Speaker 1 (00:04:23):

Okay. Ready down on that end?

Speaker 2 (00:04:26):

Yeah. Alright, let's go.

Speaker 3 (00:04:27):

Wendy's down there.

Speaker 2 (00:04:30):

Good evening and welcome to the Tuesday, September 9th, 2025 Lawrence City Commission meeting. First item on our agenda. Oh, excuse me. Let's go ahead and have the meeting rules read this time.

Speaker 4 (00:04:43):

Good evening everyone. If you would please silence your cell phones. The primary format for accessing the meeting is in person at City Hall. Virtual access cannot be guaranteed due to potential technology issues. When the mayor calls for public comment, please approach the podium to indicate you wish to speak. Virtual participants should use the raise hand function. When prompted, select join as panelist. There will be a brief delay as your role changes. Once your name is called, please unmute and turn on your camera to provide your comments. Please state your name and zip code before providing your comments and all comments will be limited to three minutes. The city reserves the right to turn videos off or mute participants. Thank you Mayor.

Speaker 2 (00:05:29):

Thank you Sherry. Alright. The first item on the agenda is to approve the agenda and the city commissioner reserves the right to amend, supplement, or reorder the agenda during the meeting. Is there a motion to approve the agenda as is move to approve the agenda.

Speaker 5 (00:05:41):

Second.

Speaker 2 (00:05:42):

That's a motion by Larson and a second by Fing Dye. All in favor say aye.

Speaker 6 (00:05:46):

Aye.

Speaker 2 (00:05:46):

Aye. Those opposed. Motion passes four zero. Next item on the agenda is to proclaim the month of September as National Service Dog Month and I think today we have Sherry Bryant here to receive the proclamation and maybe speak to this before we do our proclamation. Sherry here.

Speaker 7 (00:06:09):

Come on. Yep.

Speaker 8 (00:06:19):

Hello. Thank you very much for allowing us to do this tonight. Thank you Mayor Deaver and the commission. We are here in support of Canine Companions and are expertly trained service dogs throughout the community that empower people with disabilities to live more independent lives. Canine Companions is a nonprofit organization that created the concept of the modern day service dog for people with physical disabilities back in 1975. Over the past 50 years, we've provided more than 8,300 service dogs completely free of charge to adults, children, and veterans with disabilities. This proclamation declaring September as National Service Dog Month allows us to recognize the incredible life-changing work these special dogs do, and it enables us to advocate for the rights of their handlers in our communities. Thank you again for issuing this important proclamation with me tonight. I've got Nancy Brady from here in Lawrence and she's handling my puppy who is 14 weeks old, just beginning his journey and we've got Sandy Gro who has Elias and he is much farther along. So we've got two of our puppies in training with us tonight.

Speaker 2 (00:07:39):
Hey Sherry, how long does it take for them to be able to be used as a

Speaker 8 (00:07:44):
So we are volunteer puppy raisers, everything we do as a volunteer and we get them at eight weeks of age. We train them in 30 commands and socialize them until they're about 16 to 18 months old. Then we turn them back over to the organization. They work with a professional trainer at that point for six to nine months, and then if they make the grade, then they can be placed with somebody with a disability at about two years of age.

Speaker 2 (00:08:09):
Wow. That's a lot of work, but I'm sure the people who receive these special pets and service animals are really appreciative of the hard work that you put into it.

Speaker 8 (00:08:16):
So

Speaker 2 (00:08:17):
Thank you for doing this and absolutely read the proclamation.

Speaker 8 (00:08:19):
Yeah.

Speaker 2 (00:08:19):
Whereas we believe in the joyful transformative power of the human canine bond and the inclusivity of all citizens. And whereas the United States 70 million adults have a disability and only 16,000 service dogs from accredited training programs exist nationwide and the need is growing. And whereas Canine Companions created the service dog for people with physical disabilities 50 years ago in 1975, creating a new kind of support for disability. And whereas Canine Companions is a nonprofit organization that enhances the lives of people with disabilities by providing expertly trained service dogs and ongoing support to ensure quality partnerships free of charge. And whereas Canine Companions and their service dogs empower people with disabilities to lead life with greater independence by providing best in class training, ongoing follow-up services, and a deeply committed community of support. And whereas the National Service Dog Month aims to educate our community about the benefits of service dogs and the

laws protecting their handlers, and whereas the city of Lawrence continues to work toward becoming an inclusive community in which all citizens and their trained service dogs are embraced Now, therefore, I Mike Dever mayor, the city of Lawrence, Kansas, do hereby proclaim the month of September to be National Service Dog Month and urge all citizens to celebrate service dogs and be respectful of the rights to safe access in our community afforded to the adults, children and the veterans who lead more independent lives because of their assistance.

(00:09:46):

Thank you very much. Thank you.

(00:09:54):

Thank you very much. I need to leave those in the room maybe. Okay. We'll go ahead and move on to the consent agenda and the items on the consent agenda are considered under one motion and approved by one motion. Members of the governing body may remove items for separate discussion if desired, members of the public may remove items identified as quasi-judicial for separate discussion if desired, members of the public will be limited. Three minutes for comments on those items. Is there any items that a commission would like to be removed from the consent agenda? Okay. I don't see the quasi-judicial items here, so is there a motion to approve?

Speaker 6 (00:10:40):

Move to approve the consent agenda. Second.

Speaker 2 (00:10:42):

Okay. A motion to approve the consent agenda by Ingle Dye second to by Larson. All in favor say aye.

Speaker 9 (00:10:47):

Aye. Aye.

Speaker 2 (00:10:48):

Those opposed? The motion passes for zero. Alright, thank you. The next item on the agenda is the first regular agenda item, which is to consider adopting resolution number 7 6 3 1. Determine the city's intent to issue industrial revenue bonds and the amounts of $8 million requested by six 12 New Hampshire LLC to provide a sales tax exemption for eligible construction costs for redevelopment of the Reuter building and waiving the requirements of the city's economic development policy. Section 1.83, the affordable housing and consider conducting a public hearing to consider a neighborhood revitalization area granting a 95% property tax abatement over 15 years for redevelopment of the Reuter building at six 12 New Hampshire and adopting a first reading ordinance number 1 0 1 6 1 establishing a neighborhood revitalization area, adopting a neighborhood revitalization plan and establishing a fund to finance the redevelopment of six 12 New Hampshire and consider conducting a public hearing to consider a requested community improvement district establishing a 2% sales tax over 22 years for redevelopment of the Reuter building at six 12 New Hampshire and adopt on first reading ordinance number 1 0 1 6 2 authorizing the creation of a community improvement district authorizing the additional 2% sales tax and authorizing execution of related development agreement.

(00:12:13):

It was a lot, but I wanted to make sure it was all on the record. Thank you.

Speaker 10 (00:12:17):

Good evening, mayor and City Commission. This is Brandon McGuire, assistant city manager. That was a mouthful. Admirable job mayor. Thank you for that. I'm very excited. Actually don't often say that about many items brought before the commission, but very excited about this project. This is a project and public investment to help support the redevelopment of the Reuter building our neighboring property, which as long as I can remember, and I was born and raised in Lawrence as set vacant in an ever deteriorating state. So I'm really excited to bring this to the commission and tell you more about the project and the request for public participation. Tonight we are joined by Pat Watkins who is representing the applicant. The applicant is actually online, Matt Gilhausen and the city's financial advisor, Tom Calico from Baker Tilly Municipal Advisors is here to present the analysis. So we'll start off with Mr. Watkins doing the presentation about the project itself and then Mr. Calico will follow with more detailed information about the requested incentives.

Speaker 11 (00:13:37):

Alright, thank you Brandon. Good evening commissioners. Patrick Watkins here on behalf of six 12 New Hampshire, LLC. This is a company owned by Matt Gilhausen. He's a resident here in Lawrence. Matt has joined us on Zoom. Connor trainer is to be here as well. He's with CT design. He's a project architect. If there's any questions about the design, I share Brandon's excitement for this project. This is another exciting preservation project. It's an opportunity to also reemphasize and meet the requirements and policies of our economic development policy that we put out there as a community. In my cover letter, I referred to these buildings as cornerstones of the historic inventory of Lawrence. It's hard to even drive by the buildings without sensing their presence, sensing their want for rehabilitation. You don't often see a four story limestone structure. They don't last that long, frankly, or they don't make it this long, I should say. And as you've heard, it's not if not for the bold actions of the owner of the property, these property, these two large buildings likely wouldn't be standing today. Both of these are on the historic state and federal historic registers. They're both poised for redevelopment.

(00:14:52):

Not only are these buildings part of the unique historic inventory, just double check this, make sure I can. Here we go. They also have been cornerstones of the business community in Lawrence, the Wilder Brothers shirt factory located here and built the structure in 1882. It was 22 years after Quantros raid just a few years after the completion of the Car River Dam. It was one of just a few buildings to be powered by the Car River Dam. The Wilder Brothers at their height produced 22,000 standardized shirts annually. They employed 70 factory workers. They employed 20 salespeople. They sold shirts across the Midwest. The Rer Oregon factory relocated to Lawrence in 1919, built the north structure at that time as an Oregon assembly room. In 1927. Reuter built little red connected by a walkway and a tunnel to the larger factory buildings. It was used as offices for the building and designers and draftsmen offices in the upstairs.

(00:16:01):

By 1948, Reuter was the only organ company between St. Louis and California. Reuter continued to operate at this site until around 2001, but obviously had been phasing out for some time at that point. At the height, Reuter employed over 125 employees. They constructed over 60 organs a year. You'll notice that all of our churches here in Lawrence have great Reuter organs. Some of the nicest organs built around the country are reor organs. Since 2001, the buildings largely remained vacant. The current owner purchased 2022, began the historic designation process, completed a series of emergency repairs to keep it upright so that it could be rehabilitated.

(00:16:44):

I got a few interesting pictures of the history of this building and you can kind of get a sense for the intensity of uses they had at the Reuter building. I didn't want to pass on the opportunity to show a few of these. They had a full floor dedicated to capable carpenters. They weren't just into developing organs. It was everything around the organ as well. The basement was a lumberyard. You can see some of the

historic integrity of this building is still alive. Those 14 inch lumber pillars are still intact at the building, though many have been now historically replaced with like Douglas Fir. Here's an example of the type of organ fabric that they were developing assembly. In the assembly room. The owners assembled a capable team for the rehabilitation project. CT designs the local architect, Rosen Preservation, a group out of Kansas City, very capable preservationists ensuring that the historic tax credit can be secured.

([00:17:46](#)):

Row construction is the general contractor. The project is comprehensive. There's a range of structural work to be completed at the property. All new wood posts and beams, tuck pointing masonry, a metal frame will go up in the assembly room. We haven't seen preservation like this in many other opportunities. Turn hall is similar in age, but it doesn't approach the scale of the Reuter building. It's much, much larger. The conversion of mid-century or early century industrial to commercial and residential modern uses can't be understated or overstated. Do you have questions about the work or the design? I'm sure Connor and Matt can provide some context there. Future users have not been identified, but we've committed in this application to commercial or residential uses at the building. I've got some renderings to show you both the existing condition within the building and I'll kind of blaze through these along with some renderings of what's proposed for the building.

([00:18:49](#)):

You can see some site work, the left side of the photo, historic preservation means replacing in kind and restoring what is there. There's a massive amount of windows, doors, timber, but it's been merged in these renderings with modern uses. Rooftop deck overlooking the car river. This is the assembly space. These renderings were based upon a concept for office space. It's not clear if it's going to be office yet, but you kind of get a sense of what this building can be used for. The greater challenge beyond the rehab project is creating a navigable path for financial feasibility. On this project. There's some complexity of the financing arrangements and Matt's engaged with a number of consultants to work on that side of the project. Tying these elements together is tedious. This is an opportunity zone project which leverages a special funding source. It's obviously state and federal historic tax credit project.

([00:19:51](#)):

Tremendous amount of work has gone towards securing those incentives. Those credit, those credits come with conditions on the rehab. HUD financing is still being considered. That is a long application process, but comes with a lower debt service requirement. Private financing has been sought from banks and other financial institutions. I bring these things up because this is a complicated project. It takes years in the making to plan to get to this stage. Under every concept for these buildings, the cost for rehabilitation require some form of public participation and so we crafted the incentive application about nine months ago in an attempt to share the burden as appropriately as possible. We based our application on the city's policy creating tax savings by leveraging the owner's investment. It consists of three elements. Baker Tilly will review these. It's an IRB. It's a sales tax exemption on construction materials, an NRA, which is reduction in incremental property taxes and A CID, the ability to charge extra sales tax at the property, which could be revetted back to the developer.

([00:20:50](#)):

Even with these tools, the work is not done. Baker Tilly notes in their report that this project does not meet the standards for market-based investment. It's still below those. It's not a negative return, but it very much qualifies as an altruistic endeavor rather than a market driven investment. We're not done searching for the economic tools or conditions to make this project a reality. This is just one step that brings this project that much closer to reality. You'll have a special vote on affordability tonight. The project fulfills many goals. Affordable housing has a cost and as I've noted, this project is not in a position to solve every problem. There is an opportunity to consider affordable housing advisory funds that is still being considered. If we did make application for that, affordability would be a requirement.

(00:21:43):

As it stands right now, we're not in a position to create affordable housing with this project. There's too many other needs. These buildings tell the story of the Lawrence community. It's a story that has required the city's leadership in the past. The original construction of the building occurred as part of the industrial growth spurred by the Car. River Dam originally built for industrial growth of just this type. The repurposing of the building into the Reuter Oregon factory occurred in large part because the city attracted Reuter with an incentive package and then they sealed the deal by ordering the first organ for the Masonic temple. This building's ready for new life. We've got a local investor that's ready to make a massive commitment, but again, the city has to play a crucial role. We appreciate all the work that's gone into this over the last nine months. We appreciate the staff time, the work of the economic development team. Baker Tilley's work on this. We have been collaborators in this process. We're looking for your leadership. We are available to answer any questions you might have. Thank you. Thanks Pat. Any questions from Mr. Watkins?

Speaker 3 (00:22:54):

Pat, you said you were looking at HUD funding, but you're not interested enough. There's not a feasibility to do affordable housing here, so what HUD funding are you looking for? For what purpose?

Speaker 11 (00:23:05):

Matt could probably explain that it is a HUD loan and the reason we were looking at it is because it carries a lower interest rate than traditional financing. There are underwriting requirements, there's debt service coverage ratios. We had a consultant out of Kansas City that was on board to help secure that HUD loan and make application. It's independent of the decision to bring affordability into the requirements. My personal concern just as a advisor is that every additional burden that this property carries has some cost to it and we're already below market standards for returns. If we add affordability, we may find ourself out of the criteria for eligibility on a HUD loan or for traditional financing. But Matt, if you're on board or online, you can follow up. Yeah,

Speaker 12 (00:24:00):

I'm here. Can you all hear me? Hear me?

Speaker 11 (00:24:03):

Yes. Yes sir.

Speaker 12 (00:24:05):

I guess first of all, thanks Mr. Mayor and commissioners for giving us a chance to speak to you tonight on the question of HUD financing. Since we did go down that path quite extensively, and I frankly I think we've come to a more traditional lending structure working with our friends, capital Federal. We had to, this isn't just about trying to get the debt service coverage ratios and finding a loan that will work. We also have to bridge finance the state and federal tax credits, which don't become accessible until the very end of the project. In fact, quite ways after the project is completed. So anyway, the HUD loan, while it's still on the table, I think it's highly unlikely we ultimately use that structure.

Speaker 3 (00:25:11):

So just for education purposes, what part of the project qualifies you for the HUD loan? Is it because it's a preservation project or

Speaker 11 (00:25:20):

It's a residential building? I think that's what part of the qualification is. Matt, you may know better than I would.

Speaker 12 (00:25:27):

Yeah, I can't recite the specific HUD qualifications, but like I said, at this time we have secured financing with cap fed through a traditional loan structure for a host of reasons. The reason we were looking at the HUD loan for rehabilitation was that it was a 40 year fixed interest rate loan and it was non recourse, but it takes over well over a year to even apply. While we think we would've qualified that year long process that is extremely expensive as well. Just didn't meet the nature of what we needed of in terms of lending for this project. Caped has been a partner with us on numerous other projects in town and was able to come up with a creative structure to help us get this through their loan committee and get it financed at least to where we're at to date. So hopefully that clears that question up.

(00:26:43):

I will say that one of the biggest challenges with this particular project, and we've done several historic preservation projects around town. We did the Silas and Maddie's building at 1101 Mass. We did 9 0 1 Delaware. We did 8 42 Penn, 8 37, 8 39 Penns all those buildings over by Lawrence Beer Company Area 4 0 1 Elm 8 0 4 and 8 0 2 Massachusetts and this is the first one we've asked for any incentives. We used state and federal historic tax credits on 1101 mass, but this is a first for me and I wouldn't be asking if it wasn't absolutely necessary to have that support from the public to get this one across the finish line. So I just wanted to point out that this is, we don't take it lightly that we're asking for help here.

Speaker 10 (00:27:47):

Thanks Matt and Mayor, I may just add one more note to that, which is by our policy, based on the number of units, residential units that are anticipated to come with this project, it would trigger a requirement of one affordable housing unit under our economic development policy.

Speaker 13 (00:28:10):

Thank you. Good evening, mayor Commissioners, Tom Calico with Baker Tilly, municipal advisors, financial advisors to the city. While we're bringing up the presentation, just a quick reminder, we work as a consultant for the city. Neither I or Baker Tilly has any financial interest in the project. My role here tonight is strictly to give you the information that you need hopefully to make a confident decision about whether to award the requested incentive as many times as I've been here.

Speaker 14 (00:28:58):

Yeah, hold on. Lemme see if I can. Okay,

Speaker 13 (00:29:05):

So while we're bringing that up, to help you understand when the application for the incentives was received from the developer, it did cite a development program that included 10 residential units and four commercial spaces in the Reuter building and then three commercial spaces in the big red. All of the analysis that I'm going to show you this evening is based on that development program, but as you heard just a moment ago from Mr. Watkins, the development program is somewhat in flux but we had to land somewhere so we landed with what was initially submitted in the incentive application. Great.

Speaker 7 (00:29:46):

Be working.

Speaker 13 (00:29:48):

Alright.

(00:30:00):

I won't speak to this very long because Mr. Watkins did a fantastic job of introducing the project, but it does involve two historically significant buildings. The Reuter Building built in 1882 Little Red built in 1927. They've been vacant since 2001. There was a catastrophic failure in the Reuter building, which has now been stabilized. It's about a little over 42,000 square feet. They're anticipating initiation of operations in 2027. This is the sources and uses for the development program I described a moment ago. It's a little over $17 million project as was cited a moment ago. There are historic tax credits, both state and federal tax credits among the sources, a good deal of owner equity as well as private financing. The bulk of the money as you can see is going towards construction. It is as we'll talk about in a moment, a very expensive project to construct.

(00:31:07):

The requested incentives are a neighborhood revitalization area. You may recall this is kind residential TIFF in Kansas. What it does is it takes a piece of property, identifies the base assessed valuation as it is pre-construction. All the taxes for all the taxing jurisdictions that come off that base assessed value continue to flow to the taxing jurisdictions. When the project's completed, obviously the assessed valuation will increase and it is the taxes on that increase in assessed valuation that then is eligible to rebate to the property owner. In this case, the requested rebate is a 95% rebate of that incremental increase. But it's important to note that the taxes that all the taxing jurisdictions currently receive from the property they will continue to receive.

