

Draft Legislative Proposals amending KSA 22-4901 et seq.

Section 1. K.S.A. 22-4901 is hereby amended to read as follows: 22-4901 through 22-4910, and amendments thereto, shall be known and may be cited as the *Kansas Offender Registration Act*.

Section 2. K.S.A. 22-4902 is hereby amended to read as follows: 22-4902. As used in this act, unless the context otherwise requires:

(a) "Offender" means a sex offender as defined in subsection (b), *or a violent offender as defined in subsection (d)*.

(b) "Sex Offender" includes any person who, after the effective date of this act, is convicted of any sexually violent crime set forth in subsection (c). Upon such conviction, the court shall certify that the person is a sex offender and shall include this certification in the order of commitment. Convictions which result from or are connected with the same act, or result from crimes committed at the same time, shall be counted for the purpose of this section as one conviction. Any conviction set aside pursuant to law is not a conviction for purposes of this section. A conviction from another state shall constitute a conviction for purposes of this section.

(c) "Sexually violent crime" means:

- (1) Rape as defined in K.S.A. 21-3502 and amendments thereto;
- (2) indecent liberties with a child as defined in K.S.A. 21-3503 and amendments thereto;
- (3) aggravated indecent liberties as defined in K.S.A. 21-3504 and amendments thereto;

(4) criminal sodomy as defined in subsection (a) (2) and (a) (3) of K.S.A. 21-3505 and amendments thereto;

(5) aggravated criminal sodomy as defined in K.S.A. 21-3506 and amendments thereto;

(6) indecent solicitation of a child as defined by in K.S.A. 21-3510 and amendments thereto;

(7) aggravated indecent solicitation of a child as defined by in K.S.A. 21-3511 and amendments thereto;

(8) sexual exploitation of a child as defined by in K.S.A. 21-3516 and amendments thereto;

(9) aggravated sexual battery as defined by in K.S.A. 21-3518 and amendments thereto;

or

(10) any conviction for a felony offense in effect any time prior to the effective date of this act, that is comparable to a sexually violent crime as defined in subparagraphs (1) through (10), or any federal or other state conviction for a felony offense that under the laws of this state would be a sexually violent crime as defined in this section;

(11) an attempt, conspiracy of criminal solicitation, as defined in K.S.A. 21-3301a, 21-3302a or 21-3303a, and amendments thereto, of a sexually violent crime, as defined in this section; or

(12) any act which at the time of sentencing for the offense has been determined beyond a reasonable doubt to have been sexually motivated. As used in this subparagraph, "sexually motivated" means that one of the purposes for which the defendant committed the crime was for the purpose of the defendant's sexual gratification.

(d) "Violent offender" includes any person who, after the effective of this act, is convicted of any of the following crimes:

(1) Capital murder as defined in K.S.A. 21-3439 and amendments thereto;

(2) Murder in the first degree as defined in K.S.A. 21-3401 and amendments thereto;

(3) Murder in the second degree as defined in K.S.A. 21-3402 and amendments thereto;

(4) Voluntary manslaughter as defined in K.S.A. 21-3403 and amendments thereto;

(5) Involuntary manslaughter as defined in K.S.A. 21-3404 and amendments thereto; or

(6) any conviction for an offense in effect at any time prior to the effective date of this act, that is comparable to any crime defined in this subsection, or any federal or other state conviction for an offense that under the laws of this state would be an offense defined in this subsection; or

(7) an attempt, conspiracy or criminal solicitation, as defined in K.S.A. 21-3301a, 21-3302a, or 21-3303a and upon such conviction, the court shall certify that the person is an offender subject to the provisions of K.S.A. 22-4901 et seq. And amendments thereto and shall include this certification in the order of commitment. Convictions which result from or are connected with the same act, or result from crimes committed at the same time, shall be counted for the purpose of this section as one conviction. Any conviction set aside pursuant to law is not a conviction for purposes of this section. A conviction from another state shall constitute a conviction for purposes of this section.

(e) "Law enforcement agency having jurisdiction" means the sheriff of the county in which the offender expects to reside upon the offender's discharge, parole or release.

Recommendation 5:

The Task Force enthusiastically supports the Department of Corrections' legislative initiatives to amend the Kansas Open Records Act to provide for the clarification and expansion of offender information which can be given to the public. This information would include:

- Offender identification information, including photograph, date of birth, height, weight, sex and race. Release of this information would serve to confirm identification of a specific individual while protecting other individuals who may have the same name as the offender.
- Supervisor information about offenders on parole or post-release supervision which is comparable to public information currently available for inmates, e.g. reasons for revocation, graduated sanctions imposed in lieu of revocation, level of supervision, community service obligations and conditions of release (except for substance abuse and/or sex offender treatment and/or mental health counseling).
- Release of addresses of offenders on parole or post-release supervision for offenders convicted after the effective date of this legislation.
- The Task Force also supports the Department of Corrections' efforts to provide offender information on the Internet and recommends that the information be easily accessible by county, crime or some other mechanism. Although not everyone has a computer, it was recognized that the information could still be accessible because most colleges and high schools allow students access to Internet services through educational programs. The general public can access the information through public libraries.

Recommendation 6:

Funding must be available to assist colleges in making safety enhancements on their campuses. Many schools have been given private dollars and have utilized student fees to pay for such improvements. The Task Force recommends that existing public-university and college partnerships, community support and student contributions, as well as state funds, should be available for colleges to improve campus safety.

Recommendation 7:

The Task Force supports stricter processes for obtaining professional licenses for persons with criminal histories. Funding is needed for the Kansas Bureau of Investigation (KBI) to enhance computer capabilities so that it can check the criminal background of those applying for professional licenses. The KBI, under the leadership of the Statewide Coordinating Council, is moving forward with a comprehensive long-term strategic plan to upgrade and improve computer hardware and software. The Task Force supports this goal.

The Task Force recommends that a clearinghouse be set up which would allow all licensing boards to have access to information which could include (but not be limited to) applicants who have previously applied for a professional license and been denied based upon their criminal record. The clearinghouse would also identify those persons who have had or currently have their professional licenses suspended or revoked.

Recommendation 8:

Information concerning offenders should be available to the public. To this end, the Task Force adopted a resolution that encourages the media to publish or report the release of all violent offenders from prison. The Task Force is unaware of any media organizations that publish or report those being released on parole except in high profile cases. The Task Force commends the Johnson County Sun, which is the only news publication of which Task Force members are aware, that reports registered sex offenders living in its community on a regular basis.

