

CITY OF VALLEY CENTER

FINAL AGENDA

February 25, 2011

*THE CITY COUNCIL SHALL HOLD ITS REGULAR MEETINGS IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER
IN THE CITY HALL, LOCATED AT 121 S. MERIDIAN, BEGINNING AT 7:00 P.M.*

March 1, 2011

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **ROLL CALL**
3. **INVOCATION: MINISTERIAL ALLIANCE**
4. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
5. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA** p 3
6. **CLERKS AGENDA** p 4
 - A. Minutes p
 - February 15, 2011 Council Meeting p 5
 - B. Appropriation Ordinance p 11
 - C. Treasurer's Report December 2010 p 15 *Delayed from January 18, 2011 & February 15, 2011 Mtgs*
 - D. Treasurer's Report January 2011 p 17 *From February 15, 2011 Meeting*
7. **PRESENTATIONS / PROCLAMATIONS** p 18
8. **PUBLIC FORUM** (*Citizen input and requests*) p 18
9. **APPOINTMENTS** p 18
10. **COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS** p 18
 - A. Minutes for Council Review p 19
11. **OLD BUSINESS** p 21
 - A. Report on Fence at 7055 N Clarence p 22
12. **NEW BUSINESS** p 23
 - A. Ordinance 1225-11; Amending Zoning Regulations, 1st Reading p 24
 - B. Presentation / Recommendation from Employee Issues Committee (EIC) p 27
13. **CONSENT AGENDA** p 83
 - A. Revenue & Expense Financial Summaries for January 2011 p 84
14. **STAFF REPORTS** p 97
15. **GOVERNING BODY REPORTS** p 101
16. **ADJOURN**

All items listed on this agenda are potential action items unless otherwise noted. The agenda may be modified or changed at the meeting without prior notice.

At anytime during the regular City Council meeting, the City Council may meet in executive session for consultation concerning several matters (real estate, litigation, not-elected personnel and security).

This is an open meeting, open to the public, subject to the Kansas Open Meetings Act (KOMA). The City of Valley Center is committed to providing reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities upon request of the individual. Individuals with disabilities requiring an accommodation to attend the meeting should contact the City Clerk in a timely manner, at cityclerk@valleycenter-ks.gov or by phone at (316)755-7310.

For Additional information on any item on the agenda, please visit www.valleycenter-ks.gov or call (316) 755-7310.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Staff recommends motion to approve the agenda as presented / amended.

CLERK'S AGENDA

A. MINUTES:

Attached are the Minutes from the meeting of February 15, 2011 Regular Council Meeting as prepared by the City Clerk.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Staff recommends motion to approve the February 15, 2011 Regular Council Meeting Minutes as presented / amended

REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING
FEBRUARY 15, 2011
CITY HALL
121 S. MERIDIAN

Mayor McNown called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present: Kate Jackson, Marci Maschino, Cheryl Nordstedt, Bruce Campbell, Lou Cicirello, Harrison Gerling, Al Hobson and Lionel Jackson.

Members absent: None

Staff Present: Joel Pile, City Administrator
Teevie Lea Walker, Assistant City Clerk
Robert Tormey, Fire Captain
Mark Hephner, Police Chief
Neal Owings, Parks Superintendent
Mike Kelsey, City Engineer
Barry Arbuckle, City Attorney – arrived at 7:08 p.m.

Staff Absent: Richard Dunn, City Superintendent

Press present: The Ark Valley News

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Cicirello moved, second by L Jackson, to approve the Agenda as presented. Vote yea: unanimous. Motion carried.

CLERK'S AGENDA

MINUTES- FEBRUARY 8, 2011 SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING

L Jackson moved, second by Hobson to approve the minutes from the February 8, 2011 Special Council Meeting as presented. Vote yea: unanimous. Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE- 02/15/2011

Hobson moved, second by Cicirello, to approve Appropriation Ordinance No. 02/15/2011 as presented. Vote yea: unanimous. Motion carried.

PRESENTATIONS / PROCLAMATIONS

PUBLIC FORUM

COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS

The Mayor stated that the Veterans Day Committee needs a Council member to lead same; asking Council members to see him after the meeting if there was interest.

APPOINTMENTS**APPOINTMENT TO THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD:**

The Mayor listed the individuals he would like appointed to the Economic Development Board:

Position #1 – 2 year term	Casey Carlson, <i>Halstead Bank</i>
Position #2 – 2 year term	Penny Hargrove, <i>USD #262</i>
Position #3 – 2 year term	Harry Gerling, <i>City Council</i>
Position #4 – 1 year term	Marshella Peterson, <i>VC Chamber of Commerce</i>
Position #5 – 1 year term	Lisa Vermillion, <i>Get Fit Be Fit</i>
Position #6 – 1 year term	Jake Jackson, <i>City Council</i>

Maschino moved, second by Cicirello, to accept the Mayor's appointments. Vote yea: unanimous. Motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

None

CONSENT AGENDA**STAFF REPORTS****CITY ENGINEER KELSEY**

The Sewer Rehab Project is scheduled; also, we've met regarding the Cemetery road and plan to have construction completed by mid-June. Need to survey the site; must wait for the snow.

Maschino asked if the (77th Street) bridge would be open before May? Kelsey stated that he could not answer that as he did not know for sure. Pile stated that they were on track for May.

CITY ADMINISTRATOR PILE

City Administrator Pile referenced a handout given to the Council regarding the Code Enforcement Officer's monthly report. Pile stated that he was working with Officer Plant to provide more detailed reports about the animals picked up/ dropped off. The changes in Plant's report are an effort to gain information between now and when the Council begins reviewing the CIP in a few months.

Pile wanted to note that there was a change made in Dr. Dean's contract for sheltering services. We had originally agreed to \$17.00 per calendar day boarding fee based upon what he thought was being charged at Wag'en Tail. However, it was discovered that said fee was actually \$15.00.

Thus Dr. Dean's contract was changed to reflect the aforementioned. Consequently, the City sheltered its first animal with Dr. Dean today.

Pile also stated that the Council would find in their packets the engineer's letter (from Mr. Gene Schuette, P.E.) stating that the fence at 7055 N. Clarence was in compliance with the drawings approved at the time the building permit was issued. The City is still pursuing what it will do to finalize this case.

The Mayor addressed the engineer letter, 2nd paragraph and last sentence:

"The fence will withstand all current IRC code required vertical and lateral loads."
this seems to be in contradiction to the next paragraph/ sentence:

"This report in no way addresses quality of construction or aesthetical value of fence."

City Attorney Arbuckle stated that he had talked to Mr. Schuette and that the fence had two rebar per bag instead of one, which was the criteria of the plans. Per Arbuckle, Schuette is convinced there is enough rebar in the fence; a normal Kansas wind will have no effect on it. Also per Arbuckle, Schuette did not actually verify whether the fence had the 3' foundation. The City of Wichita requires a 2' foundation for a garage, per Arbuckle.

The Mayor pointed out that usually a garage has a poured foundation, whereas here there are cement bags we are hoping moisture seeps through. Mr. Schutte's previous letter certified that there was a 3' foundation under the fence. The Mayor questioned whether or not the City wanted to have its own inspector(s) check out the foundation?

Arbuckle did not see a problem with that as long as the City received the permission from the property owners.

Maschino addressed the issue of the fence exceeding its permitted height.

Per Pile the maximum height allowed was 6'. The City has not performed an independent inspection of its own to confirm one way or the other.

Cicirello asked whether there was a permit still opened for the fence. Yes, per the Mayor and Pile. The county is supposed to perform inspections, which in turn either leaves open or closes the permit. If that was correct then why is the county being so "vague" about the issue of this fence; while not coming to inspect it?

Per Pile, the engineer provided the aforementioned letter; the county does not feel the need to further inspect the structure.

Gerling wanted to know why the City wants to go to so much trouble to tear down the man's fence. He has done everything he can do, everything that has been requested of him. Why do we want to spend our tax money going further with this issue?

Mr. Winter stated that is was because of one person.

Gerling stated that he thought it was a group of people not just one. "One can't legislate good taste" and that is basically what the City is doing.

Pile stated that the City could take the letter at face value and "close the books" on this project or the City can contract to have an inspection done on the fence. Then have the City Engineer's office review the inspection to see if it meets specifications.

The Mayor re-emphasized the two sentences in the engineer's letter that he addressed previously.

Hobson has concerns that Schutte, per Arbuckle, was not certain about the footing under the fence.

Campbell agreed with Gerling: it seems as though it is a private dispute that has gone through the process provided by the City. Campbell, like Gerling, has problems with the City spending taxpayer money on a neighborly dispute. If we allow this letter to stand, thus closing the permit, do the individuals not have private avenues that they can take themselves?

Arbuckle stated that there has to be a “recognizable right that has been violated” before one can sue another. Otherwise, he did not believe that Mr. Sterling had any kind of claim.

This has been going on for years, per Cicirello. The City is going to spend the money for an independent inspection, or the City might spend the time in court if and when the City gets sued because of the fence (at 7055 N Clarence). Cicirello feels that moving forward with the private inspection will end up costing the City less in the long run.

Gerling reiterated his opposition to using more taxpayer dollars for this issue.

Maschino requested an estimate of what the independent inspection might cost the City.

Kelsey stated that it would probably be a couple thousand dollars. Due to the “potential place they (the independent engineers) put themselves into when backing up their findings. They’re taking the risk.”

K Jackson asked Arbuckle if the City stood to be sued.

Arbuckle state he did not think so as there is a Kansas Act that gives the City immunity when it comes to the inspections it conducts.

K Jackson stated that she could not agree to spend any more on an issue that she believed was a civil matter.

Hobson moved, second by Cicirello, that the City hire a private, independent, third-party engineer to go out and inspect the fence and its foundation. Vote yea: Cicirello and Hobson. Vote nay: K Jackson, Maschino, Nordstedt, Campbell, Gerling, L Jackson. Motion defeated.

Hobson pointed out the Council does not know what either party was told when the issue began in 2006. He was concerned what a representative of the City may have stated to the individuals affected. Whether documentation exists, for the aforementioned, that may or may not have a negative impact the City in future.

Pile stated that the fence was originally started without a permit. Upon discovery by the City the applicant was instructed to provide a letter from the design engineer. The City received the letter, approved the permit. Then due to the “non-traditional nature” of the fence the City required a certified letter stating that the fence was in compliance with its design. We have since received that letter.

The Mayor asked Kelsey whether the two sentences that the he (the Mayor) keeps addressing, within Schuette’s letter are “pretty standard.”

Kelsey said, “No.” He also stated that the code requirement for structural concrete work is 30” minimum which is below frost depth. He would put that question to Schuette. If the structure has to have the minimum foundation then Kelsey believes that Schuette would have to further investigate the issue to confirm that it met with his design; it stated the foundation was 36” in depth. Kelsey questions why the aforementioned was not addressed in the letter and why Schuette would be contradicting himself – referencing the two sentences the Mayor addressed.

Gerling asked if it had been a progression build.

Kelsey stated that the footing had already been covered up when the permit was requested. But there were ways that one could determine the depth of the footing; he gave examples of same.

Gerling moved, second by K Jackson, to accept the engineer's letter at face value thus closing the permit. Vote yea: K Jackson, Campbell, and Gerling. Vote nay: Maschino, Nordstedt, Cicirello, Hobson, and L Jackson. Motion defeated.

Gerling stated it was just a fence.

Maschino agreed but stated she would not want the fence next door to her; that the City needs to consider what Mr. Sterling (Winter's neighbor) wants.

Mayor addressed the aesthetic value of the fence. However his concern rested with the fact that the City had asked for a letter that confirmed the structural soundness of the fence. The letter received does not unequivocally address that issue.

Pile suggested that staff further discuss with the engineers; perform further research in light of the conversation that Arbuckle had with the engineer.

The Mayor asked that he do that.

Pile stated that he would further address the issue at the next Council Meeting.

COUNCIL REPORTS

MAYOR MC NOWN

He attended a SCAC meeting in Goddard last Saturday. The airfare issue is "on the chopping block," and the concern for same. Trying to stress the importance of the issue and the large impact it will have on communities.

Maschino moved, second by Nordstedt, to adjourn the meeting. Vote yea: unanimous. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 7:32 p.m.

**Teevie Lea Walker,
Assistant City Clerk**

CLERK'S AGENDA

B. APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE:

Below is the proposed Appropriation Ordinance for March 1, 2011 as prepared by City Staff.

March 1, 2011 Appropriation

• Vendor Payments	\$ 39,785.75
• Employee Payments	\$ 0.00
• Citizen Reimbursements	<u>\$ 0.00</u>
 Total	 \$ 39,785.75

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Staff recommends motion to approve the March 1, 2011 Appropriation Ordinance as presented / amended.