(00:32:07):

The project is eligible for the Neighborhood Revitalization Act by state statute because of the deterioration and obsolescence of the buildings. We estimate that the development program would produce about 1.38 million in rebate to the property owner. The second incentive requested is a community improvement district. This is also another incentive created under state statute. It allows a property owner to petition to impose an additional sales tax. So this is in addition to all of the regular city county sales taxes and in this case they're requesting a 2% add-on sales tax for up to 22 years. We estimate that the development program that we analyzed would produce about 1.25 million in capacity. I will note that the documents that you have before you tonight for the Community improvement district do anticipate an up to $3 million amount.

(00:33:16):

The developers requested that flexibility. It would take a pretty substantial change in the development program to get to that amount, but I'll speak when I speak to the but four analysis, I'll speak to how that impacts whether that if it were to possibly get to that 3 million subsidy, how it impacts the developer's return. The final one is a sales tax exemption on construction materials through the issuance of industrial revenue bonds. As I always like to mention here, when mentioned bonds, people wonder, okay, does this create a financial liability for the city? It does not. These industrial revenue bonds are strictly loan mechanism for the private property owner. They are responsible for 'em in this case, we're not doing any type of tax exemption associated with the industrial revenue bonds. This would be strictly for the purpose of allowing the exemption on purchase of construction materials.

(00:34:24):

So an important step in considering incentive requests like this is what's termed the but for analysis. The analysis is designed to answer the question, but for the requested incentives, would the project likely happen in the current market? So a couple of notes about this analysis before I get into the details of it. We analyzed the project as proposed and within the current market. This is not a feasibility study. A true feasibility study looks at what type of uses are being proposed, how much of that use is currently

provided in the trade area and what's the likelihood that the trade area could absorb that additional uses. This is not that type of study. And the other thing to note, as with any forward looking financial study, actual the actual results are going to vary. We know that we do strive very hard to use reasonable assumptions and be very detailed in our analysis, but as with all future financial forecast, there's almost certainly going to be some variation.

(00:35:43):

Okay. Our approach for the but four is to first evaluate the applicant's estimated project costs. We're looking at reasonableness, are these reasonable assumptions because obviously the costs impact the potential return. Understating costs could result in differentiation as well as overstating. We also look at the estimated project revenues for reasonableness and then because this is the gold standard in real estate development, we assume a hypothetical sale in year 10. That's not to say that the applicant intends to sell the project in year 10, but in order to calculate an internal rate of return, which as I say is kind of the gold standard in measuring the profitability of real estate investments, we need to assume that hypothetical sale and then we determine the rate of return without an incentive and we compare that return. Fortunately, we're very fortunate we have a wonderful resource in the PWC investor survey, which every quarter surveys investors for all types of projects and asks the question, what rate of return would be necessary for you to be motivated to invest in this type of project. So we make a comparison to the rate of return without an incentive to the survey.

(00:37:17):

Alright, first looking at the project costs acquisition cost is estimated at $12 per square foot. Actually, I think this is an actual figure. We used CoStar to look at whether that was a reasonable assumption. CoStar showed acquisition costs anywhere from 181 to 806. So obviously a big variation here. Not surprising. Obviously the low acquisition cost here has everything to do with the condition of the buildings anyone selling it would know, right that this is going to require substantial investment. So nothing too surprising here. Rehabilitation of the buildings, this is the bulk of the cost was estimated at $286 a square foot. We used the RS means industry construction estimator as our source of truth on this. And because this is a very unique building, we couldn't plug this building into the estimator. So we had to assume what it would be like to build building new, which is certainly an imperfect method, but the best that we had available to us and that cost if we were to build as close to a similar building new is $206 a square foot.

(00:38:43):

So at 2 86 we felt that that was a reasonable estimate given the complexity and the historic preservation that's required. Developer fee is estimated at 7.67% of the total project costs. The industry standard is five to 10%. So we felt that was reasonable and soft costs and other expenses were 7.74%. Again, the industry standard is five to 10, so we felt that was reasonable. There were some assumptions about vacancy in the proforma. They were estimated at 7%. The market average according to CoStar is closer to 2.7. In our analysis, in our proforma, we adjusted that to 2.7%. There was an annual growth rate of 2% and that was reasonable under market.

(00:39:46):

I actually gotten a little ahead of myself, but alright. All right. On the project revenues and the hypothetical sale, there were basically two sources of revenue here. Residential rents and commercial rents. Residential rents are estimated at $2 and 10 cents per square foot. Looking at CoStar for similar businesses within the trade area, we saw a range of a dollar 29 to a dollar 74. So we felt that this was potentially optimistic, potentially high. Now the effect of course is to overstate the return, not understate it. And again, what we're testing for is would the project likely happen without the incentives. So overstating actually doesn't really cause much concern. So we left that as is in the proforma. The commercial rents are at $6 to $27 per square foot with an average of just under 17. The average according to CoStar in the trade area is 1684. So we felt that that was a reasonable assumption.

(00:40:54):

And then you can see on vacancy the adjustment, the annual growth rate of revenues we thought was slightly high, but again potentially overstating return. So we left it alone and then the terminal capitalization rate, so kind the discount of the net operating income that is taken. When we determined the hypothetical sale was their estimate was 7%, we increased that to 8% because that compared to what we saw in the Pricewaterhouse Cooper investor survey. Alright, so where does that get us? Just help you understanding the graph. The shaded area indicates the PWC investor survey market range for this project. So it ranges from a low of 7.25% rate of return to a high of 11.

(00:41:50):

The dot that you see down below, this is the internal rate of return with an incentive at 1.34%. So even with an incentive, this project does not come into the market rate of return. So where is the return without an incentive? Well, it's negative and that's why it doesn't appear on the chart. So without an incentive it's a negative return with an incentive, it's a 1.34% rate of return. So clearly the project is not likely to happen without the requested incentives. Now I talked about the applicant's request to move the CID maximum from the 1.25 million to the 3 million. Even if they were to achieve the 3 million, which it would take a very different development program to achieve, it still doesn't put the rate of return into the market rate of return.

(00:42:52):

And why is this? Well, there's some very clear and I think we all understand the challenges. The building deterioration is significant. The historic preservation requirements add cost and we're currently at a rate, although it might be changing, but we're currently at a point where we have an elevated cost of capital. So all those things are the headwinds that caused this project to not be likely that would happen without the requested incentives. One of the other things that we were asked to do is to look at the fiscal impact and eligibility. We will note that as far as eligibility by the, excuse me, by the city's economic development policy, the project promotes the strategic plan and of prosperity and economic security. It meets several economic development requirements, enhances the downtown, it addresses significantly underutilized and vacant property. We did note that your economic policy does require projects which produce residential units to provide some affordable, so if it needed were the 10 units that was if they were to do that development program with the 10 units, the requirement would be one affordable housing unit.

(00:44:16):

So that's not proposed for the reasons that Mr. Watkins discussed. And I will say that I do feel like his claim that adding affordability housing would actually move the return in the wrong direction. We already know it's negative and it's below the market. Even with an incentive it would make that even more difficult, but your policy would require a waiver for that affordable housing requirement. On your screen is the summary results of the total impact economic impact analysis where you remember that total impact is a program that the city uses to estimate fiscal impact of projects and you'll see that with the development program we analyzed, it does produce a positive economic impact for all of the taxing entities. So you have a number of actions ahead of you tonight with regard to this application. There's a resolution of intent to issue the industrial revenue bonds for the purpose of the sales tax exemption.

(00:45:27):

There's a waiver to your economic development policy associated with the affordable housing requirement public hearings to be held on both the Neighborhood Revitalization Act and the Community improvement district and then first reading of ordinances that would create the NRA in the CID. That then will trigger because as you may recall, the Neighborhood revitalization Act in order for that to get in place requires the voluntary participation of both the county and the school district. So if you were to approve this on first reading tonight, we would then go into a process of bringing these before those two

other taxing jurisdictions before it returned to you for the second reading. And with that I'll be happy to stand for any questions.

Speaker 2 (00:46:17):

Tom, can you tell me what the estimated useful life of this rehabilitated building is going to be? For example, banking or tax purposes for the estimation of a loan to value ratios. What is the realistic length of this building being useful after the abatement period?

Speaker 13 (00:46:38):

Before I take a swag at that? I think you have representative architects or engineers here tonight. Yeah, the applicant has architects or engineers here tonight and I think they're better qualified to answer that. Okay, thank you.

Speaker 4 (00:46:51):

Patrick. Was there anyone else on Zoom that needed to be moved over that I'm aware of? Just

Speaker 11 (00:46:56):

Matt, I think. Okay. The estimated useful wife to a life maybe of the structure. How long beyond 15 year NRA should the community receive the benefit of a rehabilitated building

Speaker 14 (00:47:09):

Got? So once the building, the building is safe as it sits right now, the structure is safe and it's fairly dry on the inside and once there's new windows and the renovation is complete, I think it's reasonable to expect a hundred year life out of the building. Another a hundred years, hopefully more

Speaker 2 (00:47:29):

A hundred additional years after you're done with the rehabilitation process. Okay, that's good to know. Thank you.

Speaker 14 (00:47:34):

Sure.

Speaker 13 (00:47:40):

Mr. Mayor, one other thing I meant to mention, I want to make sure I mention, you'll notice that the fiscal impact numbers that were in my presentation were a bit higher than what's in your packet. My apologies. We discovered that we had accidentally assumed 22 years for the NRA abatement or the NRA rebate matching it up to the 22 years for the CID and it's a 15 year rebate. So with that correction, that's the reason for the slightly higher numbers. So again, my apologies. Thanks

Speaker 2 (00:48:13):

For the

Speaker 13 (00:48:13):

Clarification.

Speaker 2 (00:48:17):

Any other questions? Is that it for the presentation then? So far? Okay, very good. We'll go ahead and open it up to public comment.

Speaker 15 (00:48:34):

Hello, Eric Hyde. 6 6 0 4 6. I'll try to be really heartful this time. I'm really happy that Brandon's excited about this project. Pat Watkins, I know I will divulge how I know him. In 2014 I was living in Minnesota and this relates to it. I guarantee you my fiance at the time had an abortion and second trimester and it really messed me up and I had a DU, I got arrested and Pat Watkins is my lawyer. So I, after that I learned how to stop drinking and stuff and it took me a long time to learn that growing up in this town. So that applies. I definitely don't want a brewery going in that building just for future reference, but I want to mention something that was left out of the history of that building is that there was a scene in the movie Carnival of Souls that was filmed there. You guys probably know that at the turn of 2024, I tried to remake that movie. I mentioned it to Kevin Wilmont. We still talk from time to time, but even he has blacklisted me in this town from filmmaking, but I still support what's going on. I like the ideas that are going on with this project. I like the vision that's been compiled. I like the question you asked Mayor about the lifespan of the project.

(00:50:20):

Let's see here is, there's something I wanted to say. I just think it's unclear what's going to go in the building and I really don't care about affordable housing with that building because I mean look at the affordable housing over in the arts district. It's plagued by people who go to Lawrence Beer Company all the time. The parking's always taken up by people will go there just like they own the place or people in the cider gallery. They think they own the place with all their events. But anyway, that's not this building. This is different. So I am kind of iffy on this, but I still support it and I think there's some real heart behind it and I just want to emphasize focusing on the right thing to do versus just selling Lawrence out. But I don't really feel like this is completely selling it out. Anyway, that's it. Thank you. Thanks Eric. I

Speaker 16 (00:51:25):

Hello David Baston 6 6 0 4 7. I did write a letter to you guys on this. I'll just go over a few little things here. Let's see no glasses. The city's economic development policy section 1.3 requires the project receiving incentives including affordable housing units for this project. Object with 10 residential units, at least one should be affordable. However, the developer has requested a waiver of this requirement citing that including affordable housing would result in a negative IRR granting this waiver undermines the city's commitment to addressing housing affordability. The critical need in Lawrence by approving this waiver, the city risk, prioritizing private developer interest over broader community benefits, especially when the project already already benefits from significant public subsidies. The proposed incentive commit the city to a long-term financial obligation, 15 years for the property tax abatement and up to 22 years of the CID sales tax, the 2% that developer's assertion that the project will proceed regardless of the city suggests that alternative financing mechanisms such as private investment, historic tax credits already secured for 6.34 million other grants could be pursued. The city should encourage the developer to explore these options to reduce the burden on the public resources while still achieving the goal of historic preservation of the downtown revitalization.

(00:53:45):

And yeah, that building's been there since the 56 years I've been here. So I do like the building and I do would really like it to be redone, but as far as using our funds that we could be using in other spots could better serve the community. And I hope you guys did read through my email that I sent you guys. Thank you very much. David.

Speaker 17 (00:54:28):

Hello, my name is Rick Rent from, I'm 6 6 0 4 4. I can't believe the developer isn't running away from this project. When I saw those numbers up there about it's almost guaranteed to lose money if everything goes right, it might make a little bit of money and I know that he's done a lot of other projects around town. They all seem first class to me. I haven't gone in and inspected them, but it seems like he's doing all the things that are right. I think the amount of money that he's coming up with in his own finances and private through the banks and stuff is a great commitment to what's going on. The affordable housing. Any housing that we build is going to help with affordable housing because it's not affordable housing. There'll be other people moving in which will free up other places that are going on.

([00:55:22](#)):

I think this project is, this guy's a hero for making that building back. I know what it costs to take care of a building and do all that. I'm in a hundred year old building over at Johnny's and it's ridiculous how much you have to do just to maintain it and he's going to build it up to where it'll be here for a hundred years and I think all the return on investment is great. I think that the money that we're talking about is new money that's coming in. It's not money that we're taking away from something else. So I'm behind the project 110%. I think it's a really good policy that we have to encourage investment in things like this. Thank you

Speaker 7 ([00:56:03](#)):

Rick.

Speaker 2 ([00:56:12](#)):

Any other public comment on this item in the room? Sherry, why don't you go ahead and see if we have anybody online right now.

Speaker 4 ([00:56:20](#)):

There isn't any.

Speaker 2 ([00:56:21](#)):

Okay. Commissioners.

Speaker 3 ([00:56:28](#)):

Pat, I have a quick question and it may just for you or whoever for the developer as well. So looking at the numbers as far as the gross rents or proposed gross rents for the different units, looking at 'em for their costs, it looks like about doing some basic calculations, a person would need to make about 68,000 a year in order to live there for at least the basic one, the lowest end of it. And I know that our median income in the city is about 63,000. So just in regards to that note, and this may be for the, you can answer it, whoever can answer it, is there for this project, is there an appetite for these units, residential units to be only owner occupied or would that be subjective to what's available to the applicant? If you kind of get what I'm saying?

Speaker 11 ([00:57:38](#)):

Help me with owner occupied.

Speaker 3 ([00:57:40](#)):

So we're talking about residential units and so the idea is that there'd be a certain type of income that would need to work there, I mean to live there. So if there's not an appetite for those to be owner occupied, is the applicant considering making these essentially Airbnbs?

Speaker 11 (00:57:55):

Oh, I don't think it's been taken off the list of uses, but I think I want to clarify what you're saying is that a person making in the $60,000 range to spend up to a third of their income, these would be considered within their range without going beyond a third of their income.

Speaker 3 (00:58:14):

Barely.

Speaker 11 (00:58:15):

Yeah. So I just want to clarify that. You don't have to make some,

Speaker 3 (00:58:17):

They may have to eat ramen two days or three days out of the week, but they can make it work.

Speaker 11 (00:58:21):

Sure. We're not excluding a short-term rental from the list of uses. It's not in the concept right now. I think having 10 short-term rentals sounds terribly burdensome in terms of just the costs and the operating proforma that we've put together. I will say that I think we are at the high end of the residential scale in part because these are 13, 14 foot ceilings in some places. These are huge timbers. These are not the typical apartments that you would see. I think whoever is going to have the experience of living in these residential units, this is going to be a pretty unique experience downtown Fourth floor lofts for example, see straight up to Mount Orad and they see the entirety of east and west Car River. I wouldn't expect the owner to rent those for the low end of the spectrum. But to answer the question, short-term rental is an allowed use and it's something that is not in our proforma, it's not in our concept plan, but it is one of the zoned allowances. I think short-term rentals have a number of other requirements that you'd have to abide by just to make that work. I think we have a limitation on how many short-term licenses you can have in one single space. Does that help, Matt, do you have anything else to add there?

Speaker 12 (00:59:48):

I'm not sure this was the nature of the question at all, but the idea of condo, the building where we actually could sell off

Speaker 7 (00:59:57):

Individual

Speaker 12 (00:59:59):

Apartments that is not on the table for a number of reasons, including the federal tax credits. That makes it very challenging to bring in other owners and I don't have any desire to own a condo at this point in time. So I don't know if that was part of the question, but I wanted to clarify that, that they will be rentals the delta between a short-term rental and a long-term rental. It may be 40 cents a foot difference. So at the end of the day we have underwritten this project with Fed as a residential mixed use development with apartments on second, third, and fourth floors and some sort of commercial use on the ground level. So as of right now, that's the plan, but at the end of the day, you guys have seen the returns that we're looking at and while I want to keep doing more projects, so we have to and keep investing in Lawrence, so we need to try to be successful financially and we're not in the business of losing money. I think Rick, maybe you said it, I'm a little crazy for taking this on, but with your help, we'll find a way to make this thing work

and it'll be here for another a hundred years and we're going to do what we need to do to try to make it successful and financially viable. If that includes some short-term rentals, we'll consider that.

Speaker 3 (01:01:54):

And I appreciate the additional context, Matt. I mean at the end of the day, it wasn't what I asked for. I mean I'm not saying that negatively. I just, I'm glad to have that context that I think because of what is available to you then as a commission, as a governing body, it would be nice to know if that's something that is part of future funding options for this project moving forward. Not to look at it negatively or positively or in neutrality. It's just to have that information available to us. So thank you.

Speaker 12 (01:02:27):

My original dream for this property was to make it into a green tech incubator where we could create job opportunities and economic development through investing in startups in the green tech space, which is where my background is, but finding the capital to seed fund that sort of an incubator was challenging. I tried and came up short. The commercial market for office space has been challenging coming out of COVID and the residential market is equally as challenging as you all know, costs to build are very high and we don't have a lot of discretionary income in town. And so it makes it a really delicate balance of trying to maximize the income. So you can afford to do these sort of things, but I can tell you we are our rent assumptions that the bank and the various consultants that help including Baker Tilly help justify and rationalize these projects. They noted, I think that we're above what the market is for rent in this city. I think I will tell exactly where we land, but long windedly, it's very, very challenging to build or renovate and create new housing with interest rates and construction costs where they're at. But that's what we're trying to do and we'll keep trying to do that every opportunity we can, including low income housing where it's appropriate and where we can make it work.

Speaker 2 (01:04:27):

Thanks. I have a question about the CID, the dollars. Maybe Tom you can speak to this for me if you can. We're talking about land uses that are yet to be determined, which means we have sales of some unknown type and tax on whatever sales associated with that unknown use. And I guess I wonder how one anticipates sales tax on an unknown use more importantly the square footage of that unknown use and calculating and going from one and a half to 3 million I guess was part of that,

Speaker 7 (01:05:03):

The

Speaker 2 (01:05:03):

Idea that you would have some sort of tax if it were to be short-term rental. In fact, is there a sales tax on a short-term rental for example, that you applied? I'm sorry? Is there a sales tax on the short-term rentals?

Speaker 18 (01:05:17):

No.

Speaker 2 (01:05:17):

Okay. So theoretically then there'd be really no benefits to go that direction to get the CID paid off or at least generating the kind of income that's necessary to help this project.