Recommendation 9:

Model "safety and prevention" educational programs have been developed in Kansas and other states for use on college campuses for students, faculty and staff members. The Task Force recommends that the Attorney General's Office serve as a resource center for successful model programs on safety. The Attorney General's staff would collect this information from national and state colleges and universities and make it available upon request.

Recommendation 10:

All colleges and universities should review their student residential housing security programs. Sororities and fraternities are also encouraged to review and compare their security measures. This review would include a comparison of security measures with other campuses. This should be done on a regular basis, at least yearly, to maintain quality and updated security measures.

These recommendations are not all inclusive nor should they be interpreted to mean that campuses will be safe if adopted. The Attorney General views these recommendations as a starting point in addressing the safety of college campuses in Kansas. Officials at each and every campus in Kansas should meet and review their safety policies and programs on a regular basis.

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Attorney General Carla Stovall, Chair

Kansas Board of Indigents' Defense Services: Roberta McVickers, Public Defender's Office,
Topeka

Kansas Board of Regents: Judith Siminoe, Topeka

Kansas Bureau of Investigation: Larry Welch, Director, Topeka

Kansas Department of Corrections: Charles Simmons, Secretary, Topeka

Law Enforcement:

Sandra Omtvedt, Officer, University of Kansas Police Department, Kansas City

John Cersovsky, Security, Colby Community College

Mike Hall, Chief of Police, Pittsburg Police Department

James Denney, Director, University Police, University of Kansas, Lawrence

Doug Fitch, Dean of Student Services, Seward County Community College, Liberal

Parents:

Kathy Johnston, Parsons

Gene and Peggy Schmidt, Leawood

Presidents/Directors (Community Colleges/AVTS):

Carol Fagan, Director, Johnson County Community College/AVTS, Overland Park

Jim Sweeney, Director, Salina AVTS

Betty Stevens, President, Highland Community College

Laura Meeks, President, Ft. Scott Community College

President (Municipal School): Hugh Thompson, President, Washburn University

Presidents (Private Educational Institution):

Sr. Tarcisia Roths, President, Kansas Newman College, Wichita

Mark Dresselhaus, Vice President, Finance and Administration, Kansas Newman College,
Wichita

Bob Martin, President, Haskell Indian Nations University, Lawrence

Presidents/Designees (Regents Institutions):

Robert Glennen, President, Emporia State University, Emporia
Harry Stephens, Vice President, Student Affairs, Emporia State University, Emporia
Edward Hammond, President, Ft. Hays State University, Hays
Mark Bannister, Executive Assistant to the President, Ft. Hays State University, Hays
Jon Wefald, President, Kansas State University, Manhattan
Susan Scott, Dean of Student Life Office, Kansas State University, Manhattan
John Darling, President, Pittsburg State University, Pittsburg
John Patterson, Vice President, Business and Fiscal Affairs, Pittsburg State University,
Pittsburg
Robert Hemenway, Chancellor, University of Kansas, Lawrence
David Ambler, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, University of Kansas, Lawrence
Eugene Hughes, President, Wichita State University, Wichita
Ted Ayres, General Counsel/Associate to the President, Wichita State University, Wichita

Prosecuting Attorney:

Mary Ann Slattery, Assistant District Attorney, Wyandotte County District Attorney's
Office, Kansas City

Student Assistance Services:

Judy Davis, Women's Resource Center, Kansas State University, Manhattan
Vicky Triponey, Associate Vice president for Campus Life, Wichita State University,
Wichita

Student Associations (Community Colleges/AVTS):

Lisa Miller, Dean of Students, Pratt Community College
Jennifer Rios, Student Council, Kansas City, Kansas, Community College

Student Associations (Municipal School):

Kimbra Caywood, Student Association, Washburn University, Topeka

Student Associations (Private Educational Institution):

K. J. Pitman, Student Council, Southwestern College, Winfield
Matt Watkins, Student Senate, Bethel College, Newton
Tammy Lowe, Student Senate, Haskell Indian Nations University, Lawrence

Student Associations (Regents Institutions):

Tracie Schuler, Student Body, Emporia State University, Emporia

Ethan Schmidt, Student Body, Emporia State University, Emporia
Kenzie Singleton, Student Government, Ft. Hays State University, Hays
Jason Oblander, Student Government, Kansas State University, Manhattan
Matt Burton, Student Government, Pittsburg State University, Pittsburg
Natalie Weiss, Student Senate, University of Kansas, Lawrence
Stephanie Harsin, Student Senate, University of Kansas, Lawrence
Jessica Greis, Student Government, Wichita State University, Wichita
Chris Hilgenfeld, Student Government, Wichita State University, Wichita
Chris Carraher, Student Government, Wichita State University, Wichita

Attorney General's Office Support Staff

Julene Miller, Deputy Attorney General, Legal Opinions/Government Counsel Division
Kelly Feyh, Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Litigation Division
Juliene Maska, Statewide Victims' Rights Coordinator

APPENDIX

FEDERAL CRIME AWARENESS AND CAMPUS SECURITY ACT OF 1990

KANSAS CAMPUS CRIME 1993-1994 REPORTED TO KANSAS BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

**FEDERAL CRIME AWARENESS AND
CAMPUS SECURITY ACT OF 1990
20 USCA § 1092**

Disclosure of campus security policy and campus crime statistics.

(1) Each eligible institution participating in any program under this subchapter and part C of subchapter I of chapter 34 of Title 42 shall on August 1, 1991, begin to collect the following information with respect to campus crime statistics and campus security policies of that institution, and beginning September 1, 1992, and each year thereafter, prepare, publish and distribute, through appropriate publications or mailings, to all current students and employees, and to any applicant for enrollment or employment upon request, an annual security report containing at least the following information with respect to the campus security policies and campus crime statistics of that institution:

(A) A statement of current campus policies regarding procedures and facilities for students and others to report criminal actions or other emergencies occurring on campus and policies concerning the institution's response to such reports.

(B) A statement of current policies concerning security and access to campus facilities, including campus residences, and security consideration used in the maintenance of campus facilities.

(C) A statement of current policies concerning campus law enforcement, including--

(i) the enforcement authority of security personnel, including their working relationship with State and local police agencies; and

(ii) policies which encourage accurate and prompt reporting of all crimes to the campus police and the appropriate police agencies.

(D) A description of the type and frequency of programs designed to inform students and employees about campus security procedures and practices and to encourage students and employees to be responsible for their own security and the security of others.

(E) A description of programs designed to inform students and employees about the prevention of crimes.