VENDOR NAME	DESCRIPTION	FUND	DEPARTMENT	AMOUNT	
BEALL & MITCHELL LLC	CASE NO. 097168	GENERAL FUND	LEGAL & MUNICIPAL COUR	150.00	
			TOTAL:	150.00	
DIVERSIFIED LENDING INC	LEASE/PURCH AGREEMENT	GENERAL FUND	COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	12,200.00	
			TOTAL:	12,200.00	
ING LIFE INSURANCE & ANNUITY	VFG496-0196	GENERAL FUND	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	50.00	
	VFG496-0225	GENERAL FUND	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	15.00	
	VFG496-0165	GENERAL FUND	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	350.00	
	VFG496-0023	GENERAL FUND	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	12.00	
	VFG496-0195	GENERAL FUND	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	50.00	
	VFG496-0222	GENERAL FUND	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	100.00	
	VFG496-0052	GENERAL FUND	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	25.00	
	VFG496-0176	GENERAL FUND	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	20.00	
	VFG496-0224	SPECIAL HIGHWAY	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	15.00	
	VFG496-0235	WATER OPERATING	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	12.50	
	VFG496-0013	WATER OPERATING	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	200.00	
				TOTAL:	849.50
	INTRUST BANK NA	EMP FED TAX W/H-GEN	GENERAL FUND	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	163.79
EMP FICA & MEDICARE		GENERAL FUND	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	197.96	
EMP FED TAX WH-GEN		GENERAL FUND	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	4,245.72	
EMP FICA & MEDI-GEN		GENERAL FUND	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	2,500.14	
EMPR BENEFITS-MEDIC		EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	50.84	
EMP BENEFITS-FICA		EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	217.17	
EMPR BENEFITS-MEDIC		EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	641.63	
EMPR BENEFITS-FICA		EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	2,743.51	
EMP FED TAX W/H-STG		SPECIAL HIGHWAY	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	424.13	
EMP FICA & MEDI-STG		SPECIAL HIGHWAY	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	260.71	
EMPR BENEFITS-MEDIC		SPECIAL HIGHWAY	SPECIAL HIGHWAY	66.90	
EMPR BENEFITS-FICA		SPECIAL HIGHWAY	SPECIAL HIGHWAY	286.10	
EMP FED TAX W/H-WTR		WATER OPERATING	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	811.17	
EMP FICA & MEDI-WTR		WATER OPERATING	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	537.77	
EMPR BENEFITS-MEDIC		WATER OPERATING	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	138.01	
EMPR BENEFITS-FICA		WATER OPERATING	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	590.12	
EMP FED TAX W/H-SWR		SEWER OPERATING	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	291.06	
EMP FICA & MEDI-SWR		SEWER OPERATING	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	184.56	
EMPR BENEFITS-MEDIC		SEWER OPERATING	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	47.37	
EMPR BENEFITS-FICA		SEWER OPERATING	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	202.53	
			TOTAL:	14,601.19	
KANSAS DEPT OF REVENUE	2-25-11 & 2/2011 KW-5 KS	GENERAL FUND	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	1,841.97	
	2-25-11 & 2/2011 KW-5 KS	SPECIAL HIGHWAY	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	164.69	
	2-25-11 & 2/2011 KW-5 KS	WATER OPERATING	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	454.84	
	2-25-11 & 2/2011 KW-5 KS	SEWER OPERATING	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	116.45	
				TOTAL:	2,577.95
KANSAS PAYMENT CENTER	98D002573	GENERAL FUND	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	110.31	
	09DM009607	GENERAL FUND	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	144.97	
	06DM000961	GENERAL FUND	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	150.00	
	06DM000734	GENERAL FUND	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	224.00	
	07DM000222	GENERAL FUND	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	221.54	
	05DM06422	WATER OPERATING	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	204.50	
	06DM006517	WATER OPERATING	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	374.39	
				TOTAL:	1,429.71

VENDOR NAME	DESCRIPTION	FUND	DEPARTMENT	AMOUNT	
KPERs	GEN-TIER 1	GENERAL FUND	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	1,711.92	
	GEN-TIER 2	GENERAL FUND	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	217.05	
	EMPR BEN-GEN T1	EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	3,188.73	
	EMPR BEN-GEN T2	EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	280.00	
	STS-TIER 1	SPECIAL HIGHWAY	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	130.03	
	STS-TIER 2	SPECIAL HIGHWAY	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	92.62	
	EMPR BEN-STS T1	SPECIAL HIGHWAY	SPECIAL HIGHWAY	251.61	
	EMPR BEN-STS T2	SPECIAL HIGHWAY	SPECIAL HIGHWAY	119.48	
	WTR-TIER 1	WATER OPERATING	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	223.29	
	WTR-TIER 2	WATER OPERATING	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	222.92	
	EMPR BEN-WTR T1	WATER OPERATING	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	432.07	
	EMPR BEN-WTR T2	WATER OPERATING	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	287.57	
	SWR-TIER 1	SEWER OPERATING	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	140.29	
	EMPR BEN-SWR T1	SEWER OPERATING	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	271.47	
	TOTAL:				7,569.05
	LAURIE B WILLIAMS	081223113	GENERAL FUND	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	100.00
0914039		GENERAL FUND	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	55.00	
081002813		WATER OPERATING	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	84.00	
TOTAL:				239.00	
SECURITY BENEFIT	613042-5556	GENERAL FUND	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	25.00	
	613042-6484	GENERAL FUND	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	25.00	
	TOTAL:				50.00
US DEPT OF THE TREASURY	13648-5160	GENERAL FUND	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	40.32	
	19340-3803	GENERAL FUND	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	4.03	
	TOTAL:				44.35
VANTAGEPOINT TRANS AGENTS	381925-5676	GENERAL FUND	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	50.00	
	381925-1923	GENERAL FUND	NON-DEPARTMENTAL	25.00	
	TOTAL:				75.00

===== FUND TOTALS =====

010	GENERAL FUND	25,025.72
110	EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	7,121.88
150	SPECIAL HIGHWAY	1,811.27
610	WATER OPERATING	4,573.15
620	SEWER OPERATING	1,253.73

GRAND TOTAL:		39,785.75

SELECTION CRITERIA

SELECTION OPTIONS

VENDOR SET: 02-CVC - VENDOR ACCOUNTS
VENDOR: All
CLASSIFICATION: All
BANK CODE: All
ITEM DATE: 0/00/0000 THRU 99/99/9999
ITEM AMOUNT: 9,999,999.00CR THRU 9,999,999.00
GL POST DATE: 2/16/2011 THRU 2/24/2011
CHECK DATE: 0/00/0000 THRU 99/99/9999

PAYROLL SELECTION

PAYROLL EXPENSES: NO
CHECK DATE: 0/00/0000 THRU 99/99/9999

PRINT OPTIONS

PRINT DATE: None
SEQUENCE: By Vendor Name
DESCRIPTION: Distribution
GL ACCTS: NO
REPORT TITLE: COUNCIL MTG 03-01-11 VENDORS
SIGNATURE LINES: 0

PACKET OPTIONS

INCLUDE REFUNDS: YES
INCLUDE OPEN ITEM:NO

CLERK'S AGENDA

C. TREASURER'S REPORT, DECEMBER 2010:

Moved from Jan 4, 2011 & Feb 15, 2011 meetings

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Staff recommends motion to receive and file the December 2010 Treasurer's Report.

CITY OF VALLEY CENTER
 PERIOD CASH FLOW REPORT
 AS OF: DECEMBER 31ST, 2010

FUND	BEGINNING CASH BALANCE	RECEIVABLES & NET ASSETS	PERIOD REVENUES	PAYABLES & NET LIABILITIES	PERIOD EXPENDITURES	ENDING CASH BALANCE	Y-T-D ENCUMBRANCE	UNENCUMBERED CASH BALANCE
GENERAL FUND	346,725.92	0.00	176,546.31 (22,644.81)	203,920.39	341,996.65	5,659.79	336,336.86
SPECIAL PARKS AND REC	5,143.28	0.00	1,331.39	0.00	0.00	6,474.67	0.00	6,474.67
SPECIAL ALCOHOL AND DRUG	5,143.25	0.00	1,331.39	0.00	0.00	6,474.64	0.00	6,474.64
EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	29,164.79	0.00	14,537.17 (120.00)	7,073.90	36,748.06	0.00	36,748.06
FLEXIBLE SPENDING ACCT	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
FIRE VEHICLE REPLACEMENT	640.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	640.30	0.00	640.30
BUILDING EQUIP RESERVE	111,177.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	111,177.90	0.00	111,177.90
EQUIPMENT RESERVE	234,434.14	0.00	11,512.90 (2,500.00)	4,299.90	244,147.14	0.00	244,147.14
PUBLIC WORKS BUILDING	8,627.24	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8,627.24	0.00	8,627.24
LIBRARY	34,887.79	0.00	6,072.23	0.00	24,502.54	16,457.48	0.00	16,457.48
SPECIAL HIGHWAY	326,760.93	0.00	36,912.80 (26,813.54)	76,591.68	313,895.59	0.00	313,895.59
EMERG EQUIPMENT RESERVE	116,574.12	0.00	1,349.23	0.00	0.00	117,923.35	0.00	117,923.35
PAYROLL CLEARING FUND	37.62	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	37.62	0.00	37.62
ACTIVE AGING GRANT	5,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5,000.00	0.00	5,000.00
PARK BEAUTIFICATION	2,454.66	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,454.66	0.00	2,454.66
BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DIST	1,143.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,143.50	0.00	1,143.50
D.A.R.E.	2,401.56	0.00	42.86	0.00	0.00	2,444.42	0.00	2,444.42
VETERANS FLAG REWARD FUND	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
DRUG TAX DIST	4,987.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4,987.03	0.00	4,987.03
LAW ENFORCEMENT BLOCK GR	2,500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,500.00	0.00	2,500.00
ADSAP	1,999.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,999.08	0.00	1,999.08
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND	3,352.61	0.00	0.18	0.00	0.00	3,352.79	0.00	3,352.79
PROJECTS FUND	872,998.34	0.00	254,272.74 (18,000.00)	283,205.21	862,065.87	0.00	862,065.87
G O BOND & INTEREST	165,047.84	0.00 (26,139.75)	0.00	0.00	138,908.09	0.00	138,908.09
WATER OPERATING	275,353.75 (14,025.32)	101,102.14 (38,363.32)	137,258.84	263,535.05	0.00	263,535.05
METER DEPOSIT	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
STORMWATER	48,991.31 (7,373.10)	10,344.00 (26.66)	28,488.36	23,500.51	0.00	23,500.51
WATER MAINTENANCE RESERVE	7,780.37	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7,780.37	0.00	7,780.37
WATER IMPROVEMENT FUND	146,497.48	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	146,497.48	0.00	146,497.48
WATER LOAN P & I 2000	124,106.47	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	124,106.47	0.00	124,106.47
WATER LOAN P & I 2007	40,642.22	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	40,642.22	0.00	40,642.22
WATER SURPLUS RESERVE	554,057.94	0.00	28.30	0.00	18,570.00	535,516.24	0.00	535,516.24
SEWER OPERATING	126,231.67	985.83	132,406.40 (26,870.80)	265,530.13	20,964.57	1,500.00	19,464.57
SEWER OPERATION & MAINT	14,795.22	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	14,795.22	0.00	14,795.22
07 SEWER LOAN P & I	155,984.15	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	155,984.15	0.00	155,984.15
1993 SEWER BOND RESERVE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1993 SEWER BOND	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SEWER DEPRECIATION	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SEWER BOND RESERVE	302,877.50	0.00	12.72	0.00	62,000.00	240,890.22	0.00	240,890.22
1997 SEWER BOND P & I	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1997 SW BOND DEPR	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1997 SW BOND RESERVE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2001 SW BOND P & I	138,753.31	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	138,753.31	0.00	138,753.31
2001 SW REV BOND DEPR	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2001 SW BOND RESERVE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	4,217,273.29 (20,412.59)	721,663.01 (135,339.13)	1,111,440.95	3,942,421.89	7,159.79	3,935,262.10
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

*** END OF REPORT ***

CLERK'S AGENDA

D. TREASURER'S REPORT, JANUARY 2011:

Moved from Feb 15, 2011 meeting

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Staff recommends motion to receive and file the January 2011 Treasurer's Report.

CITY OF VALLEY CENTER
 PERIOD CASH FLOW REPORT
 AS OF: JANUARY 31ST, 2011

FUND	BEGINNING CASH BALANCE	RECEIVABLES & NET ASSETS	PERIOD REVENUES	PAYABLES & NET LIABILITIES	PERIOD EXPENDITURES	ENDING CASH BALANCE	Y-T-D ENCUMBRANCE	UNENCUMBERED CASH BALANCE
GENERAL FUND	341,996.65	0.00	490,308.40	11,876.65	143,355.95	677,072.45	15,723.62	661,348.83
SPECIAL PARKS AND REC	6,474.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6,474.67	0.00	6,474.67
SPECIAL ALCOHOL AND DRUG	6,474.64	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6,474.64	0.00	6,474.64
EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	36,748.06	0.00	286,149.91	120.00	40,658.91	282,119.06	31,573.28	250,545.78
FLEXIBLE SPENDING ACCT	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
FIRE VEHICLE REPLACEMENT	640.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	640.30	0.00	640.30
BUILDING EQUIP RESERVE	111,177.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	111,177.90	0.00	111,177.90
EQUIPMENT RESERVE	244,147.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	244,147.14	0.00	244,147.14
PUBLIC WORKS BUILDING	8,627.24	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8,627.24	0.00	8,627.24
LIBRARY	16,457.48	0.00	100,527.24	0.00	0.00	116,984.72	0.00	116,984.72
SPECIAL HIGHWAY	313,895.59	0.00	82,670.69	16,914.93	20,478.88	359,172.47	3,645.04	355,527.43
EMERG EQUIPMENT RESERVE	117,923.35	0.00	22,332.35	0.00	46,510.38	93,745.32	0.00	93,745.32
PAYROLL CLEARING FUND	37.62	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	37.62	0.00	37.62
ACTIVE AGING GRANT	5,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5,000.00	0.00	5,000.00
PARK BEAUTIFICATION	2,454.66	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,454.66	0.00	2,454.66
BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DIST	1,143.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,143.50	0.00	1,143.50
D.A.R.E.	2,444.42	0.00	68.05	0.00	0.00	2,512.47	0.00	2,512.47
VETERANS FLAG REWARD FUND	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
DRUG TAX DIST	4,987.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4,987.03	0.00	4,987.03
LAW ENFORCEMENT BLOCK GR	2,500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,500.00	0.00	2,500.00
ADSAP	1,999.08	0.00	150.00	0.00	0.00	2,149.08	0.00	2,149.08
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND	3,352.79	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3,352.79	0.00	3,352.79
PROJECTS FUND	862,065.87	0.00	0.00	0.00	46,009.03	816,056.84	0.00	816,056.84
G O BOND & INTEREST	138,908.09	0.00	610,545.09	0.00	0.00	749,453.18	0.00	749,453.18
WATER OPERATING	263,535.05	4,442.55	103,948.46	5,248.35	33,028.45	324,764.16	3,785.54	320,978.62
METER DEPOSIT	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
STORMWATER	23,500.51	6,510.30	2,773.80	0.00	1,670.79	31,113.82	35.96	31,077.86
WATER MAINTENANCE RESERVE	7,780.37	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7,780.37	0.00	7,780.37
WATER IMPROVEMENT FUND	146,497.48	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	146,497.48	0.00	146,497.48
WATER LOAN P & I 2000	124,106.47	0.00	0.00	0.00	97,140.55	26,965.92	0.00	26,965.92
WATER LOAN P & I 2007	40,642.22	0.00	0.00	0.00	39,972.17	670.05	0.00	670.05
WATER SURPLUS RESERVE	535,516.24	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	535,516.24	0.00	535,516.24
SEWER OPERATING	20,964.57	67.47	69,874.78	9,758.23	17,262.05	63,886.54	4,910.38	58,976.16
SEWER OPERATION & MAINT	14,795.22	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	14,795.22	0.00	14,795.22
07 SEWER LOAN P & I	155,984.15	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	155,984.15	0.00	155,984.15
1993 SEWER BOND RESERVE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1993 SEWER BOND	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SEWER DEPRECIATION	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SEWER BOND RESERVE	240,890.22	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	240,890.22	0.00	240,890.22
1997 SEWER BOND P & I	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1997 SW BOND DEPR	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1997 SW BOND RESERVE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2001 SW BOND P & I	138,753.31	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	138,753.31	0.00	138,753.31
2001 SW REV BOND DEPR	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2001 SW BOND RESERVE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GRAND TOTAL	3,942,421.89	2,135.22	1,769,348.77	43,918.16	486,087.16	5,183,900.56	59,673.82	5,124,226.74
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