Speaker 13 (01:05:29):

So the original 1.25 million estimate for the CID generation was based on the development program that we were given. There's some assumed commercial uses that would be sales tax producers. I think the important thing to keep in mind is that the CID as it's structured is a pay as you go CID, the developer takes all the risk and obviously as I mentioned before, to get to 3 million it would require a pretty significantly different development program. But there is no assurance to the developer that they will ever receive the full 3 million. This is strictly at their risk. They'll get whatever the project can generate within the 22 year period. And that's why we always say up to, because once the CID reaches whatever you agree to as the maximum, then it shuts off. But yeah, this is strictly the developer's risk that they could get, whether it's the 1.25 or the 3 million, whatever you said is the limit, that's their risk entirely. Not the city has no obligation to produce that amount for them.

Speaker 2 (01:06:48):
So the lesser amount of sales tax dollar generated at that site is going to then reduce the likelihood of them creating the revenue they need for this project to function at the level that you talked about. So therefore it might be even further in the red then, or excuse me, closer to zero or in the red then if CID doesn't pay out in the fashion that they believe.

Speaker 13 (01:07:10):
Yes.

Speaker 2 (01:07:11):
Okay. Thank you. Tom,

Speaker 3 (01:07:13):
I want to make sure I heard you correctly. You had asked Tom if there's sales tax on short-term rentals and Tom you said no?

Speaker 6 (01:07:19):
No,

Speaker 3 (01:07:20):
I think it is. You

Speaker 6 (01:07:21):
Said you didn't analyze it.

Speaker 3 (01:07:22):
Oh, didn't analyze. I didn't. Okay, okay. I was like, I think there is no falsities here. Yeah,

Speaker 2 (01:07:28):
So there is a sales tax on short-term rentals. I guess he's saying he didn't

Speaker 3 (01:07:31):
In the analysis.

Speaker 2 (01:07:32):

Yeah. Okay. That wasn't included in the calculation on the analysis. Okay, good. I was curious about that. Thank you.

Speaker 6 (01:07:42):

All right. Well I would just jump in and say I'm obviously our policy supports strengthening our downtown and our historic buildings and it's hard maybe as Pat said to Holly might be the only other one close to this of a building that was in such difficult shape and trying to renovate that and then you see these rates of return. I certainly am going to support it personally. I hope we maybe find another office tenant or something. We actually have, I'm a big residential fan generally in downtown, but I think this location sets up really nicely for an office space and some commercial space with maybe some residential. And so I don't know if we end up with 10 or not, but I think to have at least some commercial space and some office space down on this end of town is going to be very helpful. Along with what's going on across the street of the general world building, I think it really starts to revitalize this into downtown. So obviously the NOA is the 15 years and the other two all really the CID is additional money to the extent it comes in on sales tax and obviously an office wouldn't generate sales tax. So there'll be some other commercial activity there. But anyway, I think it's a good project. It meets our qualifications. It's important for downtown and I will support it.

Speaker 2 (01:09:26):

Okay. Anybody else want to add anything?

Speaker 3 (01:09:30):

I think to echo aspects of Commissioner Fin's points, I think if anyone was to take on this project because it is an NRA district, someone could have purchased and demoed the buildings and that's still, they still qualify for incentives. They could have rebuilt it and done something different. So I think the idea of this wouldn't exist, this if then kind of statement doesn't necessarily exist because this is in a district that draws on those incentive programs to allow it to happen. So whether it's a restoration or the total demo with some safe measures put in to recycle some of the older aspects of the building, there still be, the project would still qualify for an NRA. So I just wanted folks, we have to be careful with if then with this piece because it doesn't, that's not necessarily true. So with that, I am not opposed to exempting the applicant from the affordable housing piece.

(01:10:39):

We still need to look at that piece moving forward. But I think for this particular project, again, you don't want to put a square peg in a round hole and this does more detriment to the project. So I'm not interested in doing more detrimental work to something where applicant is really wanting to put that investment into it. So I do appreciate that. To that point, I think we have to be careful, and I know this was, it's germane to the conversation, it was brought up around affordable housing. We need to be very careful about how we say if then statements around affordable housing with market rate. If we build more market rate, that's going to make housing more affordable. There is some truth to that, but it's not necessarily true. That's kind of like hand me down housing because the idea is that you think that you're going to get a house that someone's moving out of that you're going to get it for lesser or that amount or less.

(01:11:26):

No individuals put money in, they invest money in the houses. So you're not necessarily going to get the house at a cheaper rate. That's just, it's an accessibility issue. So can't, that instant statement doesn't really amount to this. So I think just stating that this is creating housing in our housing market in our community, yes, that is true. We don't need to kind add on the caveat of affordable housing that is something that is separate from this, that is not a value add or add on in this capacity. I think as we continue to be dedicated to creating affordable housing, dedicated affordable housing, we can do that. But

I don't see this as a, we do this, it's going to help us move the needle on affordable housing. Other things that we could do that will do that, this is not one of those projects. But overall, I'm excited about what this project can bring for activating that corridor. Especially as we're going to talk more about doing a study to activate North Lawrence. So all of this is kind of folding and blending in together. So it's exciting from a commercial standpoint, from a development standpoint, from an activation standpoint of this area. So I'm excited about it and I look forward to approving it.

Speaker 5 (01:12:32):

Yeah, thanks you. Yeah, I don't know if I can really add much to that. I am support of this project, of the fact that the historical nature of that building, I put it up there with the turn hall building, the same way that it's important that we preserve these and what Matt is trying to do with this. I think it's definitely something that's in our best interest to be a partner on this, so I'm definitely supportive it.

Speaker 2 (01:12:54):

Good. Thank you. Thank you. That's a very good input and appreciate all the work that the developer has done previously on the historical buildings in Lawrence. I would echo some fine work done on preserving some of the few real jewels we have left standing and I'm glad to see this corner one of the first places you drive past if you come in over the bridge, look like it did 50 or 60 years ago when it was booming and full of activity. So I'm in favor of this. I'm a little uncomfortable with the financial assessment, but again, that's really not our financial risk and I'm just glad that people are willing to invest their money in Lawrence and we, he is getting some tax credits, which I think makes this easier, but this is a tough job in anyone who tries this is really doing a labor of love and this one, I still don't know how it's going to work, but I'm really excited to see it put in the dry eventually. So thank you

Speaker 3 (01:13:51):

Sherry. Real quick on this, I know we have the resolution and we have the two ordinances. Do we also need to vote on the wave waiver?

Speaker 2 (01:13:59):

I didn't see that.

Speaker 4 (01:14:00):

Yeah, so my understanding, and Brandon correct me, is you'll have a vote on the resolution. You'll have a separate vote to waive the requirement. Then you'll need to open and close a hearing specifically for the NRA and then vote on that item. Then you'll need to specifically open and close a hearing on the CID and then vote on that ordinance. Okay.

Speaker 2 (01:14:22):

Yeah, so first resolution, then waiver and the public hearing and the discussion adoption and another public hearing.

Speaker 3 (01:14:28):

Yeah, we tried to outline it.

Speaker 2 (01:14:30):

Yeah, it looks pretty good.

Speaker 3 (01:14:31):

Clearly, but I know it's a little complicated. I just wanted to make sure that was a voting action.

Speaker 6 (01:14:37):

No,

Speaker 3 (01:14:37):

No.

Speaker 6 (01:14:39):

I was only going to ask if we have to do the public queue and we haven't officially opened and closed him. We didn't officially open again. I said

Speaker 4 (01:14:45):

So you were taking public comment on the resolution and the waiver and then you'll need to open and close the hearing. Then you'll need to take public discuss

Speaker 3 (01:14:58):

On the NRA and vote on it.

Speaker 2 (01:14:59):

Okay. So we'll start with the first action

Speaker 3 (01:15:01):

I move. Do we adopt resolution number 76 31 determining the city's intent to issue IRBs and the amount of $8 million requested by six 12 New Hampshire Street LLC and to provide a sales tax abatement for eligible construction costs for redevelopment of the Reuter building.

Speaker 2 (01:15:16):

Second. Okay, that's a motion by sellers and a second by Finkle. Dial in favor, say aye.

Speaker 3 (01:15:21):

Aye.

Speaker 2 (01:15:22):

Those opposed. Motion passes four zero

Speaker 3 (01:15:26):

And then I move that we waive the requirement of the city's economic development policy and section 1.8 0.3 regarding affordable housing.

Speaker 2 (01:15:35):

Second again, the motion by sellers and is second by Finkel dye. All in favor say aye. Aye. Those opposed. Motion passes four to zero. Okay. Next I'd like to open a public hearing to consider a requested neighborhood revitalization area granting a 95% tax abatement over 15 years for redevelopment of the

Reuter building at 6 1 2 New Hampshire. This is the open public hearing for this specific item. Okay. Is there any open public comment on this one online?

Speaker 4 (01:16:07):

No, mayor.

Speaker 2 (01:16:08):

Okay. I'm going to go ahead and close the public hearing then our action is to this next ordinance.

Speaker 3 (01:16:15):

Oh, sorry, I'm going to we I was like I did too 'em all. I'm going to, we adopt on first reading ordinance number ten one sixty one establishing a neighborhood revitalization area adopting a neighborhood, revitalation NRA is what we're going to say and establishing a fund to finance the redevelopment of six 12 New Hampshire. Second,

Speaker 2 (01:16:35):

A motion by sellers second and by Finkel Dye. All in favor say Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye was opposed. Motion passes. Four zero. Okay. Next I'm going to open a public hearing to consider a requested community improvement district establishing a 2% additional sales tax over 22 years for the redevelopment of the Reuter building at six 12. New Hampshire public hearing is open. Anybody online?

Speaker 4 (01:17:04):

No

Speaker 3 (01:17:04):

Mayor.

Speaker 2 (01:17:05):

Okay. I hereby close the public hearing.

Speaker 3 (01:17:08):

All right, and finally I move that we adopt on first reading ordinance number ten one sixty two authorizing the creation of a community improvement district authorizing the additional 2% sales tax and authorizing execution of a related development agreement. Second,

Speaker 2 (01:17:23):

And that's a motion by sellers and a second by Finkel dye. All in favor say aye.

Speaker 3 (01:17:28):

Aye.

Speaker 2 (01:17:28):

Aye. Those opposed? Motion passes four zero. Thank you very much.

Speaker 7 (01:17:33):

Thank you. I think

Speaker 2 (01:17:33):
We're done with this agenda item, so if you want to leave the room you can do so now and we're going to start back up with the next item in just about 20 seconds.

Speaker 7 (01:17:54):
I mean, we kind

Speaker 2 (01:17:54):
Of coordinated today exactly. We did feel some type of, it's a team team blue or the green

Speaker 3 (01:17:59):
Didn't get the memo here. We were supposed to wear lime green.

Speaker 2 (01:18:03):
I'm missed it. Hi there. So go ahead and we're going to move on to the next item. If you want to discuss what this is about, that'd be fine. Then we'll go ahead and read it later. Okay,

Speaker 4 (01:18:15):
Great. Melinda, do you have anybody online that needs to be in? Nope. Yep.

Speaker 5 (01:18:24):
Linda, could you move the podium down just a little bit so I can move this down

Speaker 19 (01:18:28):
A little? Sure.

Speaker 7 (01:18:32):
Thank you. Yes, go for it. Start

Speaker 20 (01:18:48):
Please. Okay. Good evening, mayor and commissioners, assistant director of Municipal Services and operations, Melinda Harger. Our MSO director Melissa Si unfortunately was unable to present tonight due to a death in her family yesterday. So she does want me to pass on her excitement for the project. She is very excited to get started. So this is the North Lawrence Comprehensive Corridor plan. This study is going to evaluate land use opportunities, strengthen connection to the river and enhance modes of transportation between the airport and downtown. Our staff presentation will be briefed tonight. We really want to emphasize that the scope of services that we brought to you in the draft RFP back in February align with the proposed agreement with our consultant H and TB. They were selected through a formal RFP process. The services are split into two phases because we have a portion of the funding of this project is funded in the 2025 CIP and the other portion in 2026 EIP.

(01:19:57):
So we have already drafted both phases of scopes of services and you would see the amendment come back through in January for that second phase of services. We have chosen CC to lead this study as the

city's project manager. She's one of our transportation planners with extensive community engagement experience. Recently she successfully managed our efforts to develop the brick streets policy, so we want to invite her here to highlight the community engagement plan and the composition of our task force. And we also have Bill Madson who is the PM for HNTB, leading the effort for the consultant team.

Speaker 21 (01:20:39):

Cc? Absolutely and

Speaker 2 (01:20:41):

Cc

Speaker 21 (01:20:42):

Kurt, if you would actually go back to the agenda item if you could. I'm so sorry. Just the agenda item. The map doesn't need to be up unless we want to talk further about that, but hello Commissioner CC Riley Transportation planner with the City of Lawrence. As Melinda mentioned, HNTB was selected as a consultant on this and they've put together an extensive work plan and scoping on this project, which includes a great deal of community engagement that I think our community in North Lawrence will really be excited about. That includes stakeholder listening sessions. I believe there's 10 planned visioning workshops or charettes open houses and surveys and then mini tabling events. In addition to that, the task force, which is part of what we are asking you to who review today, the makeup of such was included on the agenda packet and ultimately will have 10 members. I believe you are a wizard. Thank you for all the work that you do. If there are any questions or comments on the makeup of the task force, we'd be happy to talk about that. As Melinda mentioned, Melissa was really the leader on this so we can speak to it as best we can, but there may be some questions that we don't have answers to tonight and with that if you have any other questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

Speaker 6 (01:22:21):

Any questions CC, now that we're getting going? Cc, do you have a estimate on the timeline?

Speaker 21 (01:22:28):

The first phase I believe runs to March or April and that's doing majority of the community engagement and discovery work and then the second phase runs April to November, so we're hoping for this comprehensive corridor study to be done by the end of this year with the final plan brought before you in November's agenda subject to some change, but that's what the work plan says so far.

Speaker 2 (01:22:54):

Thank you. Thank you. Any other questions?

Speaker 5 (01:22:57):

I've got a question please. As far as the task force goes, the folks that are being chosen for this 10, there's 10 of 'em listed here, different, definitely covers a broad spectrum of the various groups that are going to be impacted by this study. Was there any consideration given to adding, involving, I know we've got a city appointee for the planning commission. What about the county since it is going to be all part of, we're extending out to the airport, which gets into the county area. Is there consideration for possibly adding a county appointee for the planning commission too as a rep?

Speaker 21 (01:23:38):

Unfortunately that would be a great question for Melissa. I'm not sure at this time the planning commission could discuss that. I believe about they have some city planning commissioners that are more comfortable with the county area, so I'd be curious if they go in that direction, but at this time that's all I can really speculate on.

Speaker 6 (01:23:58):
Okay. Jeff looks like he wants to say something. Yeah,

Speaker 21 (01:24:00):
If you want to say something about that, I didn't realize you'd enter the room.

Speaker 22 (01:24:05):
Good evening Commissioner Jeff Crick planning and development services director. The task force is really your construct so you can always modify. It's very similar to the way that we handled the downtown plan and the land development co steering committee. So really the one that we put out there is a good best guess and so you could always add and amend and modify that as needed to make sure that the representation is responsive to what you would like to have.

Speaker 5 (01:24:28):
Okay, great. Yeah, that leads me into my next one is since we are on the north end of town there and the idea that we're so with the county, just basically button up the city boundaries if there's any consideration or possibility of adding somebody from the Grant township board of trustees, having them select somebody because essentially that is part of Grant Township of

Speaker 22 (01:24:53):
Course, and that's definitely a new prerogative.

Speaker 5 (01:24:55):
Okay, thank you.

Speaker 2 (01:25:01):
Any other questions for Jeff? Thank you. Okay, public comment on this I

Speaker 23 (01:25:20):
Good evening, Mr. Mayor. Commissioners. My name is Ted Boyle present North Lawrence Improvement Association and the North Lawrence Improvement Association has discussed this corridor plan and also the task force and we want to make sure that we have a member of the North Lawrence Improvement Association and also a member of the business community in North Lawrence and it's going to take somebody that knows the area. North Lawrence is different than this side of the river. We have stormwater problems going to need a lot of pumps long North second Street all the way out to the airport so that it could be developed. And so I'm here to ask that the task force has a member of the business community and a member of North Lawrence Improvement Association and I would volunteer to do that for the association because I have lived in North Lawrence 78 of my 81 years and so now we need to choose a business partner to be on that task force without somebody like me and a business owner. I don't care how many computer renderings you got, you're not going to know what's happening in North Lawrence, so we look forward to serving on this task force. Thank you. Thank you Ted.

Speaker 24 (01:27:23):

I am Nancy Thelman. I am still living in the days of when you had an Elmo, so we didn't get our information to you soon enough to get it on your screens. May I give this to the clerk so you can have, it's important to see because like maps,

(01:27:48):

So I want to first off say I was Thank you Commissioner Larson for your questions and also thank you and relieved to hear from Jeff Crick that the structure of the task force for this corridor study can be in play. Right off the bat, I want to say that I thank you and commend you for showing North Lawrence some love and some time and energy and investment because I think they need it and they deserve it and this will be a great project to improve the gateway to Lawrence from that north entrance. It needs it and it'll be a good thing to study the whole area first, and that's what I want to get to is if you look at the map, that's the study area that's included in the North Lawrence corridor study and if you look at the yellow boundary line, that's the boundary line of the area that's to be studied.

(01:28:51):

40% over 40% of the land that's going to be studied is actually Grant township land. It's not City of Lawrence land, so well over a thousand acres is going to be part of this corridor study and so the folks in Grant Township respectfully would request to be included in this process, which we view as a positive thing and would have I think some helpful input in the process, especially when it comes to that community engagement you're talking about. If you don't know the community you're trying to engage with, you're not likely to get the groups you need to talk to nor the consensus you want. If you would kindly include a resident of Grant Township selected by the grant township board and a county appointed planning commissioner, you would get two voices at least on that board, on that task force that could broaden the conversation and make some connections for the task force.

(01:30:02):

That in the end I think would be helpful and would, I mean I've been in your seat, you know what it's like, how important it is to be proactive and try and fix something before you get that reaction in the end that kind of spoils the whole thing. I think you've got a process here that could be wonderful and a project that could be really important I think without voices from the township, from people who live out there and value the land, but value improvements as well. I think there would be a reaction and I think the consensus you'd be looking for might be lost in the end, which would be unfortunate. So I guess that's See the time. Oh, I'm sorry. You'll see the request there written that other page. Thank you for your time. Thank you Nancy.

Speaker 25 (01:31:10):

Hi, I'm Paulette Schwart and I'm the trustee Grant Township.

Speaker 26 (01:31:15):

I'm Emily Banos and I'm the treasurer of Grant Township

Speaker 25 (01:31:19):

And Emma and I are part of the three member duly elected governing board of Grant Township and we're representing our constituents who have land use interests over 16 square miles of unincorporated Douglas County. In fact, several of our constituents attended our board meeting just last night, curious to know how Grant is going to be participating in this study because they knew about it. So go ahead.

Speaker 26 (01:31:43):

Grant Townships land use interests are diverse and include residential, agricultural, commercial, industrial, open space recreation and trails agritourism and the University of Kansas Research Field Station along with thousands of acres of KU conserved land and forest grant township's diverse land uses are documented in the city of Lawrence Douglas County comprehensive plan 2040 plan 2040 was conceived of and written as a joint comprehensive plan for unincorporated Douglas County and the city of Lawrence land use decisions for Plan 24 are also heard by a joint planning commission made up of an equal number of city and county appointed commission members. This North Lawrence corridor study includes 1,520 acres of North Lawrence, but it also includes 1,110 acres of Grant township. In reality, this is a city county North Lawrence Grant township corridor study.