(F) Statistics concerning the occurrence on campus, during the most recent calendar year, and during the 2 preceding calendar years for which data are available, of the following criminal offenses reported to campus security authorities or local police agencies--

(i) murder;

(ii) sex offenses, forcible or nonforcible;

- (iii) robbery;
- (iv) aggravated assault;
- (v) burglary; and
- (vi) motor vehicle theft.

(G) A statement of policy concerning the monitoring and recording through local police agencies of criminal activity at off-campus student organizations which are recognized by the institution and that are engaged in by students attending the institution, including those student organizations with off-campus housing facilities.

(H) Statistics concerning the number of arrests for the following crimes occurring on campus:

- (i) liquor law violations;
- (ii) drug abuse violations; and
- (iii) weapons possessions.

(I) A statement of policy regarding the possession, use, and sale of alcoholic beverages and enforcement of State underage drinking laws and a statement of policy regarding the possession, use, and sale of illegal drugs and enforcement of Federal and State drug laws and a description of any drug or alcohol abuse education programs as required under section 1145g of this title.

(2) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to authorize the Secretary to require particular policies, procedures, or practices by institutions of higher education with respect to campus crimes or campus security.

(3) Each institution participating in any program under this subchapter and part C of subchapter I of chapter 34 of Title 42 shall make timely reports to the campus community on crimes considered to be a threat to other students and employees described in paragraph (1)(F) that are reported to campus security or local law police agencies. Such reports shall be provided to students and employees in a manner that is timely and that will aid in the prevention of similar occurrences.

(4) Upon the request of the Secretary, each institution participating in any program under this subchapter and part C of subchapter I of chapter 34 of Title 42 shall submit to the Secretary a copy of the statistics required to be made available under paragraphs (1)(F) and (1)(H). The Secretary shall--

(A) review such statistics and report to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate on campus crime statistics by September 1, 1995; and

(B) in coordination with representatives of institutions of higher education, identify exemplary campus security policies, procedures, and practices and disseminate information concerning those policies, procedures, and practices that have proven effective in the reduction of

campus crime.

(5)(A) For the purposes of this subsection, the term "campus" includes--

(i) any building or property owned or controlled by the institution of higher education within the same reasonably contiguous geographic area and used by the institution in direct support of, or related to its educational purposes; or

(ii) any building or property owned or controlled by student organizations recognized by the institution.

(B) In cases where branch campuses of an institution of higher education, schools within an institution of higher education, or administrative divisions within an institution are not within a reasonable contiguous geographic area, such entities shall be considered separate campuses for purposes of the reporting requirements of this section.

(6) The statistics described in paragraphs (1)(f) and (1)(H) shall be completed in accordance with the definitions used in the uniform crime reporting system of the Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the modifications in such definitions as implemented pursuant to the Hate Crime Statistics Act.

(7)(A) Each institution of higher education participating in any program under this subchapter and part C of subchapter I of chapter 34 of Title 42 shall develop and distribute as part of the report described in paragraph (1) a statement of policy regarding--

(i) such institution's campus sexual assault programs, which shall be aimed at prevention of sex offenses; and

(ii) the procedures followed once a sex offense has occurred.

(B) The policy described in subparagraph (A) shall address the following areas:

(i) Education programs to promote the awareness of rape, acquaintance rape, and other sex offenses.

(ii) Possible sanctions to be imposed following the final determination of an on-campus disciplinary procedure regarding rape, acquaintance rape, or other sex offenses, forcible or nonforcible.

(iii) procedures students should follow if a sex offense occurs, including who should be contacted, the importance of preserving evidence as may be necessary to the proof of criminal sexual assault, and to whom the alleged offense should be reported.

(iv) Procedures for on-campus disciplinary action in cases of alleged sexual assault, which shall include a clear statement that--

(I) the accuser and the accused are entitled to the same opportunities to have others present during a campus disciplinary proceeding; and

(II) both the accuser and the accused shall be informed of the outcome of any campus disciplinary proceeding brought alleging a sexual assault.

(v) Informing students of their options to notify proper law enforcement authorities, including on-campus and local police, and the option to be assisted by campus authorities in notifying such authorities, if the student so chooses.

(vi) Notification of students of existing counseling, mental health or student services for victims of sexual assault, both on campus and in the community.

(vii) Notification of students of options for, and available assistance in, changing academic and living situations after an alleged sexual assault incident, if so required by the victim and if such changes are reasonably available.

(C) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to confer a private right of action upon any person to enforce the provisions of this paragraph.



**KANSAS
CAMPUS
CRIME
93-94**



7-24

INTRODUCTION

On October 22, 1990, Congress passed the Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act. Considered a consumer rights statute, the Act requires colleges and universities to report graduation rates of all students as well as those of student athletes. In addition, the institutions must report certain campus crime statistics and campus security procedures.

In the spring of 1991, the Kansas Bureau of Investigation (KBI), formed a committee of law enforcement and other government personnel to act as advisors in the redesign of the Kansas Incident Based Reporting System (KIBRS). The major focus of the redesign was to incorporate the requirements of the National Incident Based Reporting System (NIBRS) into the state system. At the same time crime data specific to the needs and requirements of federal acts, state mandates, researchers, and various state and local agencies could also be incorporated into KIBRS. A representative from the State Board of Education was selected as a member of the committee in order to set standards for the collection of crime data from Kansas colleges, both private and state operated.

Because the seven state regents institutions had certified police departments, they had been active participants in the previous KIBRS and state Uniform Crime Reporting Program (UCR). As a result, these agencies had been reporting the offenses and arrest categories required under the act for many years. The issue was how to collect information from private colleges and community colleges that did not have a certified law enforcement agency on campus. In addition, it was noted that in some situations, at the regents institutions,

local law enforcement agencies might respond to a crime scene at a facility defined as campus under the Act instead of the campus police.

After a review of the Act and existing data collection methods, the committee made the recommendation to include a campus code field in the offense segment of the new KIBRS. A code was assigned to each educational facility required by federal mandate to submit data under the Act. Local law enforcement agencies if responding to an incident defined as occurring on a campus or while making an arrest on a campus would list the campus code for that facility in the appropriate field on the Kansas Standard Offense Report (KSOR) or the Kansas Standard Arrest/Juvenile Report (KSAJR).

The KIBRS Information and Collection Manual, provided to each law enforcement agency in the state, defines campus crime as: "... a criminal offense or arrest that occurs in, or on, any building or property owned or controlled by the educational institution; or, contiguous to or used in direct support or related to the institution's educational purposes. In addition, any offenses which occur in a building or on a property owned or controlled by student organizations recognized by the educational institution will be classified as "Campus Crime."

The data in this handout has been compiled based on the requirements of the Act to report the number of occurrences of murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary and motor vehicle theft that occurred on campus. Arrests for liquor law violations, drug abuse violations, and weapons possessions, as required by the Act, are also listed.