*** END OF REPORT ***

PRESENTATIONS / PROCLAMATIONS

PUBLIC FORUM

APPOINTMENTS

COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS

A. MINUTES FOR COUNCIL REVIEW:

- Planning Commission / Board of Zoning Appeals, January 25, 2011 Meeting

VALLEY CENTER PLANNING COMMISSION/BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
7:00 P.M.
JANUARY 25, 2011
121 S. MERIDIAN

Vice-Chairperson Jaque Davis called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present: Don Bosken, John Dailey, Steve Jackson, Danny Park, Ricky Shellenbarger, Kathryn Schroeder and Dee Wretberg.

Members Absent: Gary Jantzen

Staff Present: Eldon G. Miller, AICP, CFM, Secretary

Press:

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Commissioner Park move, seconded by Shellenbarger to approve as presented. Vote Yea: Unanimous.

MINUTES OF DECEMBER 14, 2010 REGULAR MEETING AND JANUARY 15, 2011 WORKSHOP

Commissioner Schroeder move, seconded by Wretberg to approve the minutes as presented. Vote Yea: Unanimous.

COMMUNICATIONS

ITEMS BY ZONING ADMINISTRATOR

Eldon G. Miller, AICP, CFM stated work would begin internally on a Sidewalk Master Plan at the February Planning Commission meeting.

SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE REPORT

Commissioner Dailey gave an update from the Committee's last meeting.

SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

Eldon G. Miller, AICP, CFM, stated the Historical Preservation Committee is willing to work with the Site Plan Committee on regulations for Historical Preservation. Commissioner Dailey stated the Historical Committee would be having an Open House on Saturday (January 29, 2011) at the Historical Museum.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Diane Miller, DZ Auto, requested the Planning Commission have a Public Hearing to amend the Downtown Overlay District to allow Auto Repair Garage as a conditional use permit. Miller stated Auto Repair Garage is listed as a prohibited use within the District. He stated if Auto Repair Garage was removed from the Prohibited Use section in the Overlay District, then any property within the C-2 Zoning District could apply for a Conditional Use Permit for an Auto Repair Garage. Commissioner Schroeder move, seconded by Park to have a public hearing at the next meeting to consider amending the Downtown Overlay District. Vote Yea: Unanimous.

CONSENT AGENDA

None

PUBLIC HEARING –PUD—2010-003

Vice-Chairperson Davis opened the public hearing at 7:14 p.m.

Don Bosken stated his intent to abstain on this item.

Eldon G. Miller, Secretary verified that on November 18, 2010 a notification was published in the Ark Valley News and notices were mailed to 14 real property owners of record..

No ex parte communication.

Eldon G. Miller, AICP, CFM, Zoning Administrator presented the staff report on the proposed Planned Unit Development District and Preliminary Planned Unit Development Plan Report. There was a discussion on the property being used for multi-family residential and concerns that the property was purchased for a detention pond. Commissioners asked if the City had considered public uses for the property.

Isaac Krumme, Professional Engineering Consultants, was present on behalf of the City of Valley Center, applicant. He asked if the Commission had any questions. Commissioner Parks asked if, from a planners' viewpoint, it was optimal for a multifamily developer to locate next to a pond. Krumme stated he did not think it was the City's intention to give the land away, but to sell it at market value. There was a discussion on the detention pond.

There were no public comments or written communications.

The Public Hearing was closed at 7:57 p.m.

Vice-Chairperson Davis move, seconded by Parks to table until the next meeting for more study. Vote Yea: Bosken, Dailey, Davis, Park, Shellenbarger, Schroeder and Wretberg. Vote Nay: Jackson.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

None

ITEMS BY PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

None

The meeting was adjourned at 7:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Angela Millspaugh
Interim Community Development Officer

Approved by the Valley Center Planning Commission on February 22, 2011.

Gary Janzen, Chairman

OLD BUSINESS

A. REPORT on FENCE AT 7055 N CLARENCE:

FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY



MEMO

TO: Honorable Mayor McNown & Valley Center City Council

FROM: Joel Pile, City Administrator

DATE: February 23, 2011

RE: *Fence @ 7055 N. Clarence (Mr. Justin Winter)*

Background:

Mr. Justin Winter of 7055 N. Clarence secured a building permit on 12/14/09 (Permit #FENVC2009-018) to construct a concrete screen wall. Building Code requires any concrete wall over four feet in height, from the bottom of the footing to the top of the wall, to be designed by a Licensed Design Professional. Mr. Winter secured the services of Gene R. Schuette P.E. of *Residential Structural Inspection* to provide design specifications for the concrete wall, which were submitted with the building permit application.

Mr. Winter completed the concrete screen wall in late 2010. The City required Mr. Winter to have the completed wall inspected by the design engineer and provide an inspection report attesting the wall had been inspected and was constructed in accordance with the design submitted and approved with the building permit. On 12/7/10, the City was provided a letter from Gene R. Schuette P.E. stating the wall had been inspected and "the screen wall is sound in construction". The letter did not state the wall had been constructed according to the approved design. Mr. Winter was informed by letter on 1/14/11, he was required to have the wall inspected and to provide a report which certified the wall had been constructed according to the approved design specifications.

On 2/1/11, the City received a letter from Gene R. Schuette P.E. which stated, "I have inspected the completed fence of bags of concrete located at 7055 N. Clarence, Valley Center, Ks. The fence has been completed in accordance with the previously provided engineering drawing".

2/23/11 the City was submitted photographic evidence which showed the foundation of the fence was only +/- 14" below grade, the approved design required the wall to have a foundation 36" below grade. Upon inspection the evidence presented to the City was found to be accurate, the foundation depth was +/- 22" less than design specifications.

Mr. Winter will be informed the wall does not meet the design specifications and has failed final inspection. He will be given 20 days from the date of the letter to adjust the wall in order to meet design specifications or remove the improvement.

NEW BUSINESS

A. ORDINANCE 1225; AMENDING ZONING REGULATION, 1ST READING:

- Interim Community Development Officer Memo
- Ordinance 1225-11

Should Council choose to proceed,

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Staff recommends motion to adopt Ordinance 1225-11, amending Zoning Regulations, for 1st Reading

DATE: February 23, 2011

TO: Honorable Mayor McNown
City Council

FROM: Angela Millspaugh, Interim Community Development Officer

RE: Amendment to the Downtown Overlay District

Proposed Agenda Date: March 1, 2011

Background:

- On July 6, 2010 the Governing Body adopted Zoning Regulations which included the Downtown Neighborhood Overlay District (D-O).
- The intent of the Downtown Neighborhood Overlay District (D-O) is “to preserve, enhance and promote the character of the Downtown Neighborhood as prescribed in the Central Business District Neighborhood Plan.” (Section 4-115, Zoning Regulations)
- On January 22, 2011 a citizen approached the Planning Commission to ask them to consider allowing Auto Repair Garages as a Conditional Use within the D-Overlay District. The Planning Commission established a Public Hearing Date of February 22, 2011 to consider amending the D-O District.
- On February 22, 2011, the Planning Commission held a public hearing to consider amending the D-O District.
- The Planning Commission voted unanimously to recommend to City Council approval of the proposed zoning amendment.

Financial Considerations:

- None.

Legal Considerations:

- The City has the authority to adopt or amend the Zoning Regulations

Policy Considerations:

- The City has authority to adopt or amend the Zoning Regulations.
- Attached is the proposed changes to Zoning Regulations

Recommendation:

- *The Planning Commission recommends the proposed change to the Zoning Regulations of the City of Valley Center, Kansas be approved and adopted by ordinance.*

ORDINANCE NO. 1225-11**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE ZONING REGULATIONS OF THE CITY OF VALLEY CENTER, KANSAS, AS ORGINALLY ADOPTED BY ORDINANCE NO. 1223-10, AND INCORPORATING AS A PART THEREOF AN AMENDMENT TO SECTION 4-115C7 PERTAINING TO REPAIR GARAGES AS PROHIBITED CONDITIONAL USES IN THE D-O DOWNTOWN NEIGHBORHOOD OVERLAY DISTRICT.**

THAT WHEREAS on December 21, 2010, the City of Valley Center, Kansas enacted Ordinance No. 1223-10, which Ordinance was duly published and which provided for the adoption of and incorporation therein of certain Zoning Regulations as a Model Code for said City, official copies of the same being on file with the City Clerk: and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission of the City of Valley Center, Kansas has prior hereto and after giving due notice held a public hearing on February 22, 2011 and made certain recommendations for an amendment as contained herein: and,

WHEREAS, the Governing Body of the City of Valley Center, Kansas desires to approve such amendment of the Zoning Regulations in accordance therein;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED, by the Governing Body of Valley Center, Kansas:

Section 1. That Section 115C7 of Article 4, pertaining to “Repair garages” as Prohibited Conditional Uses in the D-O Downtown Neighborhood Overlay District, is hereby deleted and replaced with the following wording:

7. (Vacant space)

Section 2. Severability. Those sections, paragraphs, and provisions of Article 4 of the City of Valley Center Zoning Regulations which are not expressly amended or repealed by this Ordinance are hereby reenacted, and it is expressly declared to be the intention of this Ordinance no to repeal or amend any portions of the City of Valley Center Zoning Regulations other than those expressly amended or repealed in Section 1 of this Ordinance.

If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or word of this ordinance is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this ordinance. The council hereby declares that it would have passed this ordinance and each section subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, and words thereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases or words have been declared invalid or unconstitutional, and if for any reason this ordinance should be declared invalid or unconstitutional, then the remaining ordinance provisions will be in full force and effect.

Section 3. Applicability and Effective Date All portions of former ordinances in conflict herewith are hereby repealed or superseded. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage and after its publication once in the official city newspaper.

PASSED AND APPROVED by the Governing Body of the City of Valley Center, Kansas, this ____ day of _____ 2011.

First Reading:

Second Reading:

{SEAL}

Michael McNown, Mayor

ATTEST:

Kristine A. Polian, City Clerk

NEW BUSINESS

B. PRESENTATION / RECOMMENDATION FROM EMPLOYEE ISSUES COMMITTEE (EIC):

- City Clerk Memo
- Flexible Work Schedule Power Point
- 12 Hour Shift Study
- IACP Power Point

Should Council choose to proceed,

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Staff recommends motion to APPORVE / DENY recommendation from Employee Issues Committee to amend City Personnel Policy.



MEMO

TO: Honorable Mayor McNown & Valley Center City Council

FROM: Kristine Polian, City Clerk

DATE: February 22, 2011

RE: *Employee Issues Committee Recommendation*

Recommendation regarding alternative work schedules.

The Valley Center Employee Issues Committee (formally the Compensation Committee), comprised of the Mayor, an appointed Councilmember, Department Heads and 2 non-exempt (hourly) employees, was created to address general personnel issues and make recommendations regarding policy to the Council. Historically, if any changes needed to be made to the Personnel Policy, the Employee Issues Committee would present proposed changes to the Council for their consideration.

The Committee met January 21 and February 22 to discuss of alternative work schedules. Several Departments have expressed an interest in moving from the traditional 8-5 Monday-Friday work schedule, the belief is flexibility will provide for better public service, reduce overtime, and provide a benefit to the employees.

The Committee reviewed and researched the option of allowing departments to move to 10-hour or 12-hour shifts and concluded that such flexible schedules would be of benefit. The Committee also concluded prior to implementation, each schedule request made by a department head should be evaluated and approved by the City Administrator.

The Committee hereby recommends the Council consider the following policy changes to allow for alternative work schedules:

1.

Current:

E- 1. Hours of Work

a) *General Employees.* The normal work week for general employees, which includes all employees, shall be 40 hours, consisting of five eight-hour days. Full-time personnel employed in departments operating on a 24-hour basis shall work not fewer than eight hours per day, five days per week, on a schedule to be assigned by the department head.

Proposed:

E- 1. Hours of Work

a) *General Employees.* **The normal work period for all full-time hourly employees shall be forty hours. All work schedules must be approved in advance by the City Administrator.**

2.

Current:

E- 1. Hours of Work

b) *Normal Work Hours.* No employee shall be permitted to work in excess of their normal work week except when so directed by the employee's department head.

Proposed:

E- 1. Hours of Work

b) *Normal Work Hours.* No employee shall be permitted to work in excess of their normal work **period** except when so directed by the employee's department head.

3.

Current:

E- 3. Holidays

c) Employees required to work on a city observed holiday shall be granted an alternative day off. The alternative day off must be taken within thirty (30) days following the city observed holiday.