Speaker 25 (01:32:40):

This corridor study and the task force as it's presently been presented implies there's only a city of Lawrence interests seriously to be considered. Of course we disagree since our land in Grant Township is over 40% of the land identified in this study. We really would like some task force representation to include the township and the county. If we don't, I think that opens us up to problems from the very beginning. The task force you approve tonight or as it develops, should have representation from Grant Township since its citizens have a vital interest in the future land use plans and policies set out in the final work product of this corridor study. As Nancy indicated, what we ask tonight is that we have one grant township resident. We can point them with the governing board and also one Douglas County appointed planning commissioner appointed by the joint city of Lawrence Douglas County Planning Commission. We appreciate your consideration of this important request. Thank you.

Speaker 2 (01:33:42):

Assembly.

Speaker 9 (01:33:59):

Hi, I am Michael Hallman, 1311 Prairie Avenue. I'm part of the Call River Commons, an ad hoc group of five designers who four years ago approximately proposed enhanced riverfront access, cultural amenities, Lawrence Loop connections, and a bicycle pedestrian bridge. Across the call working with the MPO, we asked the city to apply for a $35 million raise grant from the US Department of Transportation for implementation of our plan, but that was not pursued by the city. Instead, our efforts morphed into this North Lawrence comprehensive corridor study coordinated still by the MPO within municipal services and operations. While I appreciate that our vision celebrating the Kansas River may eventually take form this city LED study and task force is an inappropriate instrument. First of all, the MPO is our regional countywide transportation agency, yet this is land use study as much if not more so than a transportation study.

(01:35:16):

Secondly, the study area includes approximately and everybody has different numbers here, 1,117 acres outside city limits In Grant Township, a full 40% of the total seven thousand two thousand seven hundred forty acres. That county acreage is nearly double the study's namesake North Lawrence acreage inside the city limits. Because you are studying an area that spans both city and county, it's inappropriate that only one jurisdiction controls the process, chooses advisors and hires consultants. Therefore, this entire process should logically and legally, as I understand, be handed handled as a comprehensive plan amendment to the Northeast sector plan as part of Plan 2040, which is our joint county city comprehensive plan. If you're going to employ the MPO as our shared county city agency with intention of amending our shared transportation 2050 plan and our shared plan 2040, then the process should be handled as a planning commission steering committee with task force membership of 50% county representation or at the very

least 40, 60%. So please initiate this study as a comprehensive plan amendment with a different ratio of task force members. Thank you. Thank

Speaker 7 (01:36:56):

You much.

Speaker 27 (01:37:09):

Good evening commissioners. My name is Lisa Harris Friedman. I was a former planning commissioner and was active during the Northeast sector plan development, so I am well aware that folks who live in Grant Township and in North Lawrence are very interested in the development of their area and engaged in it as well. And so I echo the comments earlier for having representation on the advisor committee from Grant Township and more from North Lawrence. I also just had a question about how this process of developing the plan, which has a lot of great goals, will fit with the planning process that we have. How do the recommendations from this plan get implemented in our community when we have a city county comprehensive plan and a planning commission? So I don't know who to ask. I hope you'll address that in your comments. Thank you very much.

Speaker 7 (01:38:13):

Thank you.

Speaker 16 (01:38:24):

Hello, David Bastin 6 6 0 4 7. I did write you guys some stuff regarding this, but I grew up in North Lawrence and I do want to see it change. It's been pretty much the same for yeah, forever, so not much goes on there. I've known dead pretty much my whole life, so I do think he is definitely a guy that could sit on that board and make some good observations and corrections if need be and not afraid to do that. And I know he had brought up something about a businessman being on the board too, and I think Rick would be a good fit for that. I don't know if he has the time for that, but yes, I mean, yeah, if Ted's for spending the money on getting that done, then I'm for it too. Thank you.

Speaker 2 (01:39:36):

Thanks Dave. Anybody else want to speak to this item in the room? Okay, anybody online? Sherry?

Speaker 4 (01:39:54):

No, mayor.

Speaker 2 (01:39:56):

Alright,

Speaker 6 (01:39:58):

Jeff, this is a comment slash question for you. I had a conversation with the planning commissioner today too. We've talked about this for a long time and put the OFP, I mean I think we decided to put it under MSO and Melissa Sein and Melinda and because the focus of this is not to redo is not do we do, it's not an area plan. We're not asking to do an area plan. We're asking to a large extent, I mean the three big things, the transportation infrastructure, placemaking, economic revitalization, not an area plan. Is that how we understand what we're trying to do here?

Speaker 22 (01:40:41):

Yes, that was the intent of the plan there with land use and transportation though, they go inextricably linked and so we didn't want to separate that as part of the study, but you're correct. Really the study is really focusing on that economic transportation and infrastructure aspects by heart.

Speaker 6 (01:40:57):

So the outcome of this is not going to be an area plan for all that acreage and like we do in the planning commission with pink areas and green areas and red areas, that's not the goal of this plan. This is the plan is really transportation, economic revitalization down the corridor of North Lawrence from this side of the river to the airport, correct? Correct. Yeah. Okay. Well it's kind of a question, but thank you. I mean I'm certainly fine with adding someone from the Grand Township and adding someone county appointed from the planning commission. I just think for those paying attention and watching and as I talked about it, the goal of this, the end product of this is not going to be a new area plan for North Lawrence. This is not going to replace the area plan. So might be some suggestions upon the edges, but this is not an area plan study like we would do on the planning commission.

(01:41:52):

This is a transportation and placemaking sort of deal economic, much more like the downtown master plan than it would be like the northeast corridor area. I mean the north area plan or the airport plan that Lisa and I spent a lot of time on when I was on the planning commission along with Nancy. We spent a lot of time on that, so just want to make that clear. We hope we accomplish a whole lot of this. I think it's going to be very exciting, but I think this committee is going to spend a lot of time talking about railroads and talking about traffic counts and talking about pumps as Ted said, and not as much about zoning issues. So that being said, I'm happy to put the two additional people on it. I don't think that helps bring in a lot of good voices, but I'm excited about the plan, but I'd be happy to add those two members.

Speaker 2 (01:42:50):
So increase the size to 11.

Speaker 6 (01:42:52):
It'd be 12, I think 12,

Speaker 2 (01:42:53):
Sorry,

Speaker 6 (01:42:55):
9, 9, 9

Speaker 2 (01:42:56):
Plus

Speaker 6 (01:42:56):
1, 2, 3, 4, 12, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. There's 10 on there now. There's

Speaker 2 (01:43:00):
Two at large, sorry, two

Speaker 6 (01:43:01):

At large business owners.

Speaker 2 (01:43:03):
And then to address one of the questions about the business owner being from North Lawrence

Speaker 6 (01:43:08):
Or at least one if you want to stick, it says study, it does say two add large study. They have to be business owners in the study area.

Speaker 2 (01:43:15):
So really there's only a tiny fringe. It goes across the river. So that's really implicit.

Speaker 6 (01:43:20):
Yes.

Speaker 2 (01:43:20):
Okay,

Speaker 3 (01:43:27):
So you wanted to add another at large resident with the caveat that they're from Grant Township and then another member of the planning commission, but one that is a county appointee. That's fine.

Speaker 5 (01:43:38):
Would ask that the Grant township board of trustees be the one who would appoint that

Speaker 2 (01:43:46):
With the resident?

Speaker 5 (01:43:46):
Yeah.

Speaker 2 (01:43:47):
You okay with that? Yeah,

Speaker 5 (01:43:49):
Sure.

Speaker 2 (01:43:51):
Okay, I'm fine with that. I think that makes most sense. They know the area best

Speaker 3 (01:43:55):
People

Speaker 2 (01:43:55):

Best

Speaker 3 (01:43:56):

And we already have someone representing the North Lawrence Improvement Association for part of this, so we don't need to add someone.

Speaker 2 (01:44:01):

That's right.

Speaker 3 (01:44:04):

Okay.

Speaker 2 (01:44:04):

Well yeah, I don't have much to add. I think we need to get this plan going and really, as I think David pointed out, it hasn't changed a whole lot, at least since I've known in the last 40 years. So I can say honestly that this is something we need to do and with the voices of the people who are going to be affected the most and most importantly. So I'm excited to move forward If we can

Speaker 6 (01:44:28):

Motion

Speaker 2 (01:44:29):

Yes, please.

Speaker 6 (01:44:30):

I move. We award RFP number 2 5 0 0 0 2 4 for professional consulting services for the No Florence comprehensive code of study to HNTB corporation authorized to see a manager to execute an engineering services agreement in the amount of $399,650 and approve resolution number 7 6 1 2 establishing the North Lawrence comprehensive corridor of study task force with the addition of adding a resident of the Grand Township appointed by the Grand Township governing board and a county appointed planning commissioner appointed by the Lawrence Douglas County Planning Commission. Second.

Speaker 2 (01:45:08):

Alright, that's a motion by fecal tie and a second by Larson. All in favor say aye.

Speaker 6 (01:45:12):

Aye.

Speaker 2 (01:45:13):

Those opposed? Alright, that motion passes four to zero and we'll take another half a minute or so then take

Speaker 3 (01:45:20):

A break before.

Speaker 2 (01:45:20):

Oh sure. How about we take a break? How long would we like? 10. 10 minute break. And so we'll come back here at 7 36. I think we're ready to get back to it. Thanks very much. Next item on the agenda is to update on implementation of the LKPD real Times Operations Center and the Community Connection Program.

Speaker 28 (01:56:18):

All right. Good evening mayor and commissioners. I'm excited to share this presentation with you all tonight. Rich Lockhart, your Lawrence Police chief. One of the things that we hope to be able to do tonight is clear up a lot of the misinformation that's been given to our community about this project. We've met with members of our community here concerns and explain how this project will make our community safer since it was first introduced to you all a few weeks ago at a city commission meeting. Tonight you're going to hear from me, deputy Chief Adam Hefley and Sergeant Drew Fennelly. I'm going to cover the contract part of it that you approved last November. Deputy Chief Hefley is going to cover the history of cameras and license plate readers in our city. Sergeant Finley will cover the fuss program itself and what it will do. And then lastly, I'll come back at the end to talk to you about some of the why's about why we want to use this program and why it's important to help keep our community safe. At the November 12th City Commission meeting, you all approved consent item D 0.6 F.

(01:57:25):

This contract was with Axon. It included body-worn cameras in-car cameras, digital evidence, storage, something known as evidence.com, tasers and fuss. The fuss program was mentioned specifically in the staff memo. It was a line item in there for $270,000. One of the reasons that fuss was included in this contract is our new body cameras and our new dash cameras can live stream. One of the really neat features they have, and in order for us to be able to access that live stream, we had to have the fuss platform. So fuss is what allows us to live stream our body cameras and dash cameras. It does other things as well. As you'll hear later on in the presentation. What it does, it creates a map. Sergeant Fenley will show you that map that shows us where the body cameras and dash cameras are in the city. What this does is it helps improve officer safety.

(01:58:18):

If there's something going on at the scene, we're able to check in on the officers. It's not designed to randomly surveil the officers. It's just designed to be able to assist if we can. All of the body cameras are equipped with a speaker and a microphone. So we can go two way with an officer who's at a call, maybe like at the scene of a critical incident or any other thing like that. So that was the big part of the fuss portion of that contract. It's also a five-year contract, so we had the option to do up to a 10 or 15 year contract, but in discussions with Mr. Owens, a city manager, we felt like a five-year contract was a nice sweet spot to settle on. You got more savings the more years you added on, but we were balancing the ability to be able to ensure that we didn't get locked in with one company because technology can change a lot in five years and balancing the cost savings. So annually, the first year of the contract is $472,000, $545. Part of that negotiation involved since this contract was approved after the 2025 budget was approved, we already budgeted our amount for all of our Axon products. So they agreed to allow us to pay that cost a little bit lower cost in the first year and then 2026 through 2029 we'll pay 674,000. It consolidated multiple contracts that we have with Axon into one contract, making them much more easy to manage.

(01:59:54):

Kurt, can you go to the next slide? There we go. Alright, so I want to go through some of the policies that we have in place right now with our public safety video system. It's police policy number 3 33. These are all publicly available and they're in the packet. So folks can look at these policies to see how we manage all of the different areas of concern. This policy covers legal requirements, ethical concerns and privacy concerns with our public safety video system. We have two different camera systems out in public in

Lawrence, the public safety video systems are on the police department server and those are downtown. You see a picture there of the signs that notify people that public safety cameras are in use. The other cameras are traffic cameras and they're maintained by municipal services and they're at different intersections throughout the city. Sergeant Fenley will cover the number of cameras during his presentation.

(02:00:49):

One thing of note with public safety cameras or the traffic cameras is they produce an image every 10 minutes on the city's website so people can see what the cameras can see every 10 minutes to still image. It's not a live video image In this policy, we already include language for integration of other resources and technologies like fuss. If we were going to aggregate all of these into one platform, there is language in the policy that we're going to be adding to prohibit individual residence cameras from the fuss integration. So one of the things we heard from folks was that the community connect program that we rolled out in July with residences, people were concerned about live streaming on residences. Somebody brought up Columbia, Missouri as a fuss customer and when we looked at their policy, they prohibited residential streaming. So we're going to incorporate that same thing in our policy.

(02:01:42):

So we will not be live streaming or integrating is what it's called in the system, any residential cameras. The one thing to note too is that all of our use of our public safety video system is reactive. It's not proactive. So we aren't there looking at these cameras to surveil people. Fuss is not a surveillance system. Our use of public safety cameras isn't for surveillance either. Our policy says that it has to be in response to a call for service or a police action, and that's the only time we're going to be looking at the cameras. The other part of the policy talks about we will not invade areas with the reasonable expectation of privacy. So everybody silence their cell phones if

Speaker 2 (02:02:30):

They haven't. Thank you.

Speaker 28 (02:02:31):

So all of our cameras to traffic cameras and the public safety cameras are in areas where they are in the public view. They don't face any residential areas, so there's no expectation of privacy in those areas. This portion of the policy guides any future installations for us and says that we shouldn't place them anywhere where somebody would have a reasonable expectation of privacy. That would include things like your front porch, your backyard inside of any private areas. We also have a prohibition on using them to target based solely on protected class categorizations, similar to what we would see in our fair and impartial policing policy. Also, public safety video equipment shall not be used to harass, intimidate, or discriminate against any person or group. So again, very clearly laid out in policy that those are things that we will not do. We also have something called an automated license plate reader because we have that, we also have a policy that governs how we use those.

(02:03:32):

That is Lawrence Police policy number 5 21. Again, it's a publicly available policy that someone can, it's in the packet, but it's also available on our website. This policy covers digital data obtained through automatic license plate reader technology, A LPR. All data and images are for official police use only. So this prohibits somebody from looking up a friend or a relative or something like that and finding out where they've been in the city. Because this data can contain confidential information, it's not open to public review. So we don't broadcast out the license plates that we find through license plate readers. This is a passive technology, so it's not something that we are looking at regularly or like with the traffic cameras. So it's a camera that takes a picture of the cars when they go by and then can read the license plate and provide information about wants, warrants or missing people, things like that. The policy

includes a section on recognition of the importance of privacy rights to the public. So again, all these policies are trying to address those concerns as well.

(02:04:44):

The mobile video recorder, also known as the dash camera and the patrol car and the body-worn camera are covered in policies five 16 and five 18. Again, publicly available policies, they are all in the packet so folks can look at those. The policies cover the purposes of the systems and when they should be used. The body-worn camera has a provision for privacy of the officer and the community. One of the things I remember when we rolled out body cameras is people were very concerned about when we would be recording inside of people's homes, recording people at very intimate moments where they probably wouldn't want the general public to see those. So the Kansas Open Records Act covers patrol video. Most of it is considered a closed record because of those privacy concerns and we've been able to responsibly use this technology for all of the years that we've had it.

(02:05:38):

We've not had a single incident where we've violated anyone's trust with the body-worn camera. The other thing it does though is it provides a level of accountability for our officers. So we're able to now see when we get complaints, a video that can portray what happened from a very impartial perspective when we have complaints and it helps us resolve those complaints much faster. When somebody is the subject of a complaint or involved in the complaint, we allow them to come in and see the video. And many times the person, their complaints resolved once they see the video and they're able to see it when they're not under the stress of a police contact.

(02:06:19):

The Columbia Missouri policies, we looked at those, see if I can move this out of the way there. One of the big differences between our system and Columbia's is the flock camera system. Columbia, Missouri has flock all of our cameras and license plate readers are owned and maintained by the city and all of the information is stored on city servers with flock. They own the cameras, they own the APRs, they also have drones. And because they own all of those systems, they also own the footage. So there's been some new stories about federal agencies being able to access flock data, flock license plate readers. That's just simply not the way our system is set up. No one can access our system without permission from us. We control that through a policy that we've discussed earlier, and the only reason we can release information from our system is for a legitimate criminal investigation.

(02:07:15):

If it's not for a criminal investigation, then it would be a regular core request and it would fall within those parameters. So for instance, immigration enforcement is not a criminal offense, it's a civil offense. So that would not be a criminal request that would be made of us for video footage and they would not be able to live stream any of our footage. Having the ability to see our live streams is something that someone would have to come to our department to do. And again, that's addressed in policy about when that's appropriate. If somebody were to issue a subpoena or a search warrant for our footage from our system, that would go to the city attorney's office and then they would decide how to handle that. So that's something that we don't have addressed in policy because it's already addressed in other areas. So you look at our systems, our camera system is Axis and the A LPR system is Genetech.

(02:08:09):

Those are the names of the companies that are the brand names. All of that information, the camera data, the A LPR data, the access control is all controlled by the city of Lawrence. No one outside of the city, Columbia, Missouri, has flock. It controls all of that access. One of the things that can happen with Fussy is if you are another fuss customer like Topeka is, you can share your information back and forth. So we could grant access to Topeka to CR cameras through the fuss platform, but that's something that would be controlled by an MOU that we would define what can be done and not be done. And one of the things that

we've talked about as we are building our policy is that anytime we have a request for access to our system, it would be covered by an MOU that would have to be approved by the city manager that we would bring to you all in a city manager report before it went into effect. So that's something that would allow for some public notification of the agency that we're requesting to give access to that's approved by the city manager. And then lastly, it would provide an opportunity for public input about whatever agency that would be.

(02:09:25):

And now I'm going to turn it over to Deputy Chief Adam Halfly to talk about the car video history and the camera history.

Speaker 29 (02:09:38):

Good evening commissioners. I wanted to give you some context and some history of these systems that will provide information to this fuss platform. The Incar video systems began in the Lawrence Police Department just prior to 2009 with some one-off systems that were purchased on grants and put into specifically traffic cars. In 2009, the department went department wide in patrol vehicles with in-car video. That system, if you care too, it was referred to as the Digital Patroller two. It was one of the first digital video systems, the prior system being the old VHS tapes around 2012. That system which these technologies are often bought and sold, which is why we try and avoid using brand names and things like that in policy and things like that. They're bought and sold. Companies succeed and failed depending on their market share. In 2012, the old digital patroller system hit a point of failure that it had to be removed and replaced with a WatchGuard system that was in the vehicles, patrol vehicles specifically, and it was maintained until 2022. Approximately 2022, our contract with Axon was put into place for in-car video systems and the Axon Fleet three system was installed in all of our patrol vehicles and some of our specialty vehicles as an A LPR. Again, automated license plate reader. Sorry, let me back up.

(02:11:31):

The incar video systems policy, as Chief Lockhart mentioned, was put into place when that system was deployed. There was discussion in the city commission chamber when we went from digital patroller to WatchGuard because it was a new system over a certain amount. So that was brought before the commission APRs. They were installed in 2011 originally to assist investigations and patrol. They were purchased on a federal grant on a limited scope, just a handful of those devices with the goal of accounting for stolen vehicles, being able to locate missing persons wanted subjects again initially purchased with a federal grant. And if you recall, these were the systems that were used in August of 2022 when there was a quadruple homicide in Ohio and the suspect ended ended up in Lawrence.