**KANSAS REGENTS INSTITUTIONS
CRIME INDEX OFFENSES REPORTED BY CAMPUS POLICE DEPARTMENTS*
1993**

INSTITUTION	1993** STUDENT POPULA- TION	MURDER NON-NEGL. MANS.	RAPE	ROBBERY	AGG. ASSAULT/ BATTERY	TOTAL VIOLENT CRIME OFFENSES	BURGLARY	THEFT	MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	TOTAL PROPERTY CRIME OFFENSES	TOTAL CRIME INDEX OFFENSES	RATE PER THOUSAND POPUL
PITTSBURG STATE	6,589	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	6	6	21	59	1	81	87	13.2
KANSAS UNIVERSITY	26,127	- 0 -	- 0 -	2	11	13	205	385	5	595	608	23.3
FT HAYS STATE	5,701	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	31	28	- 0 -	59	59	10.3
EMPORIA STATE	6,090	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	39	60	- 0 -	99	99	16.3
KANSAS STATE	20,775	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	5	5	169	208	- 0 -	377	382	19.1
WICHITA STATE	14,892	2***	- 0 -	- 0 -	2	4	49	137	- 0 -	186	190	12.7
K U MED CENTER	2,735	- 0 -	- 0 -	2	- 0 -	2	23	239	5	267	269	98.4
TOTAL	82,909	2***	- 0 -	4	24	30	537	1,116	11	1,664	1,694	20.4

* Crime Statistics from "CRIME IN KANSAS, 1993-1994", published by The Crime Data Information Center.

** Population figures from 'KANSAS STATISTICAL ABSTRACT 1993-1994'; "Enrollment In Kansas Colleges and Universities Fall 1993". Population figures are based only on student enrollment.

*** Because these murders occurred on WSU campus they were counted in their statistics. However, the victims were non- student persons attending city wide Fourth of July festivities on WSU campus.

**KANSAS REGENTS INSTITUTIONS
CRIME INDEX OFFENSES REPORTED BY CAMPUS POLICE DEPARTMENTS*
1994**

INSTITUTION	1994** STUDENT POPULA- TION	MURDER NON-NEGL. MANS.	RAPE	ROBBERY	AGG. ASSAULT/ BATTERY	TOTAL VIOLENT CRIME OFFENSES	BURGLARY	THEFT	MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	TOTAL PROPERTY CRIME OFFENSES	TOTAL CRIME INDEX OFFENSES	RATE PER THOUSAND POPULATION
PITTSBURG STATE	6,377	- 0 -	1	- 0 -	3	4	27	58	- 0 -	85	89	14.0
KANSAS UNIVERSITY	25,336	- 0 -	4	2	7	13	277	358	8	643	656	25.9
FT HAYS STATE	5,496	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	25	24	- 0 -	49	49	8.9
EMPORIA STATE	6,075	- 0 -	1	- 0 -	2	3	75	84	2	161	164	27.0
KANSAS STATE	20,669	- 0 -	2	- 0 -	2	4	177	217	1	395	399	19.3
WICHITA STATE	14,558	- 0 -	- 0 -	2	1	3	35	173	13	221	224	15.4
KU MED CENTER	2,710	- 0 -	- 0 -	1	7	8	14	229	11	254	262	96.7
TOTAL	81,216	- 0 -	8	5	22	35	630	1,143	35	1,808	1,843	22.6

* Crime Statistics from "CRIME IN KANSAS, 1993-1994", published by The Crime Data Information Center.

** Population figures from 'KANSAS STATISTICAL ABSTRACT 1993-1994'; "Enrollment In Kansas Colleges and Universities Fall 1994". Population figures are based only on student enrollment.

2-26

**KANSAS REGENTS INSTITUTIONS
CRIME INDEX OFFENSES REPORTED BY LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES*
1993**

INSTITUTION	1993** STUDENT POPULA- TION	MURDER NON-NEGL. MANS.	RAPE	ROBBERY	AGG. ASSAULT/ BATTERY	TOTAL VIOLENT CRIME OFFENSES	BURGLARY	THEFT	MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	TOTAL PROPERTY CRIME OFFENSES	TOTAL CRIME INDEX OFFENSES	RATE PER THOUS POPULA
PITTSBURG STATE	6,589	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	3	3	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	3	0.4
KANSAS UNIVERSITY	26,127	- 0 -	1	- 0 -	4	5	13	33	2	48	53	2.0
FT HAYS STATE	5,701	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	0.0
EMPORIA STATE	6,090	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	3	4	- 0 -	7	7	0.0
KANSAS STATE	20,775	- 0 -	1	- 0 -	3	4	5	4	- 0 -	9	13	0.6
WICHITA STATE***	14,892	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	0.0
K U MED CENTER	2,735	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	0.0
TOTAL	82,909	- 0 -	2	- 0 -	10	12	21	41	2	64	76	0.9

* Crime statistics from The Kansas Incident Based Reporting System (KIBRS).

** Population figures from 'KANSAS STATISTICAL ABSTRACT 1993-1994'; "Enrollment In Kansas Colleges and Universities Fall 1993". Population figures are based only on student enrollment.

*** Statistics not available from Wichita PD.

**KANSAS REGENTS INSTITUTIONS
CRIME INDEX OFFENSES REPORTED BY LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES*
1994**

INSTITUTION	1994** STUDENT POPULA- TION	MURDER NON-NEGL. MANS.	RAPE	ROBBERY	AGG. ASSAULT/ BATTERY	TOTAL VIOLENT CRIME OFFENSES	BURGLARY	THEFT	MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	TOTAL PROPERTY CRIME OFFENSES	TOTAL CRIME INDEX OFFENSES	RATE PER THOUSAND POPULATION
PITTSBURG STATE	6,377	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	1	- 0 -	- 0 -	1	1	0.1
KANSAS UNIVERSITY	25,336	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	40	24	3	67	67	2.6
FT HAYS STATE	5,496	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	0.0
EMPORIA STATE	6,075	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	0.0
KANSAS STATE	20,664	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	12	13	- 0 -	25	25	1.2
WICHITA STATE***	14,558	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	0.0
K U MED CENTER	2,710	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	0.0
TOTAL	80,096	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	53	37	3	93	93	1.1

* Crime statistics from The Kansas Incident Based Reporting System (KIBRS).

** Population figures from 'KANSAS STATISTICAL ABSTRACT 1993-1994'; "Enrollment In Kansas Colleges and Universities Fall 1994". Population figures are based only on student enrollment.