Proposed:

E- 3. Holidays

c) Employees required to work on a city observed holiday shall be granted an alternative day off. The alternative day off must be taken within the same period as the observed holiday. **For those employees working alternative work schedules, where normal hours worked exceed 8 hours per shift, personal leave (excluding sick leave) can be used to make up the additional hours not worked. Holidays hours paid cannot exceed eight hours for any one observed holiday.**

4.

Current:

E- 3. Holidays

a) The following days shall be paid holidays for city employees:

Proposed:

E- 3. Holidays

a) The following days shall be paid holidays for city employees **(equal to 8 hours paid leave):**

5.

Current:

E- 4.

f) *Minimum Hours.* Employees may use vacation leave in units of not less than four hours, subject to the approval of their supervisor.



Proposed:

E- 4.

f) *Minimum Hours.* Employees may use vacation leave in units of not less than **two** hours, subject to the approval of their supervisor.

FOR CITY OF VALLEY CENTER EMPLOYEES

FLEXIBLE WORK SCHEDULES

FLEXIBLE WORK SCHEDULES

- ✘ Several city departments would like the opportunity to utilize flexible work schedules
 - + Working other than just 8 hour work days
 - + To better serve the public
 - + To reduce overtime

CURRENT CITY POLICY

- ✘ Current City Policy Recognizes Only 8 Hour Workdays
 - + Article E of the City of Valley Center Personnel Policy and Guidelines states-“The normal work week for general employees, which includes all employees shall be 40 hours, consisting of five eight hour days.”

FLEXIBLE WORK SCHEDULES

- ✘ The VC Police Department was experiencing rising overtime issues
- ✘ The Department was allowed to experiment with 10 & 12 hour shifts during 2010
- ✘ The Police Department was on 10 hour shifts (4 10-hour days) from January through September 2010
- ✘ The Department tried 12-hour shifts from October 2010 through January 2011

EMPLOYEE FEEDBACK

- ✘ All employees that worked the 8,10 & 12-hour shifts (supervisors and detective remained on 8 hour shifts) were surveyed for shift preference
 - + The majority preferred 10-hour shifts
 - + Several preferred 12-hour shifts
 - + None preferred 8-hour shifts

PATROL SHIFT COVERAGE

- ✘ One of the main advantages of the 10-hour shifts is overlapping coverage during peak call times
- ✘ When officers begin their shift the previous shift is still on duty
- ✘ The officer just coming onto shift can cover calls and allow officers from the previous shift to complete cases and paperwork

PATROL SHIFT COVERAGE

- ✘ The current 10 hour shifts are as listed below:
 - + 1st 0700 to 1700 or 7 AM to 5 PM
 - + 2nd 1600 to 0200 or 4 PM to 2 AM
 - + 3rd 2200 to 0800 or 10 PM to 8 AM

EXAMPLE: 24-HOUR PATROL SCHEDULE, JANUARY 22 (REFER TO CALENDAR ON NEXT PAGE).

- ✘ 1ST SHIFT- OFFICER #13 WORKS 7:00 AM TO 5:00 PM.
- ✘ 2ND SHIFT- OFFICERS #6 AND #10 WORK 4:00 PM TO 2:00 AM.
- ✘ 3RD SHIFT- OFFICER #5 WORKS 10:00 PM TO 8:00 AM.
- ✘ *THIS PROVIDES OVERLAPPING SHIFT COVERAGE (3 OFFICERS ON DUTY) FROM 7:00 AM – 8:00 AM; OVERLAPPING SHIFT COVERAGE (3 OFFICERS ON DUTY) FROM 4:00 PM TO 5:00 PM; AND OVERLAPPING SHIFT COVERAGE (3 OFFICERS ON DUTY) FROM 10:00 PM TO 2:00 AM.*

VALLEY CENTER
POLICE
DEPARTMENT

10 Hour Shifts

January/Feb

rev 1/10/2011

2011

Sunday		Monday		Tuesday		Wednesday		Thursday		Friday		Saturday	
26 _{Dec}		27		28		29		30		31		1	
		10 Hour Shifts		1st-0700-1700 2nd-1600-0200 3rd-2200-0800		9 Patrol Officers 3 Per Shift							
2		3		4		5	Court	6		7		8	
9		10		11		12		13		14		15	
16		17		18		19		20		21		22	week 1
												1	13 <u>Two on duty 7-8</u>
												2	6,10 <u>three on duty 4-5</u>
												3	5 <u>Three on duty 10p-2a</u>
												P	
23		24		25		26		27		28		29	week 2
1	13, 9 <u>Three on duty 7-8</u>	1	13, 9 <u>Four on duty 7-8</u>	1	9 <u>Three on duty 7-8</u>	1	4, 9 <u>Four on duty 7-8</u>	1	4 <u>Three on duty 7-8</u>	1	4, 13 <u>Three on duty 7-8</u>	1	4,13
2	6 <u>Three on duty 4-5</u>	2	6 <u>Three on duty 4-5</u>	2	11,10 <u>Three on duty 4-5</u>	2	11, 10 <u>Four on duty 4-5</u>	2	11,10 <u>Three on duty 4-5</u>	2	6, 11 <u>Four on duty 4-5</u>	2	11,6
3	5, 12 <u>Three on duty 10p-2A</u>	3	5, 12 <u>Three on duty 10p-2A</u>	3	7, 12 <u>Four on duty 10P-2 A</u>	3	7,12 <u>Four on duty 10P-2A</u>	3	7 <u>Three on duty 10P- 2A</u>	3	7, 5 <u>Four on duty 10P-2A</u>	3	7,5
P		P		P		P		P		P		P	
30		31		1	Feb	2		3		4		5	week 3

OVERTIME COMPARISON

- ✘ While the department was on 8-hour shifts each officer got 15 minutes of overtime everyday because of no overlapping shifts
- ✘ If an officer got a late call during his/her shift the call had to be completed and sometimes reports had to be completed prior to going home, resulting in overtime.

Total Overtime Hours	2008	2009	2010
<i>January</i>	141.00	135.25	57.25
<i>February</i>	207.25	62.75	48.75
<i>March</i>	348.25	133.75	53.00
<i>April</i>	108.00	104.00	42.25
<i>May</i>	125.25	199.25	82.25
<i>June</i>	131.50	86.25	80.25
<i>July</i>	137.00	97.25	161.25
<i>August</i>	141.25	86.50	31.25
<i>September</i>	99.00	107.75	386.75
<i>October</i>	150.50	172.75	154.25
<i>November</i>	83.50	91.75	91.75
<i>December</i>	74.50	132.00	34.00

1st Quarter	696.50	331.75	159.00
2nd Quarter	364.75	389.50	204.75
3rd Quarter	377.25	291.50	579.25
4th Quarter	308.50	396.50	280.00

Total Overtime Paid	2008	2009	2010
<i>January</i>	\$ 3,688.21	\$ 3,079.93	\$ 1,327.88
<i>February</i>	\$ 5,339.06	\$ 1,569.35	\$ 1,272.18
<i>March</i>	\$ 9,027.27	\$ 3,194.61	\$ 1,356.04
<i>April</i>	\$ 2,865.21	\$ 2,716.19	\$ 1,048.61
<i>May</i>	\$ 3,111.94	\$ 4,510.56	\$ 2,248.96
<i>June</i>	\$ 3,299.46	\$ 2,189.95	\$ 2,132.52
<i>July</i>	\$ 3,204.43	\$ 2,330.47	\$ 4,214.87
<i>August</i>	\$ 3,469.14	\$ 2,234.33	\$ 867.98
<i>September</i>	\$ 2,439.32	\$ 2,668.86	\$ 9,285.06
<i>October</i>	\$ 3,580.79	\$ 4,576.23	\$ 4,057.25
<i>November</i>	\$ 1,956.40	\$ 1,595.46	\$ 1,595.46
<i>December</i>	\$ 1,639.24	\$ 3,085.14	\$ 999.55

1st Quarter	\$ 18,054.54	\$ 7,843.89	\$ 3,956.10
2nd Quarter	\$ 9,276.61	\$ 9,416.70	\$ 5,430.09
3rd Quarter	\$ 9,112.89	\$ 7,233.66	\$ 14,367.91
4th Quarter	\$ 7,176.43	\$ 9,256.83	\$ 6,652.26

OVERTIME COMPARISON—10 HOUR

Overtime during 8-month trial- 2010:	\$23,754
Overtime during 8-month period- 2009:	\$26,374
Overtime during 8-month period- 2008:	\$36,445

OVERTIME COMPARISON—12 HOUR

Overtime during 4-month trial- 2010:	\$6,652
Overtime during 4-month period- 2009:	\$9,257
Overtime during 4-month period- 2008:	\$7,176

Advantages and Disadvantages of Twelve-Hour Shifts: A Balanced Perspective

Martin Moore-Ede M.D., Ph.D.,
William Davis, & William Sirois



CIRCADIAN™

24/7 WORKFORCE SOLUTIONS

2 Main Street, Suite 310
Stoneham, MA 02180 USA
tel 781-439-6300
fax 781-439-6399
info@circadian.com
www.circadian.com



ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF TWELVE-HOUR SHIFTS: A BALANCED PERSPECTIVE

INTRODUCTION

Twelve-hour shifts are still one of the most frequently debated topics in shift work management. Managers, shiftworkers, union representatives, federal regulators, corporate policy-makers, and academic experts continue to question and debate how 12-hour shifts compare to 8-hour shifts. Are they safe? What is the impact on performance, productivity and quality? What effects do they have on shiftworker alertness, health and family life? Do they cause problems for management or shiftworkers?

In our role as the leading consulting firm in shiftwork management, CIRCADIAN is frequently asked whether the concerns about 12-hour shifts are justified and whether the enthusiasm of the proponents of 12-hour shifts is merited. We are also frequently asked to help plants solve the wide range of practical issues surrounding the successful implementation and management of 12-hour shifts, not the least of which is what schedule out of the myriad of 12-hour shift schedule possibilities, is the best one for their site.

CIRCADIAN consultants have gathered a great deal of first-hand information from surveying organizations who use 12-hour shifts, to learn about the practices, policies, results and impacts. Over the last two decades, CIRCADIAN has also collected considerable data on the benefits and complications of 12-hour shifts through our work with utilities, chemical plants, oil refineries, pulp and paper mills and other industries running 24 hours, 7 days a week. During this process, we have surveyed tens of thousands of shiftworkers and conducted interviews with thousands of managers, superintendents, supervisors, shiftworkers, regulators and shift schedule specialists.

Other than laboratory studies on alertness, sleep and human performance, there has been very little scientific research to evaluate 12-hour shifts in actual industrial operations. Full scale simulation studies that we have conducted at the Institute for Circadian Physiology indicate that fatigue and loss of alertness are not increased with 12-hour schedules, as compared to 8-hour schedules. However, in reality it is almost impossible to recreate all of the variables of the workplace in a laboratory setting. Therefore, the experience and data from the workplace is the most important to consider.

We are often asked if we know of any places where 12-hour shifts failed and people returned to 8-hour shifts – and the answer is yes. In the few cases where this has occurred, it was usually a result of management making decisions without a careful consultation with the employees. As a result, the employees misunderstood and distrusted the motive for the change and did not provide the needed support to make the 12-hour shifts work. Employee support is required for any scheduling change to fully succeed, and this is true for 12-hour shifts as well, particularly when it comes to ensuring coverage for vacations and other absences. The other cause for returning to an 8 from a 12-hour shift is the use of excessive, mandatory overtime usually due to understaffing, which negates the advantage of 12's (i.e. more days and weekends off).



ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF TWELVE-HOUR SHIFTS: A BALANCED PERSPECTIVE

ADVANTAGES OF 12-HOUR SHIFTS:

A Management Perspective

The major advantages of 12-hour shifts from the management perspective, as experienced by Human Resource Managers, Shift Supervisors, Department Superintendents and Plant Managers are the following:

- **Increased productivity, reduced errors.** There are only two shift turnovers per 24-hour day instead of three. Thus, there are fewer opportunities for miscommunication when there is a changeover in shiftwork personnel. There is less disruption of ongoing operations and reduced potential for errors. Because productivity often drops significantly and error and accident rates increase in many operations during shift transition times, this simple difference between 8-hour and 12-hour shifts has been found to have a significant impact on productivity and error rates. Reducing these "high risk" low productivity and high error periods by one-third can have significant financial and efficiency benefits for the operation.
- **Increased continuity and accountability.** On most days, crew A turns the plant over to crew B at night, and then crew B turns the plant back to crew A the next morning. No one finding a problem can "pass the buck" to a third crew, as may occur with 8-hour shifts. Crews are motivated to "do as they would like to have done to them" which is to hand over and receive the plant with the problems fixed or at least identified and communicated.
- **Reduced adaptation time.** Many shiftworkers need a ramp-up period to get adjusted to each shift, i.e., adjusting monitors and organizing tools, etc. Many state that they are "in the groove" at the 8-hour point, and would rather continue than having to readjust to getting started again the next day. Twelve-hour shifts minimize the percentage of adaptation time as compared to 8-hour shifts because there are 91 fewer shifts one has to work each year.
- **Higher project completion rates.** A greater number of long tasks and projects can be completed within a shift, such as extended maintenance tasks. On 12-hour shifts, several more hours remain to accomplish the work plan; crews are able to complete more of the procedures that they begin. Most maintenance tasks require extensive lock out/tag out procedures. If the tasks are not completed by the end of the shift, substantial time is lost in preparing for a safe crew change over. This can occur 3 times a day with an 8 hour shift and only twice a day with 12 hour shifts.
- **Reduced absenteeism.** Shiftworkers often "think twice" about taking a shift off, because doing so uses 12 hours of leave time. They also tend to feel more accountable to their crew or to the person who may need to be called in on a day off for 12 hours of relief. Thus, in plants



ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF TWELVE-HOUR SHIFTS: A BALANCED PERSPECTIVE

where absenteeism is a problem, the introduction of 12-hour shifts can have a significant beneficial impact. (However, the downside of this is that supervisors have noted that some shiftworkers who should stay home because of sickness will report for their 12-hour duty shifts.) However, with more days off, there are fewer conflicts with personal and family issues that might promote absenteeism. There is more time to take care of personal needs such as doctor's appointments or a sick child. There is also a 50% chance that sickness will occur on days off, further decreasing absences and unscheduled overtime coverage, because people are only scheduled to work half the days of the year as compared to working 75% of the days with a standard 8 hour shift schedule.