(02:12:41):

Specific plates can be entered into the system to say, Hey, this is a search for this subject in reference to a wanted person case or a missing person, a silver alert, those kind of things. Or Amber alerts this one set off the alert and that suspect was arrested here in town and later sent back to Ohio. The same technology is utilized in several different areas in town with parking, KU parking. Some private businesses operate these type of systems. If you look when you're driving down the highway, you'll see sometimes semi-truck with cameras facing the opposite direction on their fenders, and that's a company utilizing this A LPR technology and they're just data mining. They're just grabbing anything they can to try and sell stuff, track things, all that kind of stuff. So this has become very common. Additionally, when you get on K 10 and get off K 10, you don't stop and pay the toll anymore. That's all LPR technology that's being used there. This technology was discussed in a local newspaper in 2011 and the policy has been in place that entire time.

(02:14:01):

There are fixed locations in town. I believe nine is the number of fixed locations and mobile patrol LPR, which is part of that axon in car video. It uses the car camera to do the same thing. Okay, public safety video system. This was first utilized on a limited temporary scale in 2008 during the final four each year. As KU approaches the NCA tournament, if there is a chance that that team is going to end up in the Final Four, there is a chance there's going to be a large influx of people into the downtown area. Beginning in 2008, temporary cameras were set up for situational awareness and to be able to deploy resources into different areas, figure out where we have problems starting or medics are needed or something else, and to direct resources that way. That was used in 2008, 1216 and 17. After 2017, we approached the city commission in November in a work session to discuss the downtown public safety camera to make it a permanent downtown program. At the conclusion of that, that there was policy and quite a bit of discussion, several media articles or news articles about that topic at the time the question was presented to me. I was here that night about utilizing facial recognition with that system and at the time we said we don't. We won't, and we still haven't and don't.

(02:15:46):

That brings us to the body-worn camera system. In 2022, we received a federal grant. I'm sorry it might've been a little bit before that, to do a trial of several different systems to pick a system, DOJ provided a grant for the initial purchase of the body-worn camera system. We tested three different systems, ultimately landing on Axon body cameras for a couple different reasons. One of being battery life just so that they could provide coverage during a police officer's shift. There was multiple commission meetings and the trial period, multiple discussions about policy and how that would be utilized. There was some concern as chief discussed about utilization of these devices in sensitive areas, sensitive conversations and all that was discussed at length.

(02:16:43):

At the time we rolled these out, we had two separate systems. We had an Axon body camera system and we had a WatchGuard in car system. As you can imagine, that created a lot of problems with retaining, holding onto evidence. And at the conclusion of that WatchGuard contract, we went to Axon in car video, which all stores evidence on evidence.com, which evidence.com is the lion's share of our Axon contract. Just storing digital evidence is a big task, and as you can imagine, as technology evolves, there's more and more digital evidence. So that becomes a necessary thing for us to do for the prosecution of cases. I'm now going to turn it over to Sergeant Ley to discuss the current project tonight.

Speaker 2 (02:17:33):

Thank you.

Speaker 30 (02:17:50):

Good evening, mayor and commissioners, Sergeant Drew Finley. I've been involved with this project for approximately a year and a half now. We started looking back in the spring of 2024. We had a whole lot of disparate technological resources on the department and we started looking at who had access to those. Some people would have access to a technological resource that other people wouldn't even be aware existed. And so we put together a committee to start working on this project to look at what technical technological resources we had available to us in essentially a work group to explore the feasibility of implementing a realtime operation center on the police department. So as part of that process, we started gathering that information. We received a demonstration on the fuss product, which at the time, if I recall correctly, it was within days of Axon announcing that they had acquired fuss.

(02:18:42):

It used to be an independent company. So what I'm going to go through now is a little bit on how we got to where we're at, the technology that we have access to, how fuss will aid us in our investigations and how we utilize it, and finally how that helps us reach our long-term goal of implementing a real-time

operations center. So as it stands today, we currently have 112 traffic cameras that the police department has access to. There are plans to add approximately 20 more cameras in the next two years. And as I discussed these numbers, I'll cover it again in a little bit, but for instance, when I say we have plans to incorporate approximately 20 more cameras in the next two years, what that incorporates is the Vermont Street in New Hampshire. Between sixth and ninth there are plans to acquire cameras for those locations.

(02:19:31):

However, it's not 20 different intersections that we're covering with those 20 cameras. Every intersection where we place what's known as a four-way camera, for instance, what we have in the downtown corridor, you essentially have five cameras at that intersection. You have one camera that's a pan tilt zoom camera, which can be manipulated to look in different directions. It can zoom in. But then at those intersections, we also have a four-way camera, which has fixed cameras that can't be zoomed that permanently look in the four different cardinal directions at that intersection. So for instance, as we add cameras to the Vermont Street between six and ninth, we will have five cameras at the seventh Street intersection, five cameras at the eighth Street intersection and five cameras at the ninth Street intersection. So that's how we get to that number. We also, as a police department, have access to approximately 330 city building cameras.

(02:20:19):

That is not all of the cameras that the city has access to. There are quite a few cameras within the city that provide no law enforcement purpose that my understanding is they have cameras on some gauges and switches and things like that that they can monitor at water treatment facilities and things like that. There's no need for the police department to have access to those types of cameras. So approximately 330 is the number that the police department has access to. So online, the way I always find this map, I go to Google and I search lawrence ks.org.gov now, and if you hit a space and type maps, this is the first result that comes up. So if you pull up the city's interactive map, you can look at the traffic cameras. I take that back. Maps is not the one. If you do lawrence ks.gov space city traffic cameras, you end up on this page.

(02:21:11):

And so just going back to the point that I made on the previous slide, if you go to this page, as you can see there, you can click on any of those camera icons and you can see a snapshot of what that camera is looking at. And I did a hand count, so don't hold me to this, but I tried to count every icon on that map and it appears to me that there are 67 cameras on that map, and 67 does not equal 112. The reason being is that at certain intersections such as 23rd and Iowa 31st and Osda, I'm trying to remember, I think there's one more location where we have four-way cameras intersections where we have four-way cameras. It just includes the one pan tilt zoom camera in that snapshot. So it's only including one of the five cameras at that intersection.

(02:22:02):

On that map, there are also two cameras that are on the police department server due to firewall issues and technological things that I don't quite understand that city IT and our department it understand there's a camera at George Williams and Bob Billings that is not on that map. That camera actually has been down for months and does not function currently due to some technological issues. And there's another camera at 31st and Haskell. Those two cameras are on a cellular network. Those cameras were installed utilizing old cellular devices from our patrol cars that we use to access the internet through our mobile David terminals. And because they are city, I'm sorry, police department cellular devices, they're not on the city network and that's the reason that they aren't on that map. So between those two cameras and the downtown corridor, those are the public safety cameras, and then the five cameras at one intersection being replaced by one icon is the difference between 67 cameras on the map and 112 cameras that we have access to. Does that all make sense? That was a lot. Okay.

(02:23:08):

So what you're seeing on this slide is an example of the things that are captured on our city camera network every day. And what you'll notice immediately is that these are all city traffic cameras. These are not any city building cameras because there are some technological difficulties with accessing traffic cameras and city building cameras. We can't do it at the same time, which I'll get into a little bit when I start talking about fuss. So these are all examples. This is all video footage that I personally pulled in relation to investigations. As you can see, sometimes the camera is moving on these most of the traffic crashes. We don't know that those are occurring when they're occurring, but other incidents that we have dealt with, you can see that the camera is being manipulated to assist in the patrol response to the call. And that is the main purpose behind how we're trying to utilize this technology.

([02:24:00](#)):

Obviously, as you all are very well aware, we're facing budget constraints as a city. We have seen our sworn staffing go from a high of 1 55 approximately four years ago to in the proposed budget for next year. Our authorized strength is 1 44. You all obviously had discussions last week about changing that to 1 46, but we're dealing with these financial constraints. We're seeing a reduction in our staffing, and we are trying to find a way to leverage technology to make our response to calls for service more efficient and effective. And that is what I have been doing is I try to implement some of these tactics in how we respond is gathering that information to give actionable intelligence to officers as they respond. And the result of that is they have the information when they get there, rather than looking for a suspect who has left the scene and they don't know a direction of travel.

([02:24:51](#)):

If we can provide that information to them, they know where to look. They handle the call faster, they address it more appropriately, and they're able to get back in service and available for the next call more quickly. So what you're going to see is I'm going to show you some examples of how we have utilized this technology to make us more efficient and effective in our responses. This particular example is from Centennial Park. This individual was involved in a disturbance in Centennial Park. What we didn't know what wasn't provided to dispatch was that this subject was armed with a baseball bat. As officers were arriving on scene, thankfully we were able to relay that information to the responding officers and given a typical disturbance call, you would respond with two officers and each officer would try to contact an involved party in that disturbance. Because we had this information, as the officers were responding, they were to able to respond more appropriately so they were aware that the subject was armed with a baseball bat.

([02:25:43](#)):

The last thing that we want to do is approach that individual and engage in what could potentially become a violent confrontation where both people are armed, police officers are armed with firearms at all times when they're working the subject's armed with a baseball bat. We don't want that to become an escalated confrontation. So we were able to approach more tactically. You can see in the bottom photo there, we had a sergeant on scene. We had an officer that responded with a taser, an officer that responded with a less lethal shotgun. Thankfully, this particular incident didn't escalate into something further. They were able to have a peaceful resolution to this incident. Nobody was arrested, everybody walked away. So we're thankful for outcomes like that.

([02:26:24](#)):

This is an example to show how we can be more efficient in handling a call. This individual that's walking across the street in the maroon shirt was just involved in a disturbance in the 1100 block of Massachusetts Street where he assaulted a business proprietor at that location. As officers were responding to the call, I was able to pull up the camera footage from that incident and I was able to see that the suspect walked into the Watkins Museum. That traffic camera that you're seeing there is the northbound facing camera. So that top image that is from our pan tilt zoom camera, that bottom image is from our fixed camera. So that is the fixed image from that location. I was able to look at the recordings

from that incident. I was able to see that that individual walked into the Watkins Museum, and I was able to very rapidly play back that footage quickly and determine as officers were arriving on scene that individual had.

(02:27:12):

It was very unlikely that that individual had left Watkins Museum. So I passed that information along to responding officers. They went into the Watkins Museum and 30 seconds later they walked out with that individual in handcuffs. This particular individual is someone that we deal with on a very regular basis, and the way this typically would've occurred is the officers would've responded, they would've probably spent quite a bit of time looking for this individual downtown. However, they're not going to go into every business downtown looking for this individual. Having that intelligence information to know where this individual is at, enable them to resolve the call much more quickly and handle it within a matter of minutes.

(02:27:50):

This is an example of how we can more efficiently assign our resources. So this particular call came in as a simple three vehicle non-injury accident, which is typically a one officer response. The information that we didn't have, and I should add a side note, this is not an incident that we were monitoring live. This was an incident that we pulled up the footage after the fact. You can see that vehicle that struck the other vehicles, four occupants of that vehicle left the vehicle and fled on foot. Three of them were armed. A firearm remained within the vehicle as well. As you see on the bottom there, the officer shows up and because it's a one officer response, because we don't have the full context of information, he has approximately six people standing there waiting to talk to him. And if you look very closely at the corner of the building, that is the driver of the vehicle who was armed with a firearm standing directly behind the officer.

(02:28:43):

So having that contextual information would've been very valuable In that situation, we can get more officers there to more appropriately address the situation. This is an example of the opposite. This is from an incident where it was called in that a subject was unconscious in front of the bus stop at checkers on the 2300 block of Louisiana Street. We were able to utilize the camera system to check the area thoroughly determine that no one was there and we were able to disregard the law enforcement response to that call as well as the fire med response to that call. So we have a police officer that's back in service available for call. The ambulance is able to return to the station. The firetruck is able to return to the station, and those are city resources that are now available for another call rather than spending time looking for the individual that is no longer there.

(02:29:33):

This is another example of how we can utilize the system. This particular incident was a subject who walked into a business, walked up to the manager, punched him in the face, and walked out. One of the employees started to follow the suspect as he left. However, this individual did not care to be followed and made it clear that he did not care to be followed. So the employee of the business that was following this individual stopped following. We were able to utilize the camera system to track this individual as they were leaving the area. For approximately a couple minutes, he was walking down sixth Street. This incident did not occur on sixth Street. That's just where we picked him up at. He crossed the street into the 500 block of Colorado where we lost sight of him. We no longer had cameras in the area to track him. However, we tracked him long enough that an officer was able to get into the area and made contact with this individual who the overwhelming likelihood is that he never would've been identified if we hadn't known his path of travel. The likelihood that an officer would've looked for this individual in the 500 block of Colorado is extremely unlikely.

(02:30:39):

This example was from just a couple of weeks ago. On August 6th, we had an incident involving a firearm. I'm not going to go into too much detail about this incident. It is still ongoing in the court system. However, we had information to have an idea of where this individual was. We had an undercover officer that was watching the vehicle, which was the suspect vehicle, but there was no one with the vehicle when we located it, and so we wanted to do was remain in the area, not in marked units to try to keep an eye on this vehicle for anyone who had returned to it. They did eventually return to it, the undercover radioed in the information. The vehicle was moving. We were trying to get patrol resources into the area, but at that time, the only way we had to track the vehicle was through the camera system while patrol units responded.

(02:31:26):

So as we were looking at this situation and tracking the vehicle, it was stopped here at Michigan stoplight and you'll see the passenger retrieves a firearm from the driver and places it in his satchel that's attached to his chest. We were able to immediately provide that information to the officers who were responding from down the street. As you're going to see here in a moment, the camera's going to pan out. The officers have arrived in the area. We are now notifying them that the passenger placed that firearm in his satchel and they're then going to execute what we refer to as a felony car stop, which is a high risk car stop where we believe the people to be armed and they can handle that situation appropriately. So they did execute a felony car stop in that instance and gained compliance from the individuals voluntarily and they were taken into custody. Two firearms are actually recovered from that satchel.

(02:32:20):

This is an incident from back in June. This was a pursuit that was in coming into town with an armed carjacking suspect from Johnson County. We were notified by Franklin County that this individual had stolen another vehicle and was route to Lawrence Deputies located this vehicle traveling northbound on 59 Highway. However, during this pursuit it was at 10 40 in the morning. I believe it was on a Wednesday morning, lots of traffic down in that corridor. They made the determination as they were pursuing this vehicle up 59 highway that if it reached the city limits, they were going to no longer pursue this vehicle. So the traffic camera system gives us the opportunity to track these vehicles without having a police car directly behind them because what we know as law enforcement is that the active pursuit, if we continue to pursue that vehicle, the person's going to likely continue to drive in the fashion that they're driving.

(02:33:12):

So you can see there as they're coming into town, the sheriff's deputies are turning their lights off on their patrol vehicles, no longer pursuing that vehicle. And in this bottom video you're going to see as this vehicle approaches 31st and Iowa, take special note that there are no patrol vehicles behind this vehicle and it's continuing to drive in a reckless fashion. The driver executes one of the most impressive parallel parking jobs I've ever seen, though not intentionally. So as the vehicle crosses through 31st street, she loses control, ends up wedged between two poles. The vehicle can no longer go anywhere. So she jumps out the passenger window and takes off running to the northeast. You're going to see one of the frustrations that I commonly deal with when I'm trying to track a suspect on this system is she runs directly behind the pole. So I was unable to track her from that location. However, I was able to provide her last known direction of travel to the officers that were responding. They located her on the border patio right up there. She was crouched down behind the wall hiding. So we're able to track that vehicle without having patrol resources directly behind it, not encouraging that person to continue to act in a reckless fashion.

(02:34:22):

So this brings me to the topic of fuss. Fuss is a technology aggregation and integration tool. It is not in itself surveillance hardware. It is taking the resources that we already have to access to as a police department and it's compiling them into what they call a single pane of glass. So it eliminates the need to

log into several different systems. I kind of touched on a little bit before, for instance, if we have an incident at Holcomb Park with a suspect that is leaving on 27th Street, we cannot currently pull up the Holcomb Park Recreational Center exterior cameras and the 27th and Iowa traffic camera, which would be the nearest traffic camera. We cannot have those cameras up simultaneously. They operate on different servers. If we want to leave the traffic camera system to get city building cameras, we have to log out of that system and use a different log to log into the city system to access those Holcomb Recreational center cameras.

(02:35:17):

It's a process that doesn't take a ton of time. We're talking one and a half to two and a half minutes to log out and log back in. But when you're talking about circumstances where someone is fleeing the scene or you have an active incident, one and a half to two and a half minutes can be an incredibly long time. We lose a lot of information as has already been discussed. Fuss is not facial recognition software. Axon has a policy that they will not use facial recognition. Also, let's just say for argument's sake that at some point in time, axon changes their mind and they start to use facial recognition technology. We as fuss users have the ability to turn off that option. So I'm going to get into the AI searches a little bit later, but you'll see that there are limited search parameters that we can use to search those features and we do have the ability to turn those off independently from each other.

(02:36:10):

So as I've kind of touched on already, fuss is an aggregation tool. It takes the resources that we already have access to as a police department and integrates them into a single pane of glass. So that's talking about our dispatch system, our body cameras, our incar video systems, access communications on the top right there. That's our city traffic cameras. Genetech and A LPR web are what we utilize for our A LPR systems. Motorola, they are, well, they actually own Spillman, but they also do our radios. Rapid deploy is the system that dispatch uses. The Douglas County Emergency Communications Center, they utilize that system. When somebody calls 9 1 1, that system is activated and it begins trying to give a GPS location for where the person is calling from. So where that comes into play is if somebody is unable or unwilling to provide their information to receive assistance from police, fire, or med, that system begins to try to identify where they're at.

(02:37:07):

It's not always successful, but it sometimes will give us a location and it gives us an uncertainty with that location. So it may be they're at this location with a 1000 meter uncertainty. Well that's a fairly large area. That's not really helpful information, but other times it'll tell us within a three meter uncertainty. So that information can all be pulled into fuss as well. There is a feature to fuss that we were really excited about, but we are starting to understand that it may not be possible to utilize. It has the ability to monitor live 9 1 1 calls and where that comes into play is someone calls 9 1 1, they need immediate assistance. That's why they're calling nine one one. The call taker is taking that information. They're creating a call within Spillman, our dispatching system, and that information is then sent over to the dispatcher who has to read that information and then puts it out on the radio as they dispatch units.

(02:38:01):

Having the ability to hear that information as it's coming in gets people route to that location quicker, it gets us pulling up those cameras in the area quicker and gets us better information to provide to responding officers again, making us more effective and efficient. This is what our fuss map looks like as it stands today. Currently, the only things that we have integrated so far into the system is our traffic cameras and then obviously our Axon devices are already integrated into the system automatically. There was no process for doing that. All that backend work is done prior to us even starting this process. So our body cameras are in there, our vehicles are in there and our traffic cameras are in there.

(02:38:48):

Future integrations will include computer aided dispatch integration, and what that will do is you see that little yellow triangle that is there on the map that would indicate a call location. So somebody has called dispatch, they have requested service from emergency services. It would automatically place that triangle on the map and a fuss user then could click on that triangle. They could see the call notes for the call, they could see the address for the call and it would automatically pull up the cameras that are closest to that location and that's how they can begin capturing that information and that intelligence to provide to responding officers. This is a simulation for how in-car video is accessed live. This is actually the old respond map that the chief was alluding to a little bit earlier. This is where our body camera and in-car video information used to be housed.