*** Statistics not available from Wichita PD.

2-27

**OTHER FOUR-YEAR KANSAS INSTITUTIONS
CRIME INDEX OFFENSES REPORTED BY LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES*
1993**

INSTITUTION	1993** STUDENT POPULA- TION	MURDER NON-NEGL.			AGG. ASSAULT/ BATTERY	TOTAL VIOLENT CRIME OFFENSES	BURGLARY	THEFT	MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	TOTAL PROPERTY CRIME OFFENSES	TOTAL CRIME INDEX OFFENSES	RATE PER THOUSAND POPULATION
		MANS.	RAPE	ROBBERY								
Baker University	1,851	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	5	4	-0-	9	9	4.9
Benedictine College	1,257	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	6	4	-0-	11	11	8.7
Bethany College	764	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	13	1	14	14	18.3
Bethel College	638	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	1	2	-0-	3	3	5.2
Kansas Wesleyan	732	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	1	1	-0-	2	2	2.7
McPherson College	419	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	1	-0-	1	1	2.4
Mid-Am Nazarene	1,434	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	1	-0-	1	1	0.7
Ottawa University	3,682	-0-	-0-	-0-	1	1	8	9	-0-	17	18	4.9
St Marys College	875	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	1	-0-	1	1	1.1
Southwestern College	651	-0-	-0-	-0-	1	1	6	8	-0-	14	15	21.5
Tabor College	434	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	1	1	-0-	2	2	4.6
Washburn University	6,574	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	6	15	-0-	21	21	3.2
TOTAL	19,311	-0-	-0-	-0-	2	2	34	60	2	96	98	5.0

* Crime statistics from The Kansas Incident Based Reporting System (KIBRS).

** Population figures from 'KANSAS STATISTICAL ABSTRACT 1993-1994'; "Enrollment In Kansas Colleges and Universities Fall 1993". Population figures are based only on student enrollment.

**OTHER FOUR-YEAR KANSAS INSTITUTIONS
CRIME INDEX OFFENSES REPORTED BY LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES*
1994**

INSTITUTION	1994** STUDENT POPULA- TION	MURDER NON-NEGL.			AGG. ASSAULT/ BATTERY	TOTAL VIOLENT CRIME OFFENSES	BURGLARY	THEFT	MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	TOTAL PROPERTY CRIME OFFENSES	TOTAL CRIME INDEX OFFENSES	RATE PER THOUSAND POPULATION
		MANS.	RAPE	ROBBERY								
Baker University	1,997	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	11	10	-0-	21	21	10.5
Benedictine College	867	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	5	4	-0-	9	9	10.4
Bethany College	727	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	4	9	-0-	13	13	17.9
Bethel College	644	-0-	-0-	-0-	1	1	-0-	24	-0-	24	25	38.8
Kansas Wesleyan	719	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	1	3	-0-	4	4	5.6
McPherson College	453	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	5	-0-	5	5	11.0
Mid-Am Nazarene	1,445	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	2	-0-	-0-	2	2	1.4
Ottawa University	4,337	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	4	4	-0-	8	8	1.8
St Marys College	899	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	2	1	-0-	3	3	3.3
Southwestern College	752	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	2	3	1	6	6	8.0
Sterling College	782	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	3	2	1	6	6	7.7
Tabor College	503	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	3	4	-0-	7	7	13.9
Washburn University***	6,439	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	0.0
TOTAL	14,125	-0-	-0-	-0-	1	1	37	69	2	108	109	7.7

* Crime statistics from The Kansas Incident Based Reporting System (KIBRS).

** Population figures from 'KANSAS STATISTICAL ABSTRACT 1993-1994'; "Enrollment In Kansas Colleges and Universities Fall 1994". Population figures are based only on student enrollment.

*** Statistics not available from Topeka PD.

2-28

**TWO-YEAR KANSAS INSTITUTIONS
CRIME INDEX OFFENSES REPORTED BY LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES*
1993**

INSTITUTION	1993** STUDENT POPULA- TION	MURDER NON-NEGL.			AGG. ASSAULT/ BATTERY	TOTAL VIOLENT CRIME OFFENSES	BURGLARY	THEFT	MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	TOTAL PROPERTY CRIME OFFENSES	TOTAL CRIME INDEX OFFENSES	RATE PER THOUSAND POPULA- TION
		MANS.	RAPE	ROBBERY								
Allen Co Comm College	1,686	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	7	1	- 0 -	8	8	4.7
Barton Co Comm College	4,661	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	6	10	- 0 -	16	16	3.4
Butler Co Comm College	7,114	- 0 -	1	- 0 -	- 0 -	1	9	13	- 0 -	22	23	3.2
Central College	313	- 0 -	1	- 0 -	- 0 -	1	2	3	- 0 -	5	6	19.2
Cloud Co Comm College	2,039	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	1	1	5	3	- 0 -	8	9	4.4
Coffeyville Comm Coll	2,016	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	1	1	8	3	- 0 -	11	12	5.9
Colby Comm College	2,071	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	1	4	- 0 -	5	5	2.4
Cowley Co Comm Coll	3,171	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	6	6	1	13	13	4.1
Dodge City Comm Coll	2,195	- 0 -	1	- 0 -	1	2	10	2	- 0 -	12	14	6.4
Ft Scott Comm College	1,740	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	1	1	10	5	- 0 -	15	16	9.2
Garden City Comm Coll	2,150	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	3	6	1	10	10	4.6
Haskell Indian Jr College	981	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	1	1	5	6	- 0 -	11	12	12.2
Highland Comm College	2,294	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	11	5	- 0 -	16	16	7.0
Hutchinson Comm Coll	3,757	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	2	4	1	7	7	1.9
Independence Comm Col	1,550	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	2	1	- 0 -	3	3	1.9
Johnson Co Comm Coll	13,428	- 0 -	- 0 -	1	- 0 -	1	18	69	2	89	90	6.7
Kansas City KS Com Col	6,063	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	1	- 0 -	1	1	0.2
Labette Comm College	2,112	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	1	1	- 0 -	2	2	0.9
Neosho Co Comm Coll	1,596	- 0 -	1	- 0 -	6	7	1	2	- 0 -	3	10	6.3
Pratt Comm College	1,181	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	6	- 0 -	6	6	5.1
Seward Comm College	1,609	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	4	2	- 0 -	6	6	3.7
TOTAL	63,727	- 0 -	4	1	11	16	111	153	5	269	285	4.4

* Crime statistics from The Kansas Incident Based Reporting System (KIBRS).