- **Lower attrition and turnover.** Shiftworkers usually have less interest in transferring to other plants, to non-shiftwork positions or to other occupations. Experienced employees are usually more readily retained. The increased number of days off is too compelling an incentive to encourage a return to 8-hour workdays. In an industry-wide survey of chemical plants, 96.5% of the employees working 12-hour shifts reported no interest in changing back to an 8-hour schedule.
- **Improved morale.** Twelve-hour shifts typically prove more popular with both shiftworkers and their families. Stress is reduced, and the quality of work and home life is improved greatly.
- **More "dedicated" employees.** During their three to four consecutive days on duty while working 12-hour shifts, shiftworkers tend to concentrate more on their jobs. There is little time for much else besides working, sleeping, meals, and travel to and from work. On 12-hour workdays, employees are more likely to avoid major social events, excessive alcohol consumption or physically taxing activities in their fewer hours of free time.

A Shiftworker Perspective

Major advantages from the perspective of shiftworkers and other employees working 12-hour schedules are:

- **More days off.** On a typical 4 crew 12-hour shift schedules, shiftworkers can virtually double the number of days off per year, as compared to an equivalent 8-hour shift schedule. Thus the standard 2,184 work hours per year (42 hour average per week before factoring in vacations) can be accomplished in 182 work days instead of 273 work days with 8-hour shifts, and with 183 days off instead of 92 days off with 8-hour shifts.
- **Longer and better quality breaks.** There are typically 3 or 4 days off between blocks of work days instead of 1 or 2. Since there are so many more days off, the possibility increases of clustering them to provide extended time off without using up vacation days. It is even possible,



ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF TWELVE-HOUR SHIFTS: A BALANCED PERSPECTIVE

with some 12-hour shift schedules to provide as many as thirteen 7-day breaks per year. In some situations, we even find shiftworkers "selling back" vacation days to the company, because a substantial portion of their needs for vacation time are satisfied by the long breaks built into the schedule.

- **Fewer consecutive days worked.** Shiftworkers on 12-hour shifts typically work 2, 3 or 4 days in a row. The problems of stress and cumulative fatigue are thereby reduced, as compared to typically working 6 or 7 days in a row on 8-hour shifts.
- **Less commuting required.** Fewer days at work mean fewer days of driving to and from work. This represents substantial time saving and reduced transportation costs for employees with long commutes. For example, a 90 minute (82.5 mile) round trip commute and 91 fewer days to work per year means 136.5 fewer hours of commuting time annually (or the equivalent of seventeen 8-hour work shifts) and 7,500 fewer commuting miles. This represents \$3,338 (at 44.5 cents per mile - official government rate) in reduced transportation pre-tax costs per year. This translates into the equivalent of \$4,172.50 of gross earnings.
- **Twice as many weekend days off.** Shiftworkers typically have 2 out of 4 weekends off when working 12-hour shifts, vs. only 1 weekend off per month for most 8-hour schedules. Survey data shows that more weekend days off is a very high priority for shiftworkers and having only 1 weekend off per month keeps the shiftworkers further isolated from the rest of the Monday-to-Friday, daytime working world and his or her family.
- **Improved family and social life.** Shiftworkers often report improved family life because there are more "quality" days off to spend at home. Shiftworkers on 12-hour schedules report less irritability, more communication and better planning of family activities.
- **Improved morale.** Having more days off relieves stress and improves shiftworkers outlook and attitude. Family members can often become more supportive, further helping morale.
- **More home study time.** Shiftworkers have greater blocks of time in which to prepare for license and requalification exams, or to take extension courses. This can help shiftworkers advance their careers and speed their qualification for better paying positions.
- **More frequent "recuperation" or "recovery" days.** These recovery days occur after blocks of scheduled shifts, so shiftworkers feel more alert and energetic both on and off the job. Many shiftworkers need a recovery day, particularly after working nights, to catch up on sleep. With an 8-hour schedule these recovery days can consume most of the days off, leaving too little quality time for family and friends and preventing the shiftworker from feeling well rested and energetic.



ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF TWELVE-HOUR SHIFTS: A BALANCED PERSPECTIVE

- **Better use of vacation time.** Although there are technically fewer vacation days on 12's versus 8's, by taking only 2, 3 or 4 vacation days at the appropriate time in the cycle, it is possible to have up to 12 consecutive days off. Thus extended vacations are possible several times per year. With 8-hour shifts it takes 5 vacation days to get a week off.
- **Increased utilization of personal time.** With 12-hour shifts, shiftworkers have more consecutive days off and more total days off. They report that they are able to get more done at home, take care of more personal business and shopping during the week, and schedule more family and social events. With 8-hour schedules, there are seldom enough consolidated blocks of time for extended home projects and social activities.
- **Elimination of double shifts and/or holdovers.** Sixteen-hour shifts on short notice (back-to-back 8 -hour shifts) to cover for absences can be eliminated. On 12-hour shifts, shiftworkers usually know exactly how long they will be working, and they can prepare and pace themselves accordingly. This benefit is offset by the degree to which workers get called in unexpectedly on their days off to cover a 12-hour shift, which in turn depends upon the success of their voluntary overtime sign up list as well as overall plant staffing levels.
- **Little effect on overtime opportunities.** For continuous operations, 12-hour shift schedules do not add to or reduce the amount of real overtime required. In 24/7 operations, overtime is a function of staffing level rather than the shift schedule, since all positions have to be filled regardless of shift length.
- **Elimination of evening shifts.** The least desired shift on an 8-hour schedule is usually the evening shift which keeps the shiftworkers isolated from family and friends for extended periods of time. 12-hour shifts minimize this problem because shift changeover times usually allow more contact with the family in the evenings. For example, a typical 8-hour evening shift runs between 3-11 p.m. and provides little to no family time in the evening. In comparison, a typical 12-hour schedule has shift start times between 6-8 a.m. and 6-8 p.m. Thus, most shiftworkers can spend some amount of quality time with their family either before or after the shift.



ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF TWELVE-HOUR SHIFTS: A BALANCED PERSPECTIVE

DISADVANTAGES OF 12-HOUR SHIFTS:

A management perspective

The major disadvantages of 12-hour shifts from a management perspective are:

- **Greater challenge to sustain vigilance.** Twelve hours may simply be too long for someone on monitor duty to maintain constant vigilance. A machine or console operator whose sole responsibility is to monitor a process for 12 hours may be approaching or going beyond the limits of his or her ability to maintain complete effectiveness. However, this is an intuitive concern, and there is actually no hard scientific data that substantiates this perception. Moreover, survey and anecdotal feedback to date do not indicate any problems for most jobs, the exception being for extremely physically demanding jobs with high task repetitions. Possible solutions in these cases include introducing less physical tasks or rotating job assignments during shifts between crew members, or re-engineering the job or work station.
- **Extended exposure to work-related stress.** For certain shiftworkers on control room duty, the day shift often provides high demands of work related activity and distraction, and involves a high number of interactions with maintenance, instrumentation engineers, contractors and other support staff who work straight day shifts. This is especially true on week days. Twelve continuous hours may be a long time for a control room operator to deal with the stress associated with these conditions. While 4 consecutive 12-hour day shifts could be particularly fatiguing and stressful, reports to date have indicated only isolated problems in this area despite widespread conversion to 12-hour schedules.
- **Diminished communication and/or personal interaction.** Management personnel have less opportunity for interaction with crews working 12-hour shifts. Rotating 12-hour shiftworkers may only be on day shift duty for seven days during each 28 day cycle, thus decreasing exposure to day management. Shiftworkers' contacts with training staff and their availability for meetings involving management, human resources, medical and other personnel may also be reduced. Management may have to be more flexible with their own work hours in order to achieve the desired employee interaction.
- **Unequal distribution of work hours.** Over each 7-day pay period 12-hour schedules vary between 48-and-36-hour work weeks. Since Federal Law requires overtime pay for more than 40 hours work in a week, an adjustment in payroll structure and base pay rates may be required to maintain cost neutrality. Existing collective bargaining agreements can complicate this process, although this has been readily resolved with provisionary amendment letters based on mutual agreement.



ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF TWELVE-HOUR SHIFTS: A BALANCED PERSPECTIVE

- **Increased risk of getting out of touch.** Long breaks away from the plant may be good for shiftworker's personal life, but not necessarily for plant operations. Too many consecutive days off may result in decreased familiarity with changes in the operation, and shiftworkers may need a period of readjustment after returning from a long break. They may need to re-familiarize themselves more often with the "big picture" of plant operations after long breaks to ensure operational "continuity."
- **Potential compromise in alertness and performance.** Shiftworkers may be willing to compromise their alertness and performance on the job in order to get more consecutive days off. Some shiftworkers can lose their objectivity concerning the potential drawbacks of 12-hour shifts, although there are few reports to date of reduced performance with 12-hour schedules.
- **Increased "moonlighting".** The concern that some shiftworkers will use the extra days off provided by 12-hour shifts to take second jobs, especially physically demanding construction and farming jobs, has created the perception that this will undermine the advantage of recovery days. The reality is that only 7 - 10% of shiftworkers engage in this practice, and that they tend to be the most productive workers because they are highly motivated individuals.
- **Increased ergonomic risk.** Potential injury problems may occur with shiftworkers who have physically demanding jobs. Although these "hands on" jobs now comprise only 16% of the total workforce, the strain of working such jobs on a 12-hour shift instead of an 8-hour shift could potentially increase physical complaints, such as back trouble and carpal tunnel syndrome. Job processes and job rotation might have to be reexamined and altered in order to reduce the physical strain on employees. Ergonomics issues need to be identified and addressed. Again, this has rarely been reflected in actual experience, but represents a legitimate concern for some jobs.
- **More difficult absence coverage.** Since it is not advisable to assign shiftworkers overtime hours on scheduled work days, and thereby lengthen the work days beyond 12 hours, it is necessary to establish procedures to cover unexpected absences. Depending upon the effectiveness of methods such as a volunteer overtime list supported with a scheduled (annual) call-out list, coverage for vacations and absences can become more difficult, as can scheduling for training and planned overtime.
- **Difficulties of change.** The selection and conversion to any new schedule is complex and time consuming. Effort by management to educate shift workers on the many issues associated with 12-hour shifts is often necessary to ensure informed decision-making, help ease the transition, and improve worker morale.



ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF TWELVE-HOUR SHIFTS: A BALANCED PERSPECTIVE

A shiftworker perspective

- **Limited family and social time during working days.** Shiftworkers may have less opportunity to see their spouses and children on working days. Child care and day care conflicts may also occur, since many babysitters may be unable to extend their hours and the hours of child care facilities do not correspond with shift schedules. Single workers may find it more difficult to schedule dates and activities with friends.
- **Sleep schedule inflexibility.** Hours away from work during a work day are limited, so a shiftworker's optimal timing and amount of sleep may be a challenge to achieve. Sleep schedule disruption can potentially occur because of the reduced flexibility for sleep time. In contrast, on an 8-hour schedule, night shift workers can choose to sleep in the morning when they return home or stay up in the morning and sleep later in the day, depending on their sleep physiology. Twelve-hour shiftworkers do not have this flexibility, and when working nights they need to condition themselves to sleep in the morning and into the early afternoon.
- **Irregular pay weeks.** Most 12-hour schedules have alternating pay weeks of 36 and 48 hours. This can make it more difficult for a worker to budget his or her finances, since most people plan their finances based on a 40 hour week.
- **Concerns of older workers.** Older shiftworkers respond less favorably toward 12-hour shifts than younger workers. Many older workers are less enthusiastic about making any schedule changes, because this may disrupt their established work and social routines. They may also feel that 12 hours is simply too long for a regularly scheduled work period. In fact, it is physiologically more difficult for someone in their mid 50's or 60's to sustain vigilance for longer periods of time than it is for someone younger. There also may be fewer reasons for the older shiftworker to want to compress the work week by working longer hours; i.e., they no longer have children living at home, and frequent vacations or long breaks may be less important.
- **Reduced tolerance of long commutes.** With a 1-hour commute to work (each way), the actual time away from home for the shiftworker may approach 14 hours or more. This leaves time for sleeping and meals and little else. Daily recreational activity and exercise regimens may be compromised. Distance from home to the plant may thus become more important on 12-hour shifts.
- **Difficulties in scheduling meetings.** Twelve hours is typically as long as most workers want to be on-site. Thus, if shiftworkers are asked to stay over after the night shift for training or plant meetings, the workday may be unacceptably lengthened. Consequently, many employers with 12-hour schedules conduct training and other meetings on "scheduled days off." Survey data and anecdotal information suggests that the majority of shiftworkers prefer coming in on days off for meetings (rather than staying after a shift), as long as the meetings are



ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF TWELVE-HOUR SHIFTS: A BALANCED PERSPECTIVE

planned well in advance, don't last more than four hours, and occur no more than once during a four week period.