(02:39:39):

However it functions essentially the same way. You click on the vehicle and it starts the live stream. It communicates through cellular technology and we have the ability to live stream that in car video. So it also comes into play when we're talking about utilizing our body cameras. So this is an example from, oh, when was Les Ke football game here? A week and a half ago, this was Saturday. A week and a half ago. Officer got into a foot pursuit and chased down this individual, took him into custody. This is a simulation on the bottom there. This is what it would look like on the map. Had someone been observing it, you'd be able to live stream that officer's body camera footage and you would also see an updated icon on a map showing that officer's exact location. What happened in this particular incident is it was a fairly lengthy foot pursuit and when the officer had the subject eventually surrender because he got too tired from running, he lays down and surrenders.

(02:40:40):

The officer didn't know exactly where he was at other than somewhere near Dylan's and somewhere near Big O Tires. And so if someone is operating the fuss system at that time, they're able to see that icon on the map that updates live and they can provide that contextual information about where that officer is located and can see where other officers are responding from and direct them into that location. The other times that this comes into play for being very important is a lot of times we have officers that are dispatched to a two unit response that they don't always arrive at that location at the same time. So if you're dealing with a very escalated individual or a situation that is rapidly devolving, having the ability for someone who's sitting at a desk who is in a stress-free situation, to be able to monitor that and provide that information to the other responding officers is incredibly beneficial. From an officer safety standpoint. They can tell that other responding officer either, Hey, you need to step up your response, maybe respond lights and siren or alternatively, hey, everything is calm here. It's not as serious of a situation as the call to dispatch indicated it's not urgent. Take your time to get there. So it can go both ways.

(02:41:54):

Another feature of fus is an incident management system, and what this can do is it can take your live tracking of your assets, so your vehicles, your officers, because we know where their body camera is, they're wearing their body camera, we know where they're at. We can use this mapping feature to place icons on the map, which is great for commanders. If you're having a critical incident, say you have a barricaded subject or some type of standoff or some other major type incident, you can place information on this map to be updated alongside the real-time updates of what the officers and vehicle locations are to get better operational control over that incident and be more informed as a commander.

(02:42:36):

This is an example of the type of LPR hits that we get from this information. On the right is our fixed LPR hits. On the left is our mobile LPR. So you can see it gives you the information on the tag and very limited information. Otherwise it's a photo of the vehicle. Both of these vehicles are Lawrence Police Department vehicles. The vehicle on the right is not a member of the public. It is a police department vehicle with a standard Kansas tag. So that is just to provide an example of what those look like. Now we

can get into a little bit of the AI searching. So vehicle detections, it's very limited in what we're able to search on this. Again, these search features can be turned off and on at any time as far as what you can search for. So these are all of the features that you can use to detect a vehicle color.

(02:43:28):

There is a box for vehicle make, but when you click on the dropdown menu, there are no options to choose from there. And then the vehicle body type I believe is going to be shown here in this next video. So what you see here on the right there, that's just a picture that's showing you the results of the AI system of doing a detection on a blue car. You can see that three of the six detections there are not blue cars. But then I made just a little video here to show you the different options that you can choose from. So here are your yellow vehicles and it's going to go through. You can see this is not a significantly helpful tool for identifying a specific vehicle. Where this becomes beneficial is if you don't know where to start, if you have a suspect vehicle information on a specific make and model and color to begin trying to track down where that vehicle might be. But you can see there it's a little bit of a shot in the dark. This is after you've already exhausted your other resources to try to locate this vehicle. This is potentially an option.

(02:44:37):

It is not necessarily an indictment on the capabilities of the AI system so much as it is on the resolution of the cameras that we're utilizing. So the information that we're getting out of that is only as good as the information that's being put into it. So as you can see here on this, well, we're not there yet. Sorry. So this is just showing you the different detections. One thing I want to point out here, it works much better during the day than it does at night obviously because you have more light. So again, that garbage in, garbage out, it's not getting good information from those nighttime still shots. So that top right picture there, that's what it's giving is the results at nighttime for motorcycles, and I can't really give you any indication of why it's picking up those vehicles as being motorcycles. But you can see here you have different categories of vehicle body types and then it goes through and switches on the different types of things that you can search. This is the search results for a bus. We get a few city buses. We get an old Ford Explorer, a box truck, a Bud Light truck.

(02:45:44):

So I'm just going to let this play for a minute here. It's going to go through and show the different vehicle categories that we can search. So again, as you can see here, results not great. We would like for them to be better, it would be more useful. But as it stands today, that's what it's giving us. You can see that the motorcycle search during the daytime gives significantly better results because there is more light available. If I'm not mistaken, I think the next one is my favorite one. Nope, does bicycle first. My favorite one is train because we don't have any cameras in the city that look at train tracks but train's an option and there are results.

(02:46:37):

So again, you see some of these pictures are clearer than others. It all goes to resolution. How much of the camera is zoomed in? If it's not zoomed in at all, when it's capturing that specific image, there are train results. Essentially those images are blurry because it's spotting a person in a small segment of that video footage and it's extrapolating those pixels and just blowing them up. That's why that image can be so blurry at times. Also, some of these cameras that we're utilizing were purchased as long as ago as 2014. Most of the cameras that we purchased in 2008, if I'm not mistaken, have been replaced. Those aren't in use anymore, but some of these cameras are 10 to 12 years old, so they're significantly degraded quality. These cameras are very expensive to install and replace. So we're limited in how often we can replace these cameras.

(02:47:34):

I think that's all on, Nope, we're going to get into people now. So this is an example of the people search. These are all the options that you can possibly have on the people search. So whether or not they have a

bag, a backpack, it has gender on there. I'm not sure how the algorithm determines gender. It has information on do they have a hat, what color is their shirt and what color are their pants or shorts. But as you can see here, the results because of that overp pixelization from blowing up that camera image, the results are not spectacular there. As I mentioned before, if Axon were ever to reverse course and turn on facial recognition, we have the ability to turn that off. So we could go in now and take away the bag and the backpack and the hat search. The gender search we could probably take away too, and then it would just be searching for top and bottom clothing colors. But those are the different types of detections that the AI search is capable of as it stands today. There's no doubt that as technology advances, AI features will improve. They will get better. However, at the end of the day, it's still garbage in, garbage out. If we have the same cameras that are inputting that information tomorrow that we do today, then any advances in that technology for AI detection won't improve with that garbage in.

(02:49:00):

Everything that is done in the fuss system, whether it's accessing traffic, cameras live in-car video streaming, accessing dispatch information for a call, all of that is meticulously logged and tracked within the system. It is uneditable by us. It is permanently stored forever and you can see the information that is on the right there is the level of detail that's included. So you can see that on August 25th I accessed the sixth and Schwartz Schwarz traffic camera shows the organization that I'm with, and it shows you that I observed that camera for 57 seconds. All of that level of detail creates an audit record that is searchable. There is an ability to create reports as a result of that audit being run. We have asked Axon to make this a little bit simpler to be able to generate publicly consumable reports. For instance, this audit log that you're seeing here has hidden columns.

(02:50:01):

You can see it's got B-C-D-E-G on the top. It requires someone to go through and look at every one of these entries and to essentially wash it to make it consumable for the public so that we're not releasing private information. There is private information on this slide including crime locations and vehicle tag informations. That was to show that we can provide the detail of what is in an audit log. But essentially if we were going to create a regular report, that information would need to be removed to protect individual's privacy as well as to protect the content of the criminal investigation. But that is just to show the level of detail that these audits are capable of as it stands today. In order for us to audit the usage of all of these systems, we have to go to each individual platform and run an audit on that platform. Each platform has its own individual way of auditing the system. Some have more detail than others, so this would give us the ability to have a more robust auditing system for us to be able to track and look into how officers are utilizing the system.

(02:51:12):

That brings me to the Community Connect portion of the presentation. So I do want to make an important distinction. There are two separate parts of the Community Connect program. There's registration and there is integration. Registration is essentially a resident saying, Hey, Lawrence Police Department, I have a camera at this location. There is no means for us to access that camera or for us to get any information from that camera. I think it's the next slide. Yep. So on this next slide here you can see that is what a camera registry looks like. It plots the location on a map. For privacy sake, I have zoomed the map all the way out so that you can't see that location, but this is essentially the information that it gives you. It gives you the address for the individual that registered the camera, their contact, email, contact name, contact phone number, the number of cameras listed is what they have provided.

(02:52:07):

We have no way or desire to determine if that information is factual and it shows that it's coming from a residential address. So that is what the registration looks like. There is no technological connection between the fuss platform and that individual's cameras. I know there has been some discussion about fuss announcing a partnership with Ring and that is not to facilitate live streaming of cameras. That is

essentially creating a separate camera registry where if we were to go through the way the system is intended to work is we have this camera registry and if we have an incident occur, we can set up an area on the map that we want to send out an email that says contact everyone on the registry within this area. Ask them to check their camera to see if they have any relevant footage, and it provides a link to those individuals so that they can submit that footage and submitting that footage is no different than say, uploading a clip to Facebook.

(02:53:08):

It is taking just that clip and submitting it to our evidence storage system as being relevant to the investigation. The person responsible for that investigation would go back and look at that footage to determine if it is in fact relevant to their investigation and they could then either mark it as being relevant and sort evidence.com or mark it as irrelevant, in which case it would be disposed of in accordance with our evidence retention schedule. So the ring system is creating a separate registry where we could send out a notification to the people on our registry that says, please check your cameras. But aside from that ring would then contact their customers without us knowing who those customers are within that area and say on behalf of the Lawrence Police Department, please check your cameras. If you have relevant footage, you can submit it to this link.

(02:53:59):

If there is any information submitted back to the police department, we are notified about that. If no information is provided, we know nothing about what that person chose to do. We don't know that they were contacted. We don't know if they ignored the email and we don't know if they just refused to provide any footage from their cameras. It's just ring letting them know there was a crime in your area. If you'd like to submit footage, you can do so. That is the agreement that is in place between Ring and Fuss. There is no integration for ring video cameras. In order for cameras to be integrated into the fuss system, they have to be technologically connected through a fuss core device, which is essentially a server that the cameras are connected to and that's what gets us into integration. So as chief talked about, we have no desire need or there's no legitimate law enforcement purpose for us to incorporate cameras from individual private residences.

(02:55:00):

The likelihood of that camera ever being of any value to us is so insignificant small that it doesn't make any sense for one for us to enter into an MOU with that individual and it doesn't make any sense for them to spend the money on the core device to attach their cameras to the system. So integration, we're looking at potential businesses that are in high traffic areas, organizations that are large organizations within the community maybe that have multiple locations or areas that we respond to frequently or businesses that are in highly trafficked areas or businesses that we respond to regularly. So whether that be a big box store, a bank, a gas station, places like that where we're consistently responding to those areas where there's a mutual benefit between the police department and that business to say having access to provide this relevant information to responding officers would be incredibly beneficial for everybody involved.

(02:55:58):

Anybody who integrates their cameras into our system, they have their own audit log, they're able to go back and see in their audit log who has accessed their information. Again, that's not editable by them, that's not editable by us. They could go back and see when did the Lawrence Police Department access my system? And because that's a permanent record, they can see a record of every time the Lawrence Police Department has ever accessed their system. We don't have any ability to see their audit log. We don't have any ability to edit their audit log. It's entirely under the control of the person who is sharing their cameras with the police department. Anytime someone does elect to integrate their cameras with us, there are three different levels for what type of live access would be permitted. One of those is the highest level of access would be unfettered access all the time.

(02:56:48):

The streams are constantly live. We could pull them up at any time. There are pros and cons to both of those things. There are privacy concerns for the business that they don't want the police department to have access to those cameras at all times and that's totally fine. The best way to do it in my opinion, which my opinion is only my opinion, is that when a call for service is entered into our dispatch system, that'll be mapped within fussy and if someone were to click on that icon that shows where a call for service is, that is the mechanism that would initiate that live streaming capability. So if a call for service was not active in the area of that camera, then the live stream could not be activated. The final level of access authorization that the camera owner can set is that it is based strictly on push button permissions where if we need access to a camera, we send a request to that camera owner and they would have to physically open the app and press allow to give the police department access to that live stream.

(02:57:50):

So you can see how that could be problematic in a situation that's rapidly evolving or unfolding in an emergency situation that could be a several minute process by the time the person notices the notification and allows that access. So I think there's a trade off there in between with that call for service access that really strengthens the system, gives those privacy protections and allows us to get access to those camera feeds when we need 'em the most. Both of these programs are entirely optional. We are not compelling anyone to participate in the registration or in the integration of cameras.

(02:58:29):

This is directly from the website that has been set up. Connect lawrence.org. This is the types of devices that people would have to purchase in order to facilitate that technological connection to allow their cameras to be integrated into our system. Essentially the person goes online and they buy one of these devices. The first year cost, which is what that cost at the top is. So for that top device, $350 for that second device that can hold up to 50 cameras, it's $1,500. The top one is $150 a year. The bottom one is $900 a year. There is one that is significantly larger that holds 180 cameras. That is $2,300 a year. But as you can see from the cost of these, it's expensive. And what these people get out of that, they get their own fuss system. They have an app that they would be able to access their cameras on at any time, and it's also what they use to control our access.

(02:59:21):

So if someone buys a device that stores 180 cameras that gives them access to 180 of their cameras, it does not necessarily give us access to 180 of their cameras. They select which cameras they would like for us to have access to. So if they only wanted us to have access to three of their 180 cameras, those are the only cameras that would be integrated into our system. We don't have any ability to change those settings. Those are all housed completely within their own system. All this would only be done after the police department has entered into a memorandum of understanding with that camera owner that explicitly details how and why the cameras will be accessed and what the expectations are for both parties. One of those expectations that would be set out beforehand would be that the Lawrence Police Department does not guarantee that we will ever look at your cameras. The purpose of this system is not for us to provide you security monitoring for your system. The purpose of this system is to give us context when we're responding to calls. So we're not going to pull up your cameras and say, yep, your parking lot is clear at three o'clock in the morning. Rest assured we've got eyes on your parking lot. That is not a guarantee that we make and it's certainly not the intention of the way we would like to use the system.

(03:00:37):

So like I said, physical server access is required in order for people to integrate their cameras into our system. We haven't finalized an MOU with that. We haven't integrated any cameras from a public location yet. There's been some talk about the timeline for this project and we don't have an explicit

timeline for this project because when I showed you all of those things that we're going to integrate into the system, all of those things take time. They take a lot of backend work that has to happen before those devices can be incorporated into the system. So for example, we're currently working on the city building cameras for every single city building camera. We have to have the IP address, login information, the Webstream address for that camera, the GPS coordinates for where that camera is at, as well as the floor of the building that it's on, whether it's indoor outdoor.

(03:01:33):

So I have to go through and build a spreadsheet for approximately 330 cameras with that information for every single camera that is time consuming. It takes time. That's where we're at in the process right now. Axon is waiting for us to provide them that information so that they can send us the server devices for us to attach to the city network to incorporate those city cameras. So it's a very long process and each technological tool has to go through that same process. So that's what the steps are to integration things like I mentioned before, the body cameras, the in-car video, and even the community connect program. Those are systems that already have been built by Axon that don't require any work on our part. So the integration of this system and the rollout of this system is entirely dependent on how quickly we get them the information they need to incorporate this stuff.

(03:02:23):

Realistically, we are still several months out from full implementation of this. We have a very limited group of officers that have access to this information currently, but as I've shown you already, the information that's already on there is very limited to begin with. So we're still utilizing all those disparate systems that we currently have access to. Where you're logging into each one is how we're generally functioning at this point in time. So fuss we did as a demo last spring was trying to get us to this long-term goal of a real-time operation center and it's something we have explored pretty extensively on how it could potentially be implemented. You see on the top there, that is my office and that's how I'm operating with two monitors and a big screen TV that are all connected to my computer on the bottom there. That is from the Super Bowl last year.

(03:03:15):

I'm sorry to any chiefs fans in the room. The score is on there, but that's our operation center that we set up to potentially respond to any Super Bowl celebrations. We didn't obviously have any Super Bowl celebration downtown for the last Super Bowl, but this is a simulation of how we can implement these concepts of what eventually, hopefully could become a center where these assets are being monitored in response to calls for service. This center you see here is the Tulsa real-time information center and the importance of something I need to note here that's important is that you see a lot of workstations in this room and that this center could be used for multiple purposes, one of those being for daily response to calls for service. Another situation would be when you have large events, when you have large incidents, this can also be used as a command room.

(03:04:13):

So you need workstations in these areas in order to manage those incidents because you get people in the room when you're talking about something like the Final Four. We have representatives in our command center from all areas of the city, other agencies within the county, all the agencies that come to assist us have a representative in that emergency operation center. So this could function as a pseudo operation center where you have access to all those resources to give commanders the information that they need to command the incident on a day-to-day basis. There's never a need for more than two, maybe three people operating in this function. That's kind of what our call load dictates. The way we're doing it right now, I'm doing it. I say part-time, that's probably not an accurate representation. It's less than part-time. Essentially while I'm doing my work at my desk, if I hear a call come out that I know in my head, Hey, there's a camera near there, I'll pull up and try to assist with that call.

(03:05:10):

And we've seen some pretty good success with that as you've seen in some of the examples in this presentation. But the idea of staffing this with 10 to 15 people, it's not a reality frankly, this center being built in Lawrence, it's not a reality anytime in the near future. It was on the CIP request this year. The cost for an operation like that is going to be anywhere between one and a half to two and a half million dollars. That is not money that the city has in the budget right now. That is not money that the city's going to have in the budget anytime in the near future. We're exploring funding opportunities for this. We don't have anything right now that's very promising on getting this funded. So we're kind of in a wait and see approach right now. The co-location of the people performing this function is important.

(03:05:56):

We have one officer that's on injured duty right now that is performing this function. He had never utilized the camera system prior to coming into this spot. We're still getting him up to speed. His effectiveness in using the cameras is still a little bit limited because he's not real familiar with the system. He's certainly not familiar with some of the other systems that I've talked about today. So we're still trying to get him up to speed. So we haven't really seen what the full effect of it could be, but what we have seen is that providing this information to responding officers is incredibly beneficial. We've gotten a lot of great feedback from patrol officers that think it's just awesome to get information as they're responding to the call because what we know as police officers is that witnesses can be unreliable. So anytime someone is in a stressful situation, their brain is not processing memories in the same way that they do in normal situations. So we can get a call to dispatch and the witness can be absolutely 100% certain that it was a person in a red shirt that left the scene that was the suspect, and then we can get video that shows definitively it was a person in a blue shirt. So having someone that's able to sit back from that stressful context and be able to observe the information on camera and provide that information to responding officers is incredibly beneficial. So with that, I'm going to turn it back over to Chief Lockhart.

(03:07:11):

Makes true.

Speaker 28 (03:07:13):

Alright. All right. One of the things that we think is really important is to explain to everyone our why for this program. So this last, about two or three weeks ago, we had a murder case. First degree murder was the murder of a man in front of the library and it's a perfect example of how this system will work once it's implemented. So we had video evidence from the library and from a business nearby that captured the actual incident. The suspect fled on a bicycle through Old West Lawrence. And so at the time of this investigation, detectives had to go out and follow a path that they believed that this man was traveling. And as they were doing that, they were looking for video cameras on people's residences. They found one, they talked to the resident, the resident was able to activate. There's an homeowner's association, it's very active, was able to activate that network and then it had all of the people in Old West Lawrence checking their ring cameras or rings a brand.