** Population figures from 'KANSAS STATISTICAL ABSTRACT 1993-1994'; "Enrollment In Kansas Colleges and Universities Fall 1993". Population figures are based only on student enrollment.

2-29

**TWO-YEAR KANSAS INSTITUTIONS
CRIME INDEX OFFENSES REPORTED BY LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES*
1994**

INSTITUTION	1994** STUDENT POPULA- TION	MURDER NON-NEGL.			AGG. ASSAULT/ BATTERY	TOTAL VIOLENT CRIME OFFENSES	BURGLARY	THEFT	MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	TOTAL PROPERTY CRIME OFFENSES	TOTAL CRIME INDEX OFFENSES	RATE PER THOUSAND POPULA- TION
		MANS.	RAPE	ROBBERY								
Allen Co Comm College	1,558	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	9	2	- 0 -	11	11	7.2
Barton Co Comm College	4,567	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	1	1	3	13	- 0 -	16	17	3.7
Butler Co Comm College	7,447	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	5	5	1	11	11	1.5
Central College	304	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	3	4	- 0 -	7	7	23.0
Cloud Co Comm College	2,513	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	2	2	8	7	- 0 -	15	17	6.8
Coffeyville Comm Coll	2,008	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	9	6	- 0 -	15	15	7.5
Colby Comm College	2,132	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	2	1	- 0 -	3	3	1.4
Cowley Co Comm Coll	2,942	- 0 -	1	- 0 -	- 0 -	1	2	9	1	12	13	4.4
Dodge City Comm Coll	2,277	- 0 -	1	- 0 -	- 0 -	1	2	3	- 0 -	5	6	2.6
Ft Scott Comm College	1,694	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	3	1	- 0 -	4	4	2.4
Garden City Comm Coll	2,154	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	1	4	- 0 -	5	5	2.3
Haskell Indian Jr College	793	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	4***	4	7	6	- 0 -	13	17	21.4
Highland Comm College	2,444	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	1	1	6	5	- 0 -	11	12	4.9
Hutchinson Comm Coll	3,830	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	1	1	16	13	- 0 -	29	30	7.8
Independence Comm Col	1,730	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	3	3	5	3	- 0 -	8	11	6.4
Johnson Co Comm Coll	13,078	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	15	82	3	100	100	7.6
Kansas City KS Com Col	5,918	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	1	3	- 0 -	4	4	0.7
Labette Comm College	2,029	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	4	- 0 -	4	4	2.0
Neosho Co Comm Coll	1,491	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	5	2	- 0 -	7	7	4.7
Pratt Comm College	1,291	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	2	3	- 0 -	5	5	3.9
Seward Comm College	1,631	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	2	3	- 0 -	5	5	3.1
TOTAL	63,831	- 0 -	2	- 0 -	12	14	106	179	5	290	304	4.7

* Crime statistics from The Kansas Incident Based Reporting System (KIBRS).

** Population figures from 'KANSAS STATISTICAL ABSTRACT 1993-1994'; "Enrollment In Kansas Colleges and Universities Fall 1994". Population figures are based only on student enrollment.

***Three of these assaults were to Law Enforcement Officers.

2-30

**CAMPUS ACT ARRESTS
1993**

COLLEGE	DUI	LIQUOR	DRUG
PITTSBURG STATE UNIVERSITY	1	- 0 -	- 0 -
KANSAS UNIVERSITY	49	17	2
FT HAYS STATE UNIVERSITY	- 0 -	1	- 0 -
EMPORIA STATE UNIVERSITY	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY	3	5	2
K U MED CENTER	1	- 0 -	1
FT SCOTT COMM COLLEGE	1	- 0 -	- 0 -
CLOUD CO COMM COLLEGE	- 0 -	1	- 0 -
HASKELL INDIAN JR COLLEGE	1	- 0 -	- 0 -
JOHNSON CO COMM COLLEGE	2	- 0 -	1
DODGE CITY COMM COLLEGE	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -
	- 0 -	- 0 -	1

**CAMPUS ACT ARRESTS
1994**

COLLEGE	DUI	LIQUOR	DRUG
KANSAS UNIVERSITY	6	- 0 -	2
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY	- 0 -	5	2

KIBRS can provide an even deeper analysis of campus crime occurrences. Other options include:

- 1.) Location by Premise Code - did the offense occur in a dormitory/sorority/fraternity as opposed to the campus proper?
- 2.) Was the offense the result of a Domestic Incident or Gang Related?
- 3.) What were the characteristics of the victim or offender?
- 4.) What type of weapons were involved?
- 5.) What hour or day of the week did offenses most commonly occur?
- 6.) What other types of arrests are being made on campus? And how many are the result of a warrant being served on campus?

Staff at the Crime Data Information Center (CDIC) of the KBI are available to answer these questions. Please feel free to call Monday thru Friday, between 8:00 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. (913)296-8200.

The University of Kansas

Office of Public Safety



COMMENTS BEFORE THE SENATE ELECTIONS AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

February 19, 1997

Regarding Senate Bill 256

Madam Chair, Members of the Committee:

My name is James Denney. I am the Director of Public Safety at the University of Kansas, Lawrence campus. I have been involved with campus policing in Kansas since 1974, working both at the University of Kansas Medical Center in Kansas City and the main campus in Lawrence. I am here today in that capacity and as the campus police representative to the Attorney General's Task Force on Campus Crime. I have been asked to comment on Senate Bill 256.

SB 256 leaves in place existing jurisdictional boundaries of campus police but adds a component whereby authority may be expanded depending on local needs and agreement between the university and the city.

The concept for this bill arose from of the initial meeting of the Attorney General's task force in which students from various universities expressed a need for additional services from campus police. Further discussion among the chief law enforcement officers of each Regents institutions and Washburn University resulted in the drafting of a proposal to change KSA 76-726 and KSA 22-2401(a). From that point, the draft proposal was provided to the Chiefs of Police of every city where a Regents institution is located, and the Chief of Police of Topeka. This idea was then discussed with each Chief of Police and their input was sought. Without exception the chiefs supported the concept. It was then proposed to the Attorney General's task force and subsequent legislation in the form of Senate Bill 256 was introduced.

There are numerous anecdotes in support of these changes to 76-726 and 22-2401(a). These stories could include:

- campus police being asked to patrol student populated areas where a homicide occurred adjacent to campus and where students are extremely frightened;
- drunk drivers having charges dismissed because the University Police Officer didn't realize the driver was drunk when he ran the stop sign on campus until after the driver stopped a block off campus;
- an almost clandestine response by university officers to a shooting in a student neighborhood adjacent to campus in time to apprehend the person;
- university officers in a marked police unit coming upon a fight in progress in an intersection on their way to court four blocks from campus; and
- campus police transporting university funds to local banks in marked police cars.