- **Reduced tolerance to physically demanding jobs.** Such jobs can be more difficult on 12-hour shifts. Unless countermeasures are taken to alleviate the problem, there may be an increase in work-related injuries and a rise in general discomfort, such as aching feet and backs. Solutions include reworking certain job processes or rotating jobs during a shift, and many physical complaints are mitigated by the increased number of recovery days.
- **More pay lost when a day is missed.** On occasions when shiftworkers take an unpaid day off, they may lose the equivalent of 33% more pay during their absence as compared to 8-hour shifts. This magnifies their personal financial loss from absences. However, the increased number of days off means that sickness has a better than 50% likelihood of occurring during a day off, instead of on a work day.
- **Driver fatigue returning home.** Drowsiness when driving is always a concern, since it is not uncommon for workers on any type of schedule to feel drowsy or to "fight" sleep while driving home. The already difficult task of staying awake while driving home after working an 8-hour midnight shift might be assumed to be even more difficult after working a 12-hour shift. However, this concern is linked much more strongly to the time of day of commuting than to the length of the shift. Thus alertness training and other precautions can help reduce the risk of driver fatigue.
- **Fast-rotating 12-hour schedules.** Certain schedules can cause sleep problems when "flip-flopping" from nights to days, because it's hard for one's body to adjust to frequent changes. This problem can be minimized with a well-designed, biocompatible schedule that provides for sufficient recovery time between rotations.
- **Longer hours away from home in the evenings.** Extended work hours may be undesirable from the standpoint of family and home security. Watchdogs, alarm systems, and networks of telephone friends can alleviate these concerns.
- **Increased percentage of night shifts.** Instead of only one-third of work shifts being night shifts on an 8-hour schedule, one-half of the shifts are night shifts on a 12-hour schedule. This is of course counterbalanced by the reduced number of shifts worked, and also by the fact that half of the work time will occur during the day shift.



ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF TWELVE-HOUR SHIFTS: A BALANCED PERSPECTIVE

SUMMARY OF FEATURES FOR
8 AND 12-HOUR SHIFT SCHEDULES

Feature	8-Hour Shift	Combination 8 & 12	12-Hour Shifts
Consecutive shifts	5, 6, or 7	5, 6, or 7	2, 3, or 4
Length of breaks	1-4 days	2-6 days	2-8 days
Frequency of breaks	Every 5-7 days	Every 5-7 days	Every 2-4 days
Direction of rotation	Forward/Reverse	Forward/Reverse	Many
Speed of rotation	Fast or Slow	Fast or Slow	Many
Fixed shift possibilities	Few	Few	Many
# of shifts worked a year	274	248	182.5
Total days off a year	91	117	182.5
# of days worked/cycle	21/28	19/28	14/28
# of days off/cycle	7/28	9/28	14/28
Weekends off/year	6-13	26	26
# of days between weekend time off	25-91	18-40	11-35
Total hours worked a year	2184	2184	2184
Average hours worked a week	42	42	42



ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF TWELVE-HOUR SHIFTS: A BALANCED PERSPECTIVE

CONCLUSION

The assessment of the merits of 12- vs. 8-hour shift schedules is a complex issue that does not have a simple answer. Clearly, there are compelling advantages for 12-hour schedules such as more time off and more weekend days off, but these are balanced by the longer working days and the questions of mental and physical fatigue. Nevertheless, the growing trend towards conversion to 12-hour schedules in most continuous, round-the-clock operations has had positive results. In fact, 12-hour shift schedules have proven to be safe, productive, and agreeable to most shiftworkers who have made the conversion from conventional 8-hour shifts. For example, in an industry-wide survey of chemical plants in the US, 96% of all shiftworkers who have converted to 12-hour schedules reported that they would not want to return to an 8-hour schedule.

Nevertheless, 12-hour shift schedules are not for everybody and not for every situation. Jobs that require heavy physical labor may not be desirable due to the possibility of fatigue and ergonomic injuries. Similarly, 12-hour schedules may be harder on older work groups and those who have to commute long distances. Moreover, there are certain types of 12-hour schedules that are extremely difficult to adapt to in terms of circadian (sleep/wake) physiology. All 12-hour schedules are not created equal, so it is extremely important to take the time and effort necessary to determine the best possible schedule for your given shiftwork population. In the final analysis any schedule (8, 10's or 12's) is most effective when "owned" by the employees who have to work it.

In any rescheduling endeavor, the key objective is to achieve the "best" schedule. This requires providing appropriate education to the workforce to ensure that informed decisions can be made, and then involving your employees in the selection process. It is also critical that all options and alternatives (i.e. 8's, 12's, and combinations of 8 and 12-hour shifts) be thoroughly evaluated by both management and the hourly employees who have to work the new schedule. With employee involvement, it is possible to achieve a win-win situation in which the company can achieve a positive improvement in employee morale, performance and operating efficiency, while shiftworkers can enjoy the benefits that an "optimum" shift schedule can provide for their health, safety, and quality of life.

Circadian Technologies, Inc. has been helping 24/7 operations and their workers resolve these scheduling issues for over 25 years. Over that period Circadian has developed a proven approach for determining the best schedule for any given workforce. If you are interested in learning more about shift scheduling, please visit www.circadian.com, email us at info@circadian.com or call Circadian at 1-800-284-5001.



ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF TWELVE-HOUR SHIFTS: A BALANCED PERSPECTIVE

ABOUT THE AUTHORS:

Dr. Martin Moore-Ede is recognized as a world leading authority and visionary on how businesses can compete successfully, and assure their employees thrive, in the emerging 24/7 economy. As a professor at Harvard Medical School he pioneered the research on how to adapt the human body to working around the clock. As founder and CEO of Circadian Technologies, Dr. Moore-Ede lectures and consults business leaders and managers around the world on the extraordinary rewards that can be gained by executing 24/7 operations with excellence.

He has published over 145 scientific articles and 10 books on the human aspects of 24/7 operations. Dr. Moore-Ede's best-selling book *The Twenty-Four-Hour Society: Understanding Human Limits in a World That Never Stops*, has been published in the United States, United Kingdom, Germany, Australia, Japan and China.

He has appeared on the CBS Evening News, Good Morning America, Today, CNN Business News, 20/20, Dateline, Oprah, and BBC-TV and PBS documentaries. He has also received numerous academic honors and awards, including recognition as one of the outstanding teachers at Harvard Medical School. Dr. Moore-Ede received his medical degrees from the University of London and Guy's Hospital Medical School, and his Ph.D. in Physiology from Harvard University.

William (Bill) Davis joined Circadian Technologies as a former client and now serves as Vice President of Operations. He is an industrial safety manager with a broad-based and unique operational background that spans nearly 20 years. This has included production experience at the facility, divisional and corporate levels at International Paper and other leading pulp & paper companies.

Beginning as a shiftworker in the Pennsylvanian steel mills, Bill has held both plant management and corporate safety positions in the paper and specialty board industries. He has extensive experience working with a variety of unions and governmental safety and health regulatory agencies, as well as first-hand experience with high performance & self-directed work environments. His real-world industrial background affords a natural rapport with managers, union representatives and employees at all organizational levels.

William (Bill) Sirois is Senior Vice President and Chief Operating Officer for Circadian Technologies. Bill has a Chemical Engineering and Ergonomics background, with more than three decades of industrial management and consulting experience in the areas of health, safety and productivity. He has published numerous articles on shiftwork and is internationally recognized as an expert in workforce management. Bill is a frequent speaker at national and international conferences, and is often quoted in the Wall Street Journal and a wide range of industrial trade publications.

Having been a former shiftworker in chemical and plastic plant operations, Bill is well acquainted with the effects of shiftwork and shift schedules on fatigue, human error, and impaired performance.



ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF TWELVE-HOUR SHIFTS: A BALANCED PERSPECTIVE

ABOUT CIRCADIAN™

CIRCADIAN™ is the global leader in providing 24/7 workforce performance and safety solutions for businesses that operate around the clock. Through a unique combination of consulting expertise, research, software tools and informative publications, CIRCADIAN helps organizations in the 24-hour economy optimize employee performance and reduce the inherent risks and costs of their extended hours operations.

Working from offices in North America, Europe and Asia, CIRCADIAN experts ensure that over half the Fortune 500, and other leading international companies, thrive in the global 24/7 economy. CIRCADIAN's core expertise is the staffing, scheduling, training and risk management of their most vital asset – the 24/7 workforce.

Founded in 1983 by Dr. Martin Moore-Ede, a former professor at Harvard Medical School and author of the best-selling book *"The Twenty-Four Hour Society"*, CIRCADIAN has led the development of innovative new technologies and tools to enable employees to successfully adapt to today's high performance 24/7 workplace.

Publisher's Notes:

Authors: Martin Moore-Ede, M.D., Ph.D., William Davis & William Sirois
 Editor: Andrew Moore-Ede
 Publisher: Circadian Information LP

THIRD EDITION

Copyright © 2007 by Circadian Information Limited Partnership, a member of the international network of CIRCADIAN™ companies each of which is a separate and independent legal entity. All rights reserved. It is illegal to photocopy, scan, fax or otherwise reproduce the information in this report without the written permission of the publisher.

Circadian Information provides information and publications on scheduling, training, and other services for 24-hour operations.

CIRCADIAN™
 2 Main Street, Suite 310
 Stoneham, MA 02180 USA
 Tel 781-439-6300
 Fax 781-439-6399
 info@circadian.com
 www.circadian.com

Shift Scheduling: *Does Shift Length Matter?*

Annual Conference of the
International Association
of Chiefs of Police

by:
Karen L. Amendola, Ph.D.
Principal Investigator



October 24, 2010



Research Team

Karen L. Amendola, PhD

Police Foundation

David Weisburd, PhD

Hebrew University

George Mason University

Police Foundation

Edwin E. Hamilton, MA

Greg Jones, MA

Meghan Slipka, MA

Police Foundation

With:

Anneke Heitmann, PhD

Awake Institute, LLC

Jon Shane, PhD

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Christopher Ortiz, PhD

New York Institute of Technology

The National Study

- Funded by the National Institute of Justice (U.S. Department of Justice)
- Consisted of two phases:
 1. A national random survey of 300 agencies
 2. An experimental study in Detroit, Michigan and Arlington, Texas



Surveyed 300 agencies randomly: 2005 & 2009 (Results)

Agencies are moving away from 8-hour shifts.

2005 (n = 287)			
8 hour	10 hour	12 hour	Other
40%	27%	24%	9%
2009 (n = 300)			
29%	23%	27%	22%

Does it make sense to do so?????????

Survey Results: Agency Size Matters! 2005 & 2009

# Sworn Officers	Total*	8 hr	10 hr	12 hr	Total*	8 hr	10 hr	12 hr
50-100	165	68	37	47	149	47	30	49
101 – 200	82	34	27	16	84	22	19	22
201+	40	13	14	6	45	11	15	5
Total	287	115 (40%)	78 (27%)	69 (24%)	278	80 (29%)	64 (23%)	76 (27%)

Time 1: a) No response = 11
 b) < 50 officers = 2
 c) 25 had hybrids--either:
 -9 hour = 5 (2%)
 -11 hour = 3 (1%) or
 -mixed-length shifts = 17 (6%)

Time 2: a) No response = 0
 b) < 59 officers = 22 (*shrinking budgets??*)
 c) 62 had hybrids--either:
 -9 hour = 14 (5%)
 -11 hour = 16 (6%) or
 -mixed-length shifts 32 (12%)

Additional Results

- ❖ There has been a significant reduction in agencies with rotating shifts (46% down to 23%) in favor of fixed shifts (54% up to 72%)!
- ❖ But, in many agencies where they reported they used rotating shifts, the rotations were 6 or 12 months.
 - ❖ 2005 = 7
 - ❖ 2009 = 2

Research Question

Does *shift length* (8-, 10-, or 12-hours) matter when considering various outcomes such as performance and safety, health, quality of life, sleep, fatigue, or extra-duty employment?

Randomized Design

(n = 252)

		Detroit, MI (N = 117)			Arlington, TX (N = 135)		
Length ↓	Schedule →	D	E	M	D	E	M
8 hour shift		13	13	13	15	15	15
10 hour shift		13	13	13	15	15	15
12 hour shift		13	13	13	15	15	15

Measures

Performance Data

- ***Laboratory simulations:*** Driving, shooting, reaction time, interpersonal performance, pupil measure to assess fatigue
- ***Departmental Data:*** Accidents, injuries, sick leave, self-initiated police activity (stops, arrests, field reports, etc.)

Self Report Data

- ***Survey*** including validated measures of stress; quality of work life; work-family conflict; health; sleep disorders; sleepiness; etc.
- ***Sleep diaries and alertness logs***

Shooting Simulator



Pupilometer: Fitness Impairment Tester



Driving Simulator: STISIM



Communication Video Simulations B-PAD



Reaction Time: Psychomotor Vigilance Test





RESULTS

Performance Measures:

Shift Length Does Not Matter!

Performance Simulations	Does it Matter?
Driving Performance	NO
Shooting Performance	NO
Self-Initiated Activity	NO
Interpersonal Behavior	NO
Reaction Time	NO

Departmental Performance

Measures:

Shift Length Does Not Matter!

Departmental Performance	Does it Matter?
Days Sick	NO
Days Injured	NO
Accidents	NO
Failure to Appear at Court	NO
Complaints	NO

Health Measures:

Shift Length Does Not Matter!

Health	Does it Matter?
Work Stress	NO
Gastrointestinal Problems	NO
Cardiovascular Problems	NO

Quality of Life:

Does it Matter? Yes and No

TYPE	8 hour	10 hour	12 hour
Work Life	Lowest	Highest	
Personal Life	Not significantly different from each other, but those on 8-hour shifts reported more work-family conflict than the others		

Sleep:

Does it Matter? Yes and No

	8 hour	10 hour	12 hour	Does it matter?
Amount	7.35 hrs. Least	7.86 hrs. Most	7.55 hrs.	Yes
Quality	No significant differences			No
Disorders	Slightly fewer*	Equal amount		No

*** But not significantly different**

Fatigue and Alertness: *Does it Matter?*

Answer: It depends on how it is measured

	8 hour	10 hour	12 hour	Does it matter?
Fatigue	About the same		Most fatigued	YES
Alertness	About the same		Least alert	YES

However, fatigue as assessed objectively by saccadic velocity (Fitness Impairment Tester) and reaction time (Psychomotor Vigilance Test) did not result in statistically significant differences across groups.