(03:08:10):

They're doorbell cameras, they're surveillance cameras for us. We were able to recover his bike. We were able to follow his path all the way through to sixth Street all the way to ninth and Iowa. We recovered his shirt, we recovered the weapon, and so it helped us in a way that we wouldn't have been able to do that without their cooperation with camera registration. What could happen is we could send that message out to everybody much more effectively. We catch everyone who had a registered camera and then they could get that evidence back to us while detectives are off following other leads. So we've got other work that we could be doing in place of that. We had another murder that happened over off of Haskell Avenue. It was also captured on video and it was a system that we knew who the manager of the system was, so we were able to get access to that.

(03:09:00):

So had we needed that, it would've also been something that would've been beneficial in prosecution. In that case, city camera systems have directly led to the solving of murders mentioned, those missing persons, those happen almost every day. We get somebody missing or somebody who's endangered and what Drew does is he's really good at this. He'll go through and watch these cameras and look for a vehicle description. He can watch 'em at eight x, I don't know how he does it, but he's able to pick up vehicle descriptions and then all kinds of other investigations, the pursuits and things like that. Live contextual information makes us safer and more efficient. So quicker access to information means a quicker resolution. You saw the example in Centennial Park. Combining our cameras with camera registry creates a more robust net that can help us capture dangerous criminals and get them off the street quicker.

(03:09:52):

It creates an opportunity for officers on limited duty to still employ their knowledge and skills. So you all get a monthly report from me about our effective staff at any time. We have probably four to six officers who are on limited duty. They can't go out on the streets and work, but they can sit behind a desk and watch a camera and provide information. We just had an officer come back from Wichita. They had a seminar down there about how they're utilizing limited duty officers to take reports from information they gather through watching their camera system. And so we're exploring how that might work for us here, but we're now able to use these officers in a way that helps them contribute to the mission in a positive way. Lemme move this out of the way. The response to the man with the back call, drew talked about that it was more appropriate.

(03:10:41):

We had some less lethal resources there. We were also able to find him. So when we got there, they knew where he was, the medical call that we checked on. And then the accident with the armed subjects. Again, it's all about officer safety and citizen safety. When we respond on a call, reduced staffing, we mentioned that due to budget constraints, but the other part for us is the unfilled vacancies. We only run academy classes at certain times of the year, so we're down probably 20% most of the time. So if we can use this technology, it's a force multiplier for us. So we're able to have one person back there kind of look at around to get us more information and direct those resources in a more responsible way.

(03:11:29):

It would take numerous officers and detectives add to our staff to replace access to technology like this. The other thing I want to emphasize too, it's not necessarily a why, but we've been responsible utilizing city traffic cameras and building cameras since 2008 and our license plate readers strong policy and training will ensure that we continue to be intentional and effective in the way that we police the community while capitalizing on the technology and resources available to us. And then the fuss platform is, drew mentioned also provides a much more accountable platform for us so we can make sure there aren't abuses. We've listened to our community. When we talk about safeguards, we have the same values that our community has when it comes to things like immigration enforcement when it comes to things like privacy. And so we want to make sure that we've considered every concern that they have and it either addressed it in policy or something like that.

(03:12:25):

So we've done some of that already ahead of this meeting and we're going to continue to do that tonight when we hear from public comment. I also want to relate this back to our strategic plan just to remind you of our objectives here. Safe and secure. One. The percent of residents who perceive Lawrence as safe or very safe. When we do a better job of making arrests and have the evidence needed for a successful prosecution, we keep subjects from committing additional crimes, makes people feel safer, our neighbors group A crimes. This will help us reduce crime by gathering evidence in a more efficient way. In solving

crime sas five number of calls handled by service alternatives to a traditional police response. When somebody can look at a camera and determine that a law enforcement response isn't needed, they can send a non-law enforcement response to that call.

(03:13:15):

We can take reports through our real-time operations center to avoid an unwanted or unnecessary officer response. S SAS 15 response time to priority one, two, and three calls. Responding officers will have the context and information necessary to effectively address the call, meaning they get where they need to be faster. A percentage of investigations resolved. SAS seven, having the information needed to respond effectively will lead to better outcomes due to quicker suspect identification, better evidence gathering, and more successful prosecution. In the murder case, we would've never found that gun had we not had an idea where to look and those cameras gave us that opportunity. And then an A TF dog that sniffs out guns and ammunition helped as well. Fuss is a single pane of glass technology solution with resources dedicated to using it will approve our ability to be a high performing organization and will lead to a more safe and secure city. I know it was a long time. I appreciate your patience with us. It was a lot of information, so I'm happy to answer questions that y'all might have. Thank you,

Speaker 2 (03:14:17):

Chief. That was a lot, but it was very helpful and really informative. Thank you very much. And to Drew for his lengthy presentation, which I thought was also really helpful for me at least. Thank you.

Speaker 6 (03:14:35):

Couple questions. Sure, please. I can't remember if this was said in the conversation, but remind me of the length of time we keep information on the cameras.

Speaker 28 (03:14:45):

So it just depends. It's 14 days on the traffic cameras and then APRs are 180 days. If it's a relevant piece of video, it's retained for a longer period of time. So like murder cases, it's forever. The others are related to whatever the statute of limitations is for the crime. Those then come off the server, the city server or the PD server and go to evidence.com, which is where all of our digital evidence is stored.

Speaker 6 (03:15:13):

Another obviously questions about kind of passive AI sort of searches versus active searches. With the license plate readers, like let's say there's a, what do they call those? Amber Alert that says, does our A LLP system automatically search that without anyone doing something or does someone have to go into that information and do a look?

Speaker 28 (03:15:39):

So if there is what we call a hit put on a license plate, so for a warrant or an Amber alert that gets put into the system through the National Crime Information Center, the A LPR system is connected to that. So if one of our cameras, in the case of the mass murder suspect from Ohio, when his license plate came into Lawrence, there was an alert from our system that told all of the officers working that mass murder license plate was just triggered at ninth and Iowa or wherever the A LPR was that picked him up. So that alerts the officers that his car is here. So now we can go to the camera system and start looking for the car around the city to try and find it. And then if it hits another A LPR, we'll get another alert. It just went through this area.

(03:16:23):

And so the great thing about our new cameras in the cars, the dash cameras is they're all APRs as well. They're not as good as the fixed ones, but they will also read that license plate and give you that information. All the officers when they get that information, have to verify that it is what the license plate reader thinks it is. So if it's supposed to be on a red Chevy and you've got a blue Ford and the license plate is maybe a digit or two off, you want to make sure that you have some additional information before you take an action on that vehicle. So that's kind of the way it works. We can also enter alerts in there. So if we have a car that just left QuickTrip and did a robbery and we have the license plate, we can put that into the system as well as wanted for questioning in a robbery at QuickTrip. And then the systems would be begin looking for that as it drives through throughout the city or if it's gone through the city before, it would pull that up and alert us about where it's been.

Speaker 6 (03:17:21):
Thank you. Those are the questions. I just had a couple of those questions.

Speaker 5 (03:17:24):
I had a question. So if outside agencies want to access the state, I know you talked about that a little bit earlier, such as federal. On the federal side, what would they have to go through in order to get any data from us?

Speaker 28 (03:17:39):
So they have to send over a request for us. That request has to include what the purpose is for the information that they're seeking, and then I have to approve that request. That doesn't give them access. There may be a request that comes over, Hey, is this license plate, was it picked up on your license plate readers? We would want to know what's the law enforcement purpose and if there's not a law enforcement purpose, then we refer that back to what a Cora request would be, a Kansas Open Records Act request. And it would have to fall within one of those areas for release before we would release that information.

Speaker 6 (03:18:14):
Okay. I did have a follow-up question about how, of course we have a policy, an ordinance on working with ICE in the immigration or not. Does that apply to all of these cameras? I mean all those cameras existing when we came up with that policy, but I guess tell me how those interact.

Speaker 28 (03:18:34):
Yeah, so that policy covers when we can share information and when we can't. And so between that and our public safety camera policy, we believe that it would not allow us to share video with immigration enforcement actions. Now, if there was a criminal action, we would be able to share that information. So if somebody has a criminal warrant that's a law enforcement purpose that's not related to civil enforcement on immigration, we would be able to share information. That doesn't mean they have access where they're watching the video. I can't foresee an occasion where we would give somebody access to our system to watch our video. So we might say, yeah, we had a license plate hit on your Wanted Murderer subject. But we're not going to say that we are not going to track people who are wanted for just immigration stuff on our cameras. We're not going to assist in that. That would be a violation of our policy.

Speaker 6 (03:19:27):
And since when we worked on the policy, all these traffic cameras were in place, the A LLP was in place. Fuss doesn't really change that. It just integrates it into one platform. Yeah,

Speaker 28 (03:19:39):

Fuss isn't adding or taking away any cameras. Fuss doesn't have any cameras associated with it. The only cameras that we have to have on fuss are our body cameras and our dash cameras. The other ones we're adding on so that we can, one, get a more effective audit trail so we know who's using it. But then two, getting it all in that single pane of glass allows us to more effectively use it. So now we can switch from camera system to camera system. As you saw the car chase where the person's going from one end to the other of those intersections. If those were on two different systems, we'd have to log out and log back in and we would lose what we were trying to find. Same thing with our murder suspect. If we've got registered cameras in Old West Lawrence and he gets on sixth Street where we've got traffic cameras right now, we would've to log out and log in with this system. We could follow him from one camera to the next

Speaker 6 (03:20:29):

Question on the business integration, I know as far as we know is no one has signed up or joined the system. Correct. What would the process be if someone did sign up? How would you be notified? How would they be integrated? I think there's a mention of an MOU and then would that information at all be shared and made public?

Speaker 28 (03:20:53):

So the business integration is a business relationship between fuss and the business, and then they will give us through MOU access to their cameras. Fuss doesn't typically share its customer base, so I don't know if we'll be able to share that once we have access to it, but that doesn't give them access to our cameras. It's only giving us access to them. We have had some businesses inquire. We haven't had any sign up yet, but the process for them would be, they would contact fuss and say, I'm interested in being a business. Customer fuss would then contact us and say, Joe's business wants to sign up as a business customer with fuss. Are they in your community? And do you have a need for them to provide access to the cameras. Once that takes place, fuss works with them to determine which box is a best fit for their business. They conclude that business relationship, get them set up on their fuss app and then we start working through the MOU with that business and then they decide what access we're going to get. Did I miss anything? Okay.

Speaker 6 (03:22:01):

Okay, thank you.

Speaker 28 (03:22:02):

Now, on the other side of that, if somebody wanted access to our fuss platform, I mentioned that earlier where they could see our city cameras, we can allow that, but that would be something that would be handled through MOU and that was, as I mentioned earlier, it would have to be approved by the city manager that would come to the city commission in a city manager report and then there would be an opportunity for public input. We don't really see a lot of value in having someone having access to our cameras or us having access to cameras in another city in a live stream situation. We can always call up Topeka's Afus customer. We can call 'em up anytime and say, Hey, we've got a bad guy coming up there. Can you help us with your system? They can get on their system and do that for us. So right now, today, I don't see a benefit to us integrating with other fuss customers in other cities next year with the World Cup. That might be something we think about where we're in multiple communities, but today I just don't see it for a day-to-day thing that would be beneficial to us.

Speaker 6 (03:23:08):

Thank you.

Speaker 2 (03:23:13):

The automated license plate readers, do they collect that data, automatically store it and then delete it over that timeframe? Or for example, if there's a license plate that is on alert, is it collecting data on every license plate every day regardless of the plate and then only searching that database for that hit in the future or in the past? Excuse me. Is that how it operates right now?

Speaker 28 (03:23:42):

Yeah, so every time a car goes by a license plate reader, it takes a picture and it reads it, throws it in the system, checks it against any active wants or warrants in the national crime information, sir, that national network. And so if there are some then it will send an alert to the agency where that A LPR is located. So it would tell me that whatever and whatever that card just came through, those pictures of the license plates are capped for 180 days as far as the wants and warrants. When we arrest the person that gets cleared out of NCIC and when that's cleared out with the arrest of the person, the license plate information is cleared out as well. So you shouldn't keep getting repeated hits with ours on our dash cams as license plate readers, we have a procedure in place where it automatically clears that alert out in 48 hours, I think something like that. Shorter period of time or when the officer stops him, there's a procedure that says the officer has to clear that information out. It's a different system from the A LPR system that are the fixed ones that we were talking about,

Speaker 2 (03:24:52):

But the APRs aren't currently running through fuss currently. We would use that as an implementation tool then yeah,

Speaker 28 (03:24:59):

They're going to be integrated into the platform, so again, we don't have to log out of one to log into the other. They'll all be there. So when Drew was showing you, when we get dispatch, the call is integrated, the call comes out, it'll pop up the cameras. If there's license plate information, it'll go look in the license plate system and tell you, Hey, that license plate just hit a license plate reader over here, pull up a camera there. And so you can start really in that real-time information center, start looking for that car and that subject and provide that to the officers that are responding.

Speaker 2 (03:25:31):

Okay, thank you. Any questions? Any more questions? The chief right now? Okay, thank you. I think we're good for now. Alright, I'm going to go ahead and open it up to public comment on item three.

Speaker 15 (03:25:51):

Eric, I had 6, 6 0, 4 6. I am really impressed with the Lawrence police departments. I was going to use that, but I'll just talk about it later. I am so thankful for them. I can feel, I'm sorry I have a hard time speaking. Sometimes I have aphasia and I battle my words all the time, but lemme get my points out. My points out are I think that there should be cameras in Naysmith Park. There's a lot of criminals around there and we need cameras in Naismith Park. It's public property belongs to the public. We need cameras there.

(03:26:41):

What else was I going to say? Oh, I have an idea. I think you should have sort of like a contest for free resident camera giveaway. So just so if there happens to be a crime, the police, if they work together on

the crime, figure it out. The only issue I have here is something I wanted to raise a long time ago. I was harassed by the police and I was doing some stuff I could be blamed for. They're great. Now the chief now is amazing. I love the department now. I love everybody who spoke here representing the department. They've really changed since we have the new police chief and that's what I wanted to talk about is the prejudice though that I received it has disappeared as far as I know. I have a history of seven traumatic brain injuries and I've talked to them about it.

(03:27:54):

Individuals at the station and they're working on it. They know about it and that's a good thing and I'll have that traumatic brain injury. People are some of the lowest of the low on this earth. What I mean is they're lower than autism, they're lower than Native Americans, they're lower than black people, they're lower than every single race group on this earth. People with traumatic brain injuries apply to everybody, man, woman, all races. You could even have a disability and have a traumatic brain injury. But anyway, I just wanted to say that and thank you for this time. Yes, yes.

Speaker 2 (03:28:36):

Thanks. Eric.

Speaker 5 (03:28:45):

Would you mind lowering that desk so I can see you? Sure, please.

Speaker 31 (03:28:57):

How's that? Yeah, it's better. All right. Can everybody hear me okay?

Speaker 7 (03:28:59):

Yeah. Yep.

Speaker 31 (03:29:00):

All right. I want to say I appreciate this public forum and I appreciate all of the information that's been provided by the police department. It's very informative. What I've taken away from this presentation is that it seems that we already have everything that we need and this is just something that integrates all of them together in a platform that makes that more convenient. While convenience is wonderful, it's not always beneficial in the long run for the community as a whole. I think even with A LPR as it exists now, we've seen that abused in the last year with the case of the woman leaving Texas to pursue an abortion in a state where abortion is legal and an officer utilizing A LPR to track her across states just to see if he could and he could and he wasn't supposed to do that. So there are plenty of instances where people have the credentials to access certain technologies and yes, the audit trail is wonderful.

(03:30:04):

I'm glad that is a feature. However, it shouldn't be a possibility in the first place. So we have the technology we need, we don't need to compile them in this way. I understand it's inconvenient to have to log out and log back in and you lose a couple of minutes and sometimes those minutes are crucial, but sometimes inconvenience is a necessary stumbling block to prevent mass surveillance that ultimately endangers the community rather than helping it. And as a member of the community, something like this doesn't make me feel safer. It frightens me and it makes me frightened for my neighbors and I'm glad to have more information. It's been very helpful, but I don't think it's something that the Lawrence community wants. When I think of the, what was it? The ROTC, the real time operations center, I think there's a time and a place for something like that.

(03:31:05):

I don't however think that's something that the Lawrence community wants or would benefit from. I also think that $470,000 a year, especially in a time when there is very little money, is not a justifiable expense. Say if you're going from 155 people to 145 people, you break that down, that's four 70 divided by 10, that's 4 47 K for a salary. It's not a whole lot of money. I personally believe in financial transparency. I make 51 KA year. I live on that. It's not luxurious, but I can live. So that's 10 jobs. And to wrap up, granted this experience I'm about to share was in 2017, I worked at the Willow Domestic Violence Center and would often have to make missing persons reports when people did not come by their curfew time. I will wrap up by saying when I made one of these missing person reports, the officer who came out told me if she's dead now, she'll be dead later. Okay.

Speaker 32 (03:32:18):

My name is Sarah Hill Nelson and I am one of the operators of the Bower Stock Mills and Power Company, and I am here to just share our experience, what we've had working with LPD and just want to say we're grateful to Lawrence Police Department on a daily basis and we do have cameras at Bower, so and we would sign up to be on the registry for the maps, and I'll just give an example for you of how that has been used in the past. I've frankly lost track of how many times we've submitted footage to the sheriff's department or the Lawrence Police Department because we are in the river corridor and we see a lot of incidents in that area, but just maybe three, four weeks ago, there was a person that was portaging their canoe down the Kansas River, and so you have to drop your canoe, carry your bag.

(03:33:05):

They took their bag to one side, went back to get their canoe, and in the four minutes that they were going back to get their canoe, their bag with everything they owned was stolen. And so LPD was able to contact to us. We were able to say, here's the footage, and they were able to identify the person going across the bridge. And so I don't know the outcome. I hope that that CANOEIST was able to get their bag back, but I think from Bowersox perspective, we see it as a really important asset for the community and we're glad to participate in the registration program and again, we appreciate working with LPD and the sheriff's department. They've been great to work with and we support the general program. It is optional. However people want to participate and we support people choosing to do whatever works for them. Thank you. Thank

Speaker 33 (03:33:57):

You, sir. Mike Harold, 6 6 0 4 9. I find it very, I suppose kind of reassuring that our Lawrence Police Department is so trusting. We talked a lot about policy tonight. In my experience, most corporations do not respect their internal policy. It's kind of what they can get away with. They respect it when it's convenient and don't when it's not. I've seen that repeatedly. I've seen it in nonprofits. So we're sitting around talking about axons policy. Well, even if we had the strongest contract in the world, if they thought they could profit off of, say, implementing facial recognition software not telling us and not giving us an option to opt out, they could very well do that, and there's no way for us to know. After all, they don't need to come and request access to our systems. We've given that to them. That's the whole point. It's being routed through them.

(03:35:04):

They're the ones dealing with that data. So ICE doesn't need to come to us with a warrant or alternatively to come by and strong arm us as the federal government has already shown a willingness to do. In other instances, we saw this with Doge. They broke into federal agencies oftentimes with backup access systems that they were not given permission to access. They don't need to do that with us. They just need to go to Axon and ask for permission. Now the reality is, is that we've implemented this, we're pushing ahead and maybe we need to pause that. Maybe we need to stop, get more community input, get more people who probably paid a little bit more attention to this than our local PD has in terms of the

technology and its impacts and that sort of thing. They're talking about this as if it's just another camera system.

(03:36:00):

Large language models are not just another camera system. They're not. They tabulate tons of data and the reality is that even the people who develop these systems oftentimes can't totally predict how they're going to operate. So this is something that needs a lot more discussion before we do full implementation, especially right now, we have a federal government that does not respect the rule of law and we're acting like they will. That is not going to work out well. At the end of the day, we're sitting around pretending that the house isn't burning down. We need to respond to the situation we find ourselves in. Please. Thank you, Mike.