- With the exception of the University of Kansas Medical Center, the current law does not even allow for transport of arrestees by university police officers to jails outside their jurisdiction.

(No university has a jail on campus.)

The real point is that there is a belief that campus police should be doing more than they are now legally able to do. Exactly what that "more" is changes from campus to campus, city to city and population to population.

An outline of the problem, through discussion, showed that a "one size fits all" law of jurisdiction for campus police is probably not possible. Issues involved are:

- 1) The scope and breadth of law enforcement authority needed varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction.
- 2) While not necessarily an emergency, time is frequently of the essence when changes in jurisdiction need to be made.
- 3) Needs beyond current law can likely be only temporary -- until the crisis or the community alarm subsides.
- 4) Each campus police department is currently doing things not provided for in current law that expose the department, the university and the state to some liability, but is done in response to individual community needs.

This measure, if passed into law, would allow each city and university to determine the appropriate scope of law enforcement authority and jurisdiction beyond the existing statute needed for the campus police in their community.

I do want to stress:

- 1) All Regents and Washburn campus police administrators are in agreement that this change is needed and workable.
- 2) The Council of Presidents of Regents Institutions voted unanimous support for this measure.
- 3) The Board of Regents voted unanimous support for this measure.
- 4) The Attorney General and the Campus Task Force (including students of Regents universities and Washburn) support this measure.
- 5) The Chiefs of Police of the municipalities involved all believe this measure is workable and useful.

I urge you to pass SB256.

In the interest of brevity, I will conclude my prepared remarks and remain available for any questions you may have.

TESTIMONY OF DAVID L. YEAROUT, AICP
BUTLER COUNTY PLANNER
PRESIDENT, KANSAS ASSOCIATION OF COUNTY
PLANNING & ZONING OFFICIALS

Regarding Senate Bill 232

February 19, 1997

Senator Hardenburger and members of the Senate Elections and Local Government Committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today regarding Senate Bill 232. My name is David Yearout. I am the County Planner for Butler County, but am addressing you today as the President of the Kansas Association of County Planning & Zoning Officials.

Senate Bill 232 proposes amendments to three provisions within Kansas statutes: 1) procedures for vacating streets, alleys and the like by cities and counties; 2) providing authorization for subcommittees of Planning Commissions to have full authority to make recommendations and decisions on plats and rezonings, as well as reducing the voting requirements on certain matters; and, 3) allowing Subdivision Regulations to provide for an unlimited number of lot splits without platting. I will direct my comments to these issues in that order.

David Yearout Testimony

The first issue, that of the procedures for vacating streets, alleys and the like need amending and the general provisions contained in SB 232 are acceptable. However, it is our understanding that the original proposal on this matter called for one procedure to be prepared which could be used by both cities and counties. This bill does not do that.

Sections 1 and 2 of this bill provide amendments to K.S.A. 12-504 and 12-505, which provide the procedures for cities to vacate streets, alleys, public reservations, ~~public easements~~, dedicated building setback lines, access control, or parts thereof. Sections 6 and 7 of this bill provide amendments to K.S.A. 58-2613 and 58-2614, which provide the procedures for counties to vacate streets, alleys, public reservations, public easements, or parts thereof. The proposed procedures for cities and counties are the same, but the matters that can be considered are not. This is what we are asking you to change.

It is not uncommon for a county to be presented a request to vacate a platted building setback line that was shown on a plat years ago because that was the "accepted standard" at that time. Today, Zoning Regulations often allow a smaller setback requirement, but because of the platted building setback line the landowner is forced to honor the extra setback requirements.

David Yearout Testimony

Please combine the procedures into a single statutory provision as was originally requested. If that is not possible, please provide that the vacation statutes for cities and counties authorize both to consider vacation petitions on all platted provisions, including the building setback lines. This will allow the local governments greater flexibility in addressing the needs of our constituents with the least amount of "red tape".

The second item mentioned in the bill, providing greater authority to subcommittees of the Planning Commission and altering the voting requirements on certain matters is acceptable and will cause no problems that we can see. This amendment provides greater flexibility in how local governments provide for planning and zoning matters for their jurisdiction.

The third item in the bill, allowing Subdivision Regulations to provide for an unlimited number of lot splits without platting, needs to be changed. While it is acceptable for unlimited splitting of industrial and commercial tracts; allowing unlimited splits of residential lots is not good.

David Yearout Testimony

The ability of local governments to manage the development of land within its jurisdiction is critical. The proper design of a rural subdivision can avoid numerous problems, both for the local units of government (i.e., counties and townships), as well as the **BUYERS** of the rural building lots. The platting process provides the county the opportunity to address the needs of the proposed development in terms of roads, water, sewage treatment, other utilities, and other support services such as emergency responses, school buses and mail delivery. If these issues are not addressed during the platting process, most often the buyers quickly find that their intended "dream home" has become a "nightmare". Water may not be available or may be very expensive to produce, either from a water well or a connection to a rural water district. The sewage treatment method may not work well on the property, resulting in expensive modifications to the treatment system at a later date. Plus the intrusion of dirt and dust from the rural roads is not what was intended when the buyers moved to the country. In effect, the county is forced to deal with the **"INNOCENT VICTIMS"** of unregulated rural development if the division of land was exempt from platting to begin with.

David Yearout Testimony

While it is true that platting will not cause these development issues to go away, it will help ensure that the seller is fully aware of the impacts associated with his proposed development, and that the buyers are informed of these costs before a purchase is made. While this process may add time and cost to the development of the property, it avoids the expenditure of public funds to attempt to correct the effects of poorly designed or improper development. This is definitely in the public's interest and general welfare.

You may not feel that these concerns are valid, or that they are the imagination of an overzealous planner. But if you will look at the example of current land patterns in rural Butler County shown on the aerial cadastral map I have brought, you will see that it is not only possible that poorly design development might occur; it in fact has. Note the tremendous waste of land associated with the division of the property shown on the aerial. Also note the subdivision immediately north that is platted and developed under more current design standards.

David Yearout Testimony

The Planning and Zoning laws were recodified in 1991 after many years effort by many people. The resulting laws were well written and designed to be a broad enabling law that establishes basic procedural and contextual requirements, and leaves to the local cities and counties broad discretion in developing regulations that will address the local needs.