Extra-Duty Employment:

Does it Matter? Yes and No

TYPE	8 hour	10 hour	12 hour	Does it matter?
Off-duty	6.83 hrs.	5.32 hrs.	7.52 hrs.	NO
Overtime	5.70 hrs. MOST	.87 hrs. LEAST	3.26 hrs.	YES

Based on a two week period

Conclusions

- No meaningful differences for performance or health based on shift length.
- 8 hour shifts do not appear to result in better performance, greater safety, or better health.
 - May result in increased overtime.
 - Can lead to less average sleep per night.
 - However, they are associated with the **least** amount of fatigue and the **highest levels** of alertness while working.
- Some potential disadvantages of 12 hour shifts
 - Increased fatigue and decreased alertness.
- 10 hour shifts have important advantages, and no noted disadvantages.
 - More sleep, greater quality of work life/satisfaction.
 - Less overtime.

Policy Implications

- Our research suggests that moving to longer shifts is *not likely* to pose significant safety or health risks, or result in worsened performance.
- Based on this research, 10 hour shifts *may be* a viable and more beneficial alternative to 8 hour shifts in larger agencies.
- In larger agencies, some caution should be exercised when considering 12 hour shifts due to greater reported fatigue, and lower alertness while working which could potentially impact safety.

CONSENT AGENDA

A. REVENUE and EXPENSE FINANCIAL SUMMARIES for JANUARY 2011

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Staff recommends motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

CONSENT AGENDA

B. REVENUE and EXPENSE FINANCIAL SUMMARIES for JANUARY 2011

- *GENERAL FUND*
- *EMPLOYEE BENEFITS FUND*
- *LIBRARY*
- *SPECIAL HIGHWAY*
- *EMERGENCY EQUIPMENT RESERVE*
- *BOND AND INTEREST*
- *WATER OPERATING*
- *STORMWATER OPERATING*
- *SEWER OPERATING*

2-23-2011 04:12 PM

CITY OF VALLEY CENTER
REVENUE & EXPENSE REPORT (UNAUDITED)
AS OF: JANUARY 31ST, 2011

PAGE: 1

010-GENERAL FUND
FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	CURRENT BUDGET	CURRENT PERIOD	PRIOR YEAR PO ADJUST.	Y-T-D ACTUAL	Y-T-D ENCUMBRANCE	BUDGET BALANCE	% OF BUDGET
<u>REVENUE SUMMARY</u>							
TAXES	927,350.00	407,821.09	0.00	407,821.09	0.00	519,528.91	43.98
INTERGOVERNMENTAL	470,500.00	37,127.05	0.00	37,127.05	0.00	433,372.95	7.89
LICENSES & PERMITS	476,750.00	33,400.88	0.00	33,400.88	0.00	443,349.12	7.01
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	6,900.00	2,400.00	0.00	2,400.00	0.00	4,500.00	34.78
FINES & FORFEITURES	65,000.00	8,450.45	0.00	8,450.45	0.00	56,549.55	13.00
USE OF MONEY & PROPERTY	21,200.00	680.00	0.00	680.00	0.00	20,520.00	3.21
OTHER REVENUES	60,000.00	101.93	0.00	101.93	0.00	59,898.07	0.17
MISCELLANEOUS	142,000.00	327.00	0.00	327.00	0.00	141,673.00	0.23
MISCELLANEOUS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL REVENUES	2,169,700.00	490,308.40	0.00	490,308.40	0.00	1,679,391.60	22.60
<u>EXPENDITURE SUMMARY</u>							
<u>ADMINISTRATION</u>							
PERSONNEL SERV. & BENEF.	228,000.00	18,732.78	0.00	18,732.78	0.00	209,267.22	8.22
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	148,095.00	1,995.34	0.00	1,995.34	5,177.67	140,921.99	4.84
COMMODITIES	9,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9,000.00	0.00
CAPITAL OUTLAY	17,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	17,000.00	0.00
OTHER COSTS/MISC.	106,000.00	3,987.26	0.00	3,987.26	0.00	102,012.74	3.76
DEBT SERVICE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL ADMINISTRATION	508,095.00	24,715.38	0.00	24,715.38	5,177.67	478,201.95	5.88
<u>LEGAL & MUNICIPAL COURT</u>							
PERSONNEL SERV. & BENEF.	89,325.00	4,804.05	0.00	4,804.05	0.00	84,520.95	5.38
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	16,270.00	195.95	0.00	195.95	497.98	15,576.07	4.27
COMMODITIES	850.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	750.00	11.76
CAPITAL OUTLAY	300.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	300.00	0.00
OTHER COSTS/MISC.	25,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25,000.00	0.00
DEBT SERVICE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL LEGAL & MUNICIPAL COURT	131,745.00	5,000.00	0.00	5,000.00	597.98	126,147.02	4.25
<u>COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT</u>							
PERSONNEL SERV. & BENEF.	54,075.00	12,119.85	0.00	12,119.85	0.00	41,955.15	22.41
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	29,800.00	7,100.65	0.00	7,100.65	13.95	22,685.40	23.87
COMMODITIES	500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	500.00	0.00
CAPITAL OUTLAY	3,000.00	(11,650.00)	0.00	(11,650.00)	3,162.50	11,487.50	282.92-
OTHER COSTS/MISC.	15,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15,000.00	0.00
DEBT SERVICE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	102,375.00	7,570.50	0.00	7,570.50	3,176.45	91,628.05	10.50

2-23-2011 04:12 PM

CITY OF VALLEY CENTER
 REVENUE & EXPENSE REPORT (UNAUDITED)
 AS OF: JANUARY 31ST, 2011

PAGE: 4

010-GENERAL FUND
 FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	CURRENT BUDGET	CURRENT PERIOD	PRIOR YEAR PO ADJUST.	Y-T-D ACTUAL	Y-T-D ENCUMBRANCE	BUDGET BALANCE	% OF BUDGET
PUBLIC WKS STORAGE BLDG							
PERSONNEL SERV. & BENEF.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
COMMODITIES	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
CAPITAL OUTLAY	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
OTHER COSTS/MISC.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
DEBT SERVICE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL PUBLIC WKS STORAGE BLDG	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	2,266,985.00	143,355.95	0.00	143,355.95	15,723.62	2,107,905.43	7.02
** REVENUE OVER(UNDER) EXPENDITURES *(97,285.00)	346,952.45	0.00	346,952.45	(15,723.62)	(428,513.83	340.47-
OTHER FINANCING (USES)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
NET OTHER SOURCES/(USES)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
REVENUE & OTHER SOURCES OVER/ (UNDER) EXPENDITURES & OTHER (USES) (97,285.00)	346,952.45	0.00	346,952.45	(15,723.62)	(428,513.83	340.47-

2-23-2011 04:12 PM

CITY OF VALLEY CENTER
REVENUE & EXPENSE REPORT (UNAUDITED)
AS OF: JANUARY 31ST, 2011

PAGE: 1

110-EMPLOYEE BENEFITS
FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	CURRENT BUDGET	CURRENT PERIOD	PRIOR YEAR PO ADJUST.	Y-T-D ACTUAL	Y-T-D ENCUMBRANCE	BUDGET BALANCE	% OF BUDGET
<u>REVENUE SUMMARY</u>							
TAXES	639,120.00	286,149.91	0.00	286,149.91	0.00	352,970.09	44.77
USE OF MONEY & PROPERTY	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
OTHER REVENUES	15,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15,000.00	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL REVENUES	654,120.00	286,149.91	0.00	286,149.91	0.00	367,970.09	43.75
<u>EXPENDITURE SUMMARY</u>							
<u>NON-DEPARTMENTAL</u>							
PERSONNEL SERV. & BENEF.	608,825.00	40,658.91	0.00	40,658.91	31,573.28	536,592.81	11.86
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
COMMODITIES	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
CAPITAL OUTLAY	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
OTHER COSTS/MISC.	30,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30,000.00	0.00
DEBT SERVICE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL NON-DEPARTMENTAL	638,825.00	40,658.91	0.00	40,658.91	31,573.28	566,592.81	11.31
<u>ADMINISTRATION</u>							
PERSONNEL SERV. & BENEF.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
COMMODITIES	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
CAPITAL OUTLAY	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
OTHER COSTS/MISC.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
DEBT SERVICE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL ADMINISTRATION	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	638,825.00	40,658.91	0.00	40,658.91	31,573.28	566,592.81	11.31
** REVENUE OVER(UNDER) EXPENDITURES **	15,295.00	245,491.00	0.00	245,491.00	(31,573.28)	(198,622.721,398.61	
OTHER FINANCING (USES)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
NET OTHER SOURCES/(USES)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
REVENUE & OTHER SOURCES OVER/ (UNDER) EXPENDITURES & OTHER (USES)	15,295.00	245,491.00	0.00	245,491.00	(31,573.28)	(198,622.721,398.61	

2-23-2011 04:12 PM

CITY OF VALLEY CENTER
 REVENUE & EXPENSE REPORT (UNAUDITED)
 AS OF: JANUARY 31ST, 2011

PAGE: 1

140-LIBRARY
 FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	CURRENT BUDGET	CURRENT PERIOD	PRIOR YEAR PO ADJUST.	Y-T-D ACTUAL	Y-T-D ENCUMBRANCE	BUDGET BALANCE	% OF BUDGET
<u>REVENUE SUMMARY</u>							
TAXES	226,900.00	100,527.24	0.00	100,527.24	0.00	126,372.76	44.30
USE OF MONEY & PROPERTY	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL REVENUES	226,900.00	100,527.24	0.00	100,527.24	0.00	126,372.76	44.30
<u>EXPENDITURE SUMMARY</u>							
<u>NON-DEPARTMENTAL</u>							
OTHER COSTS/MISC.	225,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	225,000.00	0.00
DEBT SERVICE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL NON-DEPARTMENTAL	225,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	225,000.00	0.00
<u>ADMINISTRATION</u>							
CAPITAL OUTLAY	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
OTHER COSTS/MISC.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
DEBT SERVICE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL ADMINISTRATION	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	225,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	225,000.00	0.00
** REVENUE OVER(UNDER) EXPENDITURES **	1,900.00	100,527.24	0.00	100,527.24	0.00	(98,627.245,290.91	
OTHER FINANCING (USES)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
NET OTHER SOURCES/(USES)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
REVENUE & OTHER SOURCES OVER/ (UNDER) EXPENDITURES & OTHER (USES)	1,900.00	100,527.24	0.00	100,527.24	0.00	(98,627.245,290.91	

2-23-2011 04:12 PM

CITY OF VALLEY CENTER
 REVENUE & EXPENSE REPORT (UNAUDITED)
 AS OF: JANUARY 31ST, 2011

PAGE: 1

150-SPECIAL HIGHWAY
 FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	CURRENT BUDGET	CURRENT PERIOD	PRIOR YEAR PO ADJUST.	Y-T-D ACTUAL	Y-T-D ENCUMBRANCE	BUDGET BALANCE	% OF BUDGET
<u>REVENUE SUMMARY</u>							
TAXES	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
INTERGOVERNMENTAL	718,950.00	82,670.69	0.00	82,670.69	0.00	636,279.31	11.50
USE OF MONEY & PROPERTY	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
OTHER REVENUES	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS	60,500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	60,500.00	0.00
TOTAL REVENUES	779,450.00	82,670.69	0.00	82,670.69	0.00	696,779.31	10.61
<u>EXPENDITURE SUMMARY</u>							
<u>NON-DEPARTMENTAL</u>							
PERSONNEL SERV. & BENEF.	222,500.00	20,473.19	0.00	20,473.19	2,551.98	199,474.83	10.35
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	47,100.00	5.69	0.00	5.69	24.63	47,069.68	0.06
COMMODITIES	75,300.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,068.43	74,231.57	1.42
CAPITAL OUTLAY	398,500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	398,500.00	0.00
OTHER COSTS/MISC.	71,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	71,000.00	0.00
DEBT SERVICE	10,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10,000.00	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL NON-DEPARTMENTAL	824,400.00	20,478.88	0.00	20,478.88	3,645.04	800,276.08	2.93
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	824,400.00	20,478.88	0.00	20,478.88	3,645.04	800,276.08	2.93
** REVENUE OVER(UNDER) EXPENDITURES *(44,950.00)	62,191.81	0.00	62,191.81 (3,645.04)(103,496.77	130.25-
OTHER FINANCING (USES)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
NET OTHER SOURCES/(USES)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
REVENUE & OTHER SOURCES OVER/ (UNDER) EXPENDITURES & OTHER (USES) (44,950.00)	62,191.81	0.00	62,191.81 (3,645.04)(103,496.77	130.25-

2-23-2011 04:12 PM

CITY OF VALLEY CENTER
 REVENUE & EXPENSE REPORT (UNAUDITED)
 AS OF: JANUARY 31ST, 2011

PAGE: 1

160-EMERGENCY EQUIPMENT
 FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	CURRENT BUDGET	CURRENT PERIOD	PRIOR YEAR PO ADJUST.	Y-T-D ACTUAL	Y-T-D ENCUMBRANCE	BUDGET BALANCE	% OF BUDGET
<u>REVENUE SUMMARY</u>							
TAXES	49,910.00	22,332.35	0.00	22,332.35	0.00	27,577.65	44.75
OTHER REVENUES	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL REVENUES	49,910.00	22,332.35	0.00	22,332.35	0.00	27,577.65	44.75
<u>EXPENDITURE SUMMARY</u>							
<u>NON-DEPARTMENTAL</u>							
CAPITAL OUTLAY	54,000.00	46,510.38	0.00	46,510.38	0.00	7,489.62	86.13
OTHER COSTS/MISC.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
DEBT SERVICE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL NON-DEPARTMENTAL	54,000.00	46,510.38	0.00	46,510.38	0.00	7,489.62	86.13
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	54,000.00	46,510.38	0.00	46,510.38	0.00	7,489.62	86.13
** REVENUE OVER(UNDER) EXPENDITURES *(4,090.00)	(24,178.03)	0.00	(24,178.03)	0.00	20,088.03	591.15
OTHER FINANCING (USES)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
NET OTHER SOURCES/(USES)	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
REVENUE & OTHER SOURCES OVER/ (UNDER) EXPENDITURES & OTHER (USES) (4,090.00)	(24,178.03)	0.00	(24,178.03)	0.00	20,088.03	591.15

2-23-2011 04:12 PM

CITY OF VALLEY CENTER
 REVENUE & EXPENSE REPORT (UNAUDITED)
 AS OF: JANUARY 31ST, 2011

PAGE: 1

410-BOND & INTEREST
 FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	CURRENT BUDGET	CURRENT PERIOD	PRIOR YEAR PO ADJUST.	Y-T-D ACTUAL	Y-T-D ENCUMBRANCE	BUDGET BALANCE	% OF BUDGET
<u>REVENUE SUMMARY</u>							
TAXES	729,961.00	266,693.41	0.00	266,693.41	0.00	463,267.59	36.54
USE OF MONEY & PROPERTY	2,500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,500.00	0.00
OTHER REVENUES	793,000.00	343,851.68	0.00	343,851.68	0.00	449,148.32	43.36
MISCELLANEOUS	98,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	98,000.00	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MISC TRANSFERS	30,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	30,000.00	0.00
MISC TRANSFERS	180,500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	180,500.00	0.00
TOTAL REVENUES	1,833,961.00	610,545.09	0.00	610,545.09	0.00	1,223,415.91	33.29
<u>EXPENDITURE SUMMARY</u>							
<u>NON-DEPARTMENTAL</u>							
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	5,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5,000.00	0.00
COMMODITIES	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
CAPITAL OUTLAY	125,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	125,000.00	0.00
OTHER COSTS/MISC.	100,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100,000.00	0.00
DEBT SERVICE	1,641,700.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,641,700.00	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL NON-DEPARTMENTAL	1,871,700.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,871,700.00	0.00
<u>ADMINISTRATION</u>							
CAPITAL OUTLAY	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
OTHER COSTS/MISC.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
DEBT SERVICE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL ADMINISTRATION	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	1,871,700.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,871,700.00	0.00
** REVENUE OVER(UNDER) EXPENDITURES *(37,739.00)	610,545.09	0.00	610,545.09	0.00	(648,284.09)	1,617.81-
OTHER FINANCING SOURCES	180,500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	180,500.00	0.00
OTHER FINANCING (USES)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
NET OTHER SOURCES/(USES)	180,500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	180,500.00	0.00
REVENUE & OTHER SOURCES OVER/ (UNDER) EXPENDITURES & OTHER (USES)	142,761.00	610,545.09	0.00	610,545.09	0.00	(467,784.09)	427.67

2-23-2011 04:12 PM

CITY OF VALLEY CENTER
REVENUE & EXPENSE REPORT (UNAUDITED)
AS OF: JANUARY 31ST, 2011

PAGE: 1

610-WATER OPERATING
FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	CURRENT BUDGET	CURRENT PERIOD	PRIOR YEAR PO ADJUST.	Y-T-D ACTUAL	Y-T-D ENCUMBRANCE	BUDGET BALANCE	% OF BUDGET
<u>REVENUE SUMMARY</u>							
TAXES	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	1,121,100.00	103,948.46	0.00	103,948.46	0.00	1,017,151.54	9.27
USE OF MONEY & PROPERTY	500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	500.00	0.00
OTHER REVENUES	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL REVENUES	1,121,600.00	103,948.46	0.00	103,948.46	0.00	1,017,651.54	9.27
<u>EXPENDITURE SUMMARY</u>							
<u>NON-DEPARTMENTAL</u>							
PERSONNEL SERV. & BENEF.	295,300.00	31,429.39	0.00	31,429.39	2,885.28	260,985.33	11.62
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	540,100.00	1,706.27	0.00	1,706.27	900.26	537,493.47	0.48
COMMODITIES	41,500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	41,500.00	0.00
CAPITAL OUTLAY	49,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	49,000.00	0.00
OTHER COSTS/MISC.	296,970.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	296,970.00	0.00
DEBT SERVICE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL NON-DEPARTMENTAL	1,222,870.00	33,135.66	0.00	33,135.66	3,785.54	1,185,948.80	3.02
<u>ADMINISTRATION</u>							
CAPITAL OUTLAY	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
OTHER COSTS/MISC.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
DEBT SERVICE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL ADMINISTRATION	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	1,222,870.00	33,135.66	0.00	33,135.66	3,785.54	1,185,948.80	3.02
** REVENUE OVER(UNDER) EXPENDITURES *(101,270.00)	70,812.80	0.00	70,812.80	(3,785.54)	(168,297.26	66.19-
OTHER FINANCING (USES)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
NET OTHER SOURCES/(USES)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

REVENUE & OTHER SOURCES OVER/
(UNDER) EXPENDITURES & OTHER (USES) (101,270.00) 70,812.80 0.00 70,812.80 (3,785.54)(168,297.26 66.19-

2-23-2011 04:12 PM

CITY OF VALLEY CENTER
REVENUE & EXPENSE REPORT (UNAUDITED)
AS OF: JANUARY 31ST, 2011

PAGE: 1

612-STORMWATER UTILITY FUND
FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	CURRENT BUDGET	CURRENT PERIOD	PRIOR YEAR PO ADJUST.	Y-T-D ACTUAL	Y-T-D ENCUMBRANCE	BUDGET BALANCE	% OF BUDGET
<u>REVENUE SUMMARY</u>							
USE OF MONEY & PROPERTY	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
OTHER REVENUES	62,000.00	2,773.80	0.00	2,773.80	0.00	59,226.20	4.47
MISCELLANEOUS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL REVENUES	62,000.00	2,773.80	0.00	2,773.80	0.00	59,226.20	4.47
<u>EXPENDITURE SUMMARY</u>							
<u>NON-DEPARTMENTAL</u>							
PERSONNEL SERV. & BENEF.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	35,000.00	1,649.19	0.00	1,649.19	35.96	33,314.85	4.81
COMMODITIES	0.00	21.60	0.00	21.60	0.00	21.60	0.00
CAPITAL OUTLAY	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
OTHER COSTS/MISC.	22,500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	22,500.00	0.00
DEBT SERVICE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL NON-DEPARTMENTAL	57,500.00	1,670.79	0.00	1,670.79	35.96	55,793.25	2.97
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	57,500.00	1,670.79	0.00	1,670.79	35.96	55,793.25	2.97
** REVENUE OVER(UNDER) EXPENDITURES **	4,500.00	1,103.01	0.00	1,103.01	(35.96)	3,432.95	23.71
OTHER FINANCING (USES)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
NET OTHER SOURCES/(USES)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
REVENUE & OTHER SOURCES OVER/ (UNDER) EXPENDITURES & OTHER (USES)	4,500.00	1,103.01	0.00	1,103.01	(35.96)	3,432.95	23.71

2-23-2011 04:12 PM

CITY OF VALLEY CENTER
 REVENUE & EXPENSE REPORT (UNAUDITED)
 AS OF: JANUARY 31ST, 2011

PAGE: 1

620-SEWER OPERATING
 FINANCIAL SUMMARY

	CURRENT BUDGET	CURRENT PERIOD	PRIOR YEAR PO ADJUST.	Y-T-D ACTUAL	Y-T-D ENCUMBRANCE	BUDGET BALANCE	% OF BUDGET
<u>REVENUE SUMMARY</u>							
TAXES	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	1,011,800.00	69,874.78	0.00	69,874.78	0.00	941,925.22	6.91
USE OF MONEY & PROPERTY	200.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	200.00	0.00
OTHER REVENUES	3,500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3,500.00	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL REVENUES	1,015,500.00	69,874.78	0.00	69,874.78	0.00	945,625.22	6.88
<u>EXPENDITURE SUMMARY</u>							
<u>NON-DEPARTMENTAL</u>							
PERSONNEL SERV. & BENEF.	234,600.00	15,624.24	0.00	15,624.24	3,158.97	215,816.79	8.01
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	299,400.00	1,637.81	0.00	1,637.81	1,751.41	296,010.78	1.13
COMMODITIES	26,200.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	26,200.00	0.00
CAPITAL OUTLAY	19,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	19,000.00	0.00
OTHER COSTS/MISC.	449,500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	449,500.00	0.00
DEBT SERVICE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL NON-DEPARTMENTAL	1,028,700.00	17,262.05	0.00	17,262.05	4,910.38	1,006,527.57	2.16
<u>ADMINISTRATION</u>							
CAPITAL OUTLAY	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
OTHER COSTS/MISC.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
DEBT SERVICE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MISCELLANEOUS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL ADMINISTRATION	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	1,028,700.00	17,262.05	0.00	17,262.05	4,910.38	1,006,527.57	2.16
** REVENUE OVER(UNDER) EXPENDITURES *(13,200.00)	52,612.73	0.00	52,612.73	(4,910.38)	(60,902.35	361.38-
OTHER FINANCING (USES)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
NET OTHER SOURCES/(USES)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

REVENUE & OTHER SOURCES OVER/
 (UNDER) EXPENDITURES & OTHER (USES) (13,200.00) 52,612.73 0.00 52,612.73 (4,910.38)(60,902.35 361.38-

STAFF REPORTS

A. City Clerk Polian

B. Chief of Police Hephner

- Police Department January 2011 Report
- Municipal Court January 2011 Report

C. Fire Chief Tormey

D. City Superintendent Dunn

E. Environmental Services Officer Plant

F. Parks & Public Buildings Superintendent Owings

G. City Engineer Kelsey

H. City Attorney Arbuckle

I. City Administrator Pile

Officer's Report February 11, 2011 Chief Mark V. Hephner #1

Attention: Joel Pile
 City Administrator
 Valley Center Kansas

Subject: Valley Center Police January Monthly Report

The Police Department answered 253 calls for service during January 2011. Of those calls, 64 generated police cases. Emergency Communications/Records recorded 49 Fire Department calls for service, 84 records dissemination requests, 1352 telephone calls and 143 citizen contacts. The following is a break down of the police department cases:

Calls for Service: Eleven alarm calls; four animal calls; twenty assist citizen/motorist calls; thirteen assist EMS calls; three assist fire; twenty-five assist other agency calls; one battery case; two burglary cases; three criminal damage to property cases; two check business/residence calls; twelve check the welfare calls; one club check; eight disorderly conduct/disturbance calls; eight driving/parking complaints; one drug violation; five DV battery cases; three found property cases; one fraud report; one harassment/phone call complaints; one ID theft case; one indecent liberties case; two injury accidents; one lost juvenile call; one lost property case; seventeen misc reports; one missing person report; sixteen non injury accidents; one recovered stolen property cases; two runaway reports; four parking complaints; fifteen suspicious activity/persons/vehicle calls; six theft reports; three threats reports; five traffic hazard calls; one truant reports; one unauthorized use of financial card report; two violation of PFA's cases; and two warrant arrests. Officers wrote fifty-three citations with seventy-one violations during the month.

During the month of January, Sedgwick County Emergency 911 Dispatch covered for the City of Valley Center 80 hours.

The chief attended a KACP/KPOA Joint Training meeting at KLETC on January 14. The chief attended the monthly Chamber Meeting on January 18. The chief attended the monthly Chief's Meeting on January 20 in Andale. The chief attended an Employee Benefits Meeting on January 24. The chief had a meeting with the High School principal on January 26.

During the month, Detective Sergeant Lloyd Newman II completed the monthly fuel report. He along with Sgt Vogt supervised Municipal Court sessions during the month. He completed one internal investigation.

Sgt Vogt completed an Internal Investigation. Sgt Vogt attended the January 4 Council Meeting for the chief. He attended an Operation Impact Meeting on January 5. He and Officer Schrag picked up new patrol vehicles and worked to set the cars up during the last week of January.

Detective Grayson participated in the City Wellness Committee by attending a meeting. He arranged with KLETC to host a stalking and protection orders training class in March. He interviewed two suspects on a theft case and recovered some stolen property. He testified on suppression hearing regarding an auto theft case, motion denied.

Training: Brian Hunter attended NCIC training with the KHP for 8 hours and was certified.

Community Outreach Programs: Detective Grayson worked with a Boy Scout Troop on Bear For Kids Project. Detective Grayson visited Sunflower Garden and set up a meeting with the new manager.

Response Times Average:

Priority calls-6 minutes

Non-priority calls (Report calls)-8 minutes

Miscellaneous items: Sgt Vogt and Officer Jackson went to Mulvane at their request to assist with the Phelps' protests on December 14.

Chief Mark Hephner
Valley Center Police Chief
February 11, 2011

JANUARY 12, 2011

78 TOTAL CASES
 52 TOTAL PERSONS

5 CASES WITH NO STATUS CHG.
 1 EXTENSION OF TIME TO PAY TO NEW DATE
 10 EXTENSION OF TIME TO PAY
 9 CONTINUED TO NEW DATE
 1 CONTINUED
 2 PAYMENT PLAN
 5 DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE
 1 SENTENCING
 1 TRIAL TO NEW DATE
 11 TRIAL
 1 INITIAL APPEARANCE TO NEW DATE
 1 DISMISSED WITHOUT COST
 11 FINALIZED - FOUND GUILTY
 7 LATE NOTICE
 9 DISMISSED/PRESENTED INSURANCE
 1 DISMISSED HAD DL
 2 REVIEW HEARING

JANUARY 26, 2011

64 TOTAL CASES
 44 TOTAL PERSONS

7 CASES WITH NO STATUS CHG.
 4 CONTINUED TO NEW DATE
 4 CONTINUED
 3 TRIAL TO NEW DATE
 6 TRIAL
 6 LATE NOTICE
 3 NOTICE OF SUSPENSION SENT
 18 FINALIZED - FOUND GUILTY
 3 EXTENSION OF TIME TO PAY TO NEW DATE
 1 EXTENSION OF TIME TO PAY
 4 REVIEW HEARING
 3 DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE
 1 DISMISSED/PRESENTED INSURANCE
 1 PAYMENT PLAN

GOVERNING BODY REPORTS

- A. Mayor McNown**
- B. Councilmember K. Jackson**
- C. Councilmember Maschino**
- D. Councilmember Nordstedt**
- E. Councilmember Campbell**
- F. Councilmember Cicirello**
- G. Councilmember Gerling**
- H. Councilmember Hobson**
- I. Councilmember L. Jackson**

ADJOURN