The provision in Senate Bill 232 regarding unlimited lot splits without platting is a local issue and should be addressed at the local level. Planning, Zoning and Subdivision Regulations are not mandatory in Kansas and cities and counties have great flexibility in developing local regulations that address the local needs. To amend state law as proposed would lead to an erosion of this process and be detrimental to the local communities and counties. Please change Section 5 of SB 232 so that only industrial and commercial lots can be split without platting; but do not open this up to all land divisions. It is our belief that such an action would not be in the interests of the taxpayers of the state.



Terry Boswell, Development Assistance Director
Testimony on SB 232
Senate Elections and Local Government Committee
February 19, 1997

CITY CUTS RED TAPE FOR REAL ESTATE DEVELOPERS

The City of Wichita has taken a cutting-edge approach and is aggressively working to reduce bureaucratic hurdles faced by real estate developers.

The Development Assistance Center was established in 1995 for the purpose of streamlining the City's development processes and improving customer service. As one of the Center's initial efforts, customers from local development professions were interviewed about their experiences with the City's development-review processes. The length of time to process development projects was identified as a key area needing improvement. As a result, City Manager Chris Cherches set the goal to reduce the time it takes the City to approve plats and building plans by 33% while simultaneously improving customer service.

In response to this goal, two employee teams from the City's development-review departments have designed improvements to the subdivision and building plan review processes using common-sense business principles developed by General Electric. Through the G.E. method, each team documented their work processes, identified problems and solutions, determined time savings, and assigned staff as plan managers. Together, the teams integrated their plans to ensure seamless interdepartmental workings. The plans were presented to the City Manager and received his approval.

The key component of the improvement plans infuses PC-based technology into the City's development review processes. Commercial software available for this technology will increase efficiency and consistency in the review of land use and construction plans, save research time, and improve communications. Other improvements include reducing platting time, reconfiguring the work day for plan reviewers to maximize plan review time, enforcing minimum plan submittal standards, and improving communication between the City and customers.

*SENATE ELECTIONS + LOCAL GOVERNMENT
2-19-97
ATTACHMENT 5*

The technology component of the improvement processes has been adopted and is now being customized for installation this summer. We anticipate that the system will be fully operational in September 1997. The incorporation of PC-based technology and new integrative voice response system into the City's development review process has involved major contributions from customers in the architectural and engineering fields in terms of identifying their needs and tapping their expertise. The inclusion of the development, design, and building industries in our review and selection of a new electronic information management system is totally unique, based on staff's conversations with other cities that have gone through the technology review and selection process. Wichita plans to build on our strong partnering start to give our clients input/education on design, implementation and eventual remote site use of the new technology system.

To date, significant improvements in time reduction and customer service have already been documented without the benefit of the technology enhancements. For the review of construction plans, the improvements range from 66% to 89% reduction in plan review times. The range is due to the valuation categories of plan review (i.e. more complex and larger valuation projects typically require more review time. The 66% improvement was for plans in the category of between \$1-\$24,000, an 85% reduction has been documented for plans in the \$25,000-\$75,000 valuation range, an 89% reduction has been realized for plans in the \$76,001-\$250,000 valuation, and 76% reduction has occurred for plans over \$250,000 in valuation.)

For the review of plats and land-use issues, the savings in review time has been documented between 22-30% through the one-step plat process. Approximately 20% of the plats submitted in 1996 opted for the one-step method.

SB 232 was created as a direct response to a problem cited by customers. Its intention is to provide legislation which will reduce time and, consequently, costs associated with development projects for those customers who want this advantage as well as for the City. We know from conversations with our counterparts in other cities, that this approach is a novel one. It is the City of Wichita's initiative to improve service and responsiveness to the real estate development community and to reduce bureaucratic red-tape which can sometimes strangle a project.

CITY OF WICHITA DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE CENTER

September 1995

MISSION STATEMENT

The Development Assistance Center will be the account executive for significant development projects.

Its specific functions are to:

- Serve as the initial point of contact with the City for significant development projects.
- Arrange optional preliminary application development conferences with the appropriate City agencies.
- Provide personalized schedules with time lines for developers and City agencies.
- Provide a central point of continued contact for the customer throughout the development review process in order to ensure that a) schedules are maintained, b) coordination issues are identified and resolved at the lowest possible level, c) provide a problem solving resource short of the quasi-legal appeals process for customers, and d) provide timely information to the City Manager so that he can keep the City Council informed on the progress and status of development projects.
- Coordinate public-private development project partnerships on behalf of the City Manager.
- Monitor the development review process to ensure that timeliness and quality are maintained.
- Provide a focal point for continuous improvement of the development process.
- Provide customer outreach and education services on timely development topics (i.e , contemplated revisions to City laws regarding development; interpretations and applications of code requirements).
- Establish and maintain regular communications with the development community and its groups, organizations and individuals.

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE CENTER DEPARTMENT SUMMARY

Highlights of 1995:

- Surveyed over 40 U.S. cities on their organizational structures and policies and procedures that enhance development in their cities to glean ideas that could benefit Wichita.
- Made personal visits to jurisdictions in peer cities and others in high growth areas to view the development services departments. Sites visited in Florida were Tampa, Hillsborough County (Tampa area), Orlando, Brevard County, and Daytona Beach. Midwest cities visited include Des Moines, Kansas City (both Missouri and Kansas), Omaha, and Overland Park. Sonoma County, California was visited for a demonstration of the Sierra Software permitting and land use programs.
- Conducted confidential, personal interviews with 38 Wichita customers. Professions surveyed include architecture, engineering, development, contracting, real estate, and various professional associations.
- Management briefings of personal visits and local interviews were held for the City Manager, Assistant City Manager, and Department Heads during Summer 1995.
- Pre-application conferences for developers were created and piloted in August 1995.
- Regular developers' forum with key City staff was established. Wichita Area Builders' Association identified key areas of concern which have been, and continue to be, addressed through regular meetings.
- Contact with key publics has been established through speaking engagements and attendance at regular meetings of professional groups (i.e. Wichita Area Builders' Association, Wichita Independent Business Association, Associated General Contractors, Association of Realtors, American Institute of Architects, Kansas System Builders, Building and Owners Management Association, International Facilities Management Association, Business Advancement, etc.)
- Over 700 Central Inspection customers were invited to a customer briefing on development process improvements and were surveyed as to topics they desired the City to provide through workshops and seminars.
- Facilitated processes for staff from Central Inspection, Planning and other related departments to analyze their work processes with the goal of reducing processing times by 33% while improving customer service.
- Facilitated Planning, Central Inspection and other related departments in the development of action plans to implement reductions in processing times of development projects. The fifteen action plans have been, and continue to be, implemented. Final implementation is scheduled for 1996.
- Facilitated the resolution of disputes regarding the City's development requirements with local development customers.