Speaker 34 (03:36:52):

My name is Jackson Space 6 6 0 4 4 and pretty much what that guy just said, I want to open by saying that Thomas Jefferson once said, people who are willing to trade freedom for security deserve neither. This is a unique moment in American history and I am trusting the Lawrence Police Department. I have had positive relations with them in the past. I don't trust it's a federal government though we all see what's going on in dc. We know it's been going on in LA for a while now we know what might be happening in Chicago soon, and lot can change in two years when these cameras are going to be installed. Finally, and man, that guy really did just say exactly what I was thinking. That's all I had, I guess. Thank you.

Speaker 35 (03:37:45):

Autumn Colbeth 6 6 0 4, 9. Good evening City council members. I'm here to discuss my concerns about regarding the surveillance contract with Axon. Like others are here, I'm concerned that the city and LPD are getting upsold on a system that will someday skyrocket in price for marginal benefits at the expense of our privacy. As citizens of Lawrence Axon does not have any interest in making Lawrence Streets safer. They're only interested in upselling an expensive subscription service that will require more technology and therefore more dependence on them in exchange for a fat long-term contract. The return of investment going forward just isn't there for a community of our size. While it's nice that the LPD has policies in place to prevent abuse, like other people have said, that does not mean that those policies will prevent abuse. If a policy or even a law we're able to do that, we wouldn't have many of our common crimes, murder, theft, et cetera, we wouldn't need a police officer with that.

(03:38:54):

There is always the possibility of police officers using their work applications to spy on former partners or settling personal vendettas. Adding in the ability to do so at the person's job, potentially without the knowledge of the officer's ability to do so, adds further possibility for abuse while an audit is nice. Will there be someone who monitors it constantly 24 7 or would it be pushed onto the business to constantly monitor the log for abuse? The ROI just isn't there to risk that sort of abuse and that's just talking about the abuse within the city. We don't have any recourse. If Axon uses the captured video for their own purposes, profiting from our own lack of privacy, not only from its direct contract with LPD, but perhaps indirectly by feeding footage of us without our consent to whatever data collection or AI companies they decide to contract within the future. The ROI just isn't there. For Lawrence, the only entity that benefits substantially from the surveillance program would be Axon, not Lawrence Citizens Axon. I hope genuinely that we reconsider, as it does sound like, as other people said, the systems we have in place currently are great. Of course, again, missing a minute or two of sometimes crucial information is bad, but is that enough to give away all of our privacy to a company that does not have our best interests at heart? Thank you.

Speaker 18 (03:40:38):

Hi, my name is Kincaid Dennet. I didn't know you could do the, oh,

Speaker 6 (03:40:43):
Just hold it for a second next time. We'll, you just have to hold it for a second. It is a delay.

Speaker 18 (03:40:47):
Okay. Well, I think I can do two things at one.

(03:40:51):
So I want to thank the commission for putting this on the agenda on the regular agenda tonight and entertaining us. I also want to thank the Lawrence Police Department for meeting with us for a marathon amount of time. I was really informative and we're all really good friends now, so I will keep this short with y'all because you have heard my thoughts multiple times through various emails. There are some concerns that I still have with the ai, the camera, the technological shortcomings I don't think are a fair form of regulation. I think that saying that the cameras aren't so good, so we don't really need to worry about it because it's going to be too pixelated. I think that that kind of pushes into a conversation that we could probably flesh out a little bit more. But the larger point that I want to make is that we're having two different conversations here.

(03:41:45):
I personally am not against cameras will admit readily that cameras do solve crimes and that they exist. I do think that there is a place for them. I think that the problem is that this conversation should have happened a long time ago. This conversation is the start where the Lawrence Police Department and staff show us the community, some of the benefits that integrating traffic cameras can have other sorts of efficiencies and ways to improve public safety. And then we come up, some of us don't know what we're talking about. Some of us do and we all make that decision together. I think that that's the fundamental missing piece in this, and that is why I would ask for a pause tonight for us to begin this conversation together. I think things like a real time operations center, that is a massive expansion of police capabilities.

(03:42:58):
If the foundation that we're building from is on this lack of trust on something that was passed through the consent agenda that I think many of us, most of us didn't know what it was, there's no way to build on that. You're going to end up with commission meetings packed with confused people over and over again. So I do think that the ordinance that I shared in the written public comment that learns transparency project has shared is a good way to move forward. I think involving stakeholders, like I said, Lawrence Police Department and I are best friends now. I would be really excited to work positively to establish oversight, but I would ask for an immediate pause right now so that we can work forward in good faith. So thank you. Okay, thank you very much.

Speaker 5 (03:43:58):
Thank you. Should have thought of that.

Speaker 36 (03:44:05):
Good evening, Mr. Mayor and commissioners. My name is Brooke Miller and today I am here as a private citizen, although I have been before you many times before. Prior to going on medical leave in October, I was a civilian employee of the police department and the first ever accreditation manager and management analyst tasked with implementing national law enforcement accreditation. This initiative was one that came from recommendations based on the city's needs assessment and was tied to the city's safe and secure outcomes of strategic plan. My job was to guide the analysis of elk a PD policies and practices

and help bring them into compliance with national standards. Evaluated by Kalia, the Commission on Accreditation for law Enforcement agencies, I came to understand and believed deeply that the transparency, accountability, and trust that this initiative would bring to our community would protect both the public as well as the many incredible officers and civilians that we have in the Lawrence Police Department.

(03:45:13):

And during my time at the pd, which would've been three years back in April, I came to truly love and admire the many humans, including those that I've reported to that protect and serve our community. And I believe we have the capacity to make greater progress towards effective community-based policing by emphasizing the integration of civilians and professionalized policing, employing technology with thoughtful restraint and preparation and by embracing real transparency and public engagement. About a year ago, I flew to North Carolina to attend a training conference for people in my position, and this escalated my medical condition, which is a cerebral spinal fluid leak, which rendered me incapacitated for about the last 10 months. I'm very fortunate that about four weeks ago I had neurosurgery at the Mayo Clinic and I am grateful just to be alive here today. I've spent the last year fighting for my life to survive and getting to advance medical intervention, and despite my medical condition and my disability prior to my leave, I was able to successfully guide the Lawrence Police Department through all stages of the accreditation process as I was released from my position during my medical leave. I'm unaware of the progress that's been made and the changes that have been made since, or what implications this project has on accreditation, these major operational shifts and ensuring that we are evolving with the technology to ensure equitable application. Due to my experience in the department as well as my background and policy, I support the idea of pausing the rollout, especially the community camera integration, slowing that down until there's been an opportunity to develop regulatory oversight and evaluate operational readiness. Thank you very much. Thank

Speaker 17 (03:47:13):

You, Brooke.

Speaker 37 (03:47:21):

Hello, my name is Corin Yoki 6 6 0 4 4. I'm a lifelong Kansan and I currently serve as a criminal defense attorney with Kansas Holistic Defenders. I'm here on behalf of my organization to stand with the Lawrence Transparency Project, who we just heard from and to advocate for Lawrence specific surveillance oversight ordinance that is developed with community stakeholder input. It's hard to overstate how dystopian the potential of the software is a city where every sidewalk and storefront is a sensor where our movements and faces are captured by networks we never opted into and sorted by algorithms we can't see layer that onto phones that quietly harvest where we go, who we meet, what we read sold by data brokers to whoever pays from marketers to police. An ordinary life starts to feel like evidence gathering in this world. People stop being neighbors and become data sets. Public safety becomes perpetual suspicion, and a criminal punishment system already shot with bias gets a 24 7 feet of our lives.

(03:48:28):

Privacy isn't a luxury here. It's the thin line between being a citizen and becoming a commodity. Under constant automated scrutiny, this expanded surveillance capacity seriously implicates the constitutionally protected rights of all people who live in or travel through Lawrence, neighbors, visitors, workers, and passerby who never consented are recorded and potentially live viewed by police. A decision of such weight should not be rushed, but should rather be carefully debated and analyzed by those affected by this increased surveillance. There has been no debate or public discussion, and as a holistic nonprofit law firm that widely serves the Lawrence community, Kansas Holistic Defenders recognizes these potential harms

that are outlined in the Lawrence Transparency Projects materials and we implore the commission to properly make space for public debate and put a pause on this program. Okay,

Speaker 7 (03:49:21):

Thank you.

Speaker 38 (03:49:31):

Is this the right desk height? Darla Moore 6 6 0 4 4. During the presentation, the lengthy presentation that the police gave, they mentioned some pros and cons of using Axon and what is it, Fluxus

(03:49:52):

UIs over say, a competitor like F Flux Systems, and one of the advantages they gave was that the city actually owns the infrastructure that they're using that is Axon branded, whereas if they were using flock systems, flock would own that infrastructure. Now the city owns most of that physical infrastructure. That's true, but what the city doesn't own is the software. The company Axon is on a contract with the city to give them access to the fuses software that Axon still owns, and Axon still has access to that data and is able to use that data and at any time, axon can jack up the price on Fuses access can or Axon can decide that they don't want to give the city of Lawrence access to the software anymore. And it's really important for transparency that law enforcement or whoever has access to that data actually owns that data.

(03:50:57):

I don't think anyone should be accessing the data of what other people's movements are. I don't believe in surveillance like that, and I think that it's important for there to be a pause in order that ordinance can be put into place, that that data can be protected and actually owned by the users of the data and owned by the people who are generating that data and not by a faceless private company that is extorting the city for, what is it, $3.2 million over five years when the city is shutting down a division of the fire department. I feel like there's just better ways to use money than this. Thank you.

Speaker 39 (03:51:46):

Hello, my name is Evan Noke. I live in 6 6 0 4 4. I'm here to ask the city commission and the mayor to pause roll out of this program until for two reasons really. We need more data to figure out if this actually works and to figure out what its other effects are, and we need time to develop policy, policy informed by the community that will let us roll this out safely if we do it at all. We spent a very, very long time tonight listening to law enforcement officers tell us about how great these programs are, and a significant part of that was them telling us a bunch of anecdotes about how programs like this have helped them, but we should not be making decisions based on anecdotes. We should be making decisions based on aggregate data that shows us actual trends over large amounts of time and large numbers of incidents.

(03:52:43):

That is how good decision making happens. That's how science works. We should not be making these decisions rashly quickly based on the police department saying that it works because there have been a few incidents, I have not heard anything tonight about how implementing a program like this would reduce crime rates broadly or about what other effects this would have on our community. We need to collect more data, we need to get more information. We need to find studies. If there haven't been studies done yet, then we should not have Lawrence be the laboratory for the rollout of programs like this. We should figure out if this works and then maybe implement it moving on. We also, if we're going to roll this out, we need to have policy in place before we do so that will make sure it is rolled out safely and effectively in a way that does not harm our community and its members.

(03:53:38):

In the presentations that we heard, we heard that there are some guardrails in place, but they are almost entirely internal policies of the police department and these corporations. Our city government cannot directly change the internal policies of our police department or these external corporations, especially the corporations. So the way these programs work can change without any input from the city, without any input from the people who live here. Instead of letting that happen, we should slow things down and we should create policy guided by the community with extensive community input that will allow these programs to be implemented in a way that the community is comfortable with. We should not be embracing a panopticon of surveillance. There have been a lot of people who've explained why that is a bad idea. If we're going to embrace surveillance like this at all, we should be doing so in an informed way and with policies in place to protect us. Thank you.

Speaker 40 (03:54:46):

Brandon Landis, 6 6 0 4 6. Okay. It's no secret that the entire city is freaked out about this, sorry. Anyway. Oh no. As we have seen lately, the entire country is on its toes right now. We are seeing a loads of, oh, no, no, no, no. Let me start over.

(03:55:24):

It's no secret that this country is in turmoil right now. Everybody in this room has made a great point right now. Oh, and right now considering, considering what we've heard about FIUs right now, oh yes, it's a great idea on paper, but in practice there's no telling a what could wrong with it at this program if it moves forward. Anyway, I am sorry I keep stuttering right now. I'm mostly apologizing to the rest of the people watching anyway. Hey, everybody is right. This country is on the verge of authoritarianism. FIUs is a great example of what it could lead to if we don't keep it in check. And I am just saying if this still goes, if this notion, no, if this action gets passed after everything you've just heard tonight from on the public, I've just at leaves me to believe that this city does not values its law over its residence. Thank you. Thank you.

Speaker 41 (03:57:18):

You guys should have two settings for this, like a tall and a shorter one. Okay. Hi commissioners, mayor, my name is Faith Lopez, 6 6 0 4 4, and I work at a local domestic violence shelter where confidentiality and safety are principled to the services that we provide. The implementation of the FU technology and expanded surveillance poses significant risks to our residents staff and to the overall integrity of our operations. Our shelter operates under a strict confidentiality policy that ensures a protected and empowering environment for survivors. While we maintain a working relationship with Lawrence Police Department, it is critical to acknowledge that any surveillance oversight, regardless of who is monitoring, introduces a potential for misuse, including stalking and unauthorized tracking. There have been documented cases where survivors have fled abusive partners where members of law enforcement who were members of law enforcement including and warrants, there was an officer police officer Brad Williams had a license revoked to due to his harassment and targeting of young intoxicated women in 2023.

(03:58:25):

There have also been instances in Georgia of an officer breaking his PSA that his girlfriend had filed against him who was also in part of law enforcement. This underscores the reality that no system of oversight is immune from abuse. Survivors deserve the fundamental right to privacy, not only to protect their immediate safety, but also to support their long-term healing goals. Surveillance technologies like fuss risk, compromising that privacy, and by extension the wellbeing of those who we serve. True public safety is not achieved through policing or surveillance. It is built by investing in community-based solutions that need to address the root causes of instability and harm. The whatever amount of money allocated to fuss can be used to promote a safer community. Even the still images that are updated to the

public can also serve as safety risks to community members. If those photos get out and they're in hiding, the survivors are in hiding. Lawrence would be better served by expanding access to low barrier affordable housing, improving transportation and public transportation, and increasing the support services for family and caregivers. Our community needs these critical resources, not more police presence under the guise of safety, prioritizing care, equity and trust is how we create a safer, stronger. Lawrence for everyone. I urge you all to please use this moment to pause and reflect on the negative impact this technology and oversight will cause Lawrence and their communities. Thank you so much.

Speaker 42 (04:00:00):

I was excited to get to use the machine, but I think we're the same height. My name is Jeff Miller, 6 6 0 4 4. The full scope of what is possible through fuss represents a fundamental shift in data procurement and analysis by the police department of this town, and I want to highlight the difference, the distinction between all of what fuss could allow and what the police department has been talking about this evening. It seems that the LPD understands on some level that a sizable group of Ians would not be comfortable with the rollout of this program. There's been very little transparency around the full technological potential of fuss and few guarantees beyond internal police policy around how the department intends to utilize it. I don't believe that a good faith attempt at securing the public's consent to be, if not surveilled, then how about watched without our knowledge, I'm going to go ahead and assume that this was all a misunderstanding of the public sentiment around this program.

(04:01:01):

The police are workers. I want you to be safe in your roles and I want you to be effective and have the tools that you need, and of course, we all want a safe Lawrence. It sounds like the LPD is not even interested in utilizing the full scope of fuss and what it permits and many of its troubling capacities such as AI analytics, proactive monitoring, residential camera integration. So rather than advance this program through a consent agenda item, we need a specific ask from the police department as others have mentioned tonight. This long presentation informing us of the ins and outs of fuss is the beginning of a conversation around how we would utilize this sort of technology in our town.

(04:01:44):

We need to have a city ordinance that codifies what is permissible and what is not, because without that, if we're only relying on internal police policy, then we need to assume that the technology will be utilized to the full extent of its potential. Axon is an aggressive and expanding company and we need to be prepared for future incursions into our city infrastructure. Let me be clear, I'm not nearly so concerned about what was presented this evening as about the future potential of fuss and what it would allow if we permit it to be governed solely by police notions like I think Drew, you were saying earlier, fuss in itself is not a surveillance program. It's all on how it's used, that we would always have the option to turn off facial recognition technology and even Chief Lockhart's notion that ICE would just respect the boundaries of our town. That does not leave me feeling comfortable. I'm confused about why we're pushing for this right now. Violent crime rates in Lawrence seen a slight uptick in the last decade. Property crime rates are down nearly half 2023 saw record lows and crimes committed. This is not the moment for an expansion like this. I'm asking you to pause fuss time. I don't think you want this to be a part of your legacy. Don't let this just slide. Thank you.

Speaker 43 (04:03:13):

I'll join the same height club. My name is Christie Lynch, 6 6 0 4 4. I am not interested in making police workflows more efficient. I am interested in making our community safer and these things are not the same. This technology both in its current state to some degree and certainly in all of these potential future iterations and integrations that we're discussing tonight, that we are expressing concern over this technology makes our neighbors who are already vulnerable, more vulnerable, including people who are

being targeted by ice, people who have to travel to access healthcare, other communities whose rights are being targeted and plucked away as others have already noted tonight, we are living in a world where the rule of law is crumbling at a federal level. Promises and reassurances about how this technology will or will not be used, will not protect us from an administration with no regard for whatever restrictions we might put in place to try and make this technology less of a threat to our privacy and our safety.

(04:04:35):

It's a flawed premise. It won't work. It doesn't make us safer. We don't want it Increased surveillance and police oversight do not make us safer. Money spent in pursuit of any contract or network or technology that operates on this flawed premise is money wasted. It's money that could be spent instead on the kinds of community supports and public goods that actually reduce crime and make our city a safer place for all of us to live. Please pause all new fuss, integrations and analytics until the public sent an opportunity to provide oversight and input. Thank you. Thank you.

Speaker 44 (04:05:33):

Jamie Gasman, 6 6 0 4 6. I'm a business owner and I work in the tech industry. This expensive platform is only going to become increasingly costly to the city, both in hardware that we add and we upgrade as was said, and because of software feature expansion, that's just how software works. It expands, but I'm not scared of technology. The thing that I am terrified of is the impact of this surveillance consolidation because data collection is never neutral. We know from science from the Heisenberg principle that the very act of observation influences the thing being observed, and we know from history the Book on Tyranny uses the example of 1938 Austria that people who are scared obey what they think a government wants in advance and based on the turnout tonight, I think scared is not an overstatement. I mean, I know when I'm walking downtown and I'm watched by law enforcement, I feel anxious and unwelcome, and that's not the Lawrence that I want to live in, but really it's the inevitable creep of the use of license plate data that I really fear.

(04:06:44):

The data does aim to be predictive. Make no mistake. It's not just Awares Waldo as was in the presentation tonight, the software company calls it pattern mapping, and as we go about our lives, we absolutely should be worried that doing ordinary things may place us at a higher risk for harassment, targeting and harsher treatment because we may be identified as ideological dissenters or may be predicted to be potential criminals, and I'll make that really concrete with some scenarios. When one of us or one of our neighbors drives to the women's clinic or the mosque drives to the union meeting or the political rally or the immigration lawyer's office, we actually should be worried about whether about what our taxpayer funded institutions will do with that data. Not just now they say it's okay now, but in the future. The presentation tonight pointed to limited functionality and use, but it will.

(04:07:43):

This platform will get more comprehensive and the use of it will get more complicated because that's what software does. Hundreds of people have asked for a pause and reassessment, and I absolutely agree, but more so I don't want this data collection and consolidation at all. It will negatively affect our community just because the police have created precedence and are already on this path. Just because they've asked for this technology does not mean that we as a city need to support it. You have the power to put on the brakes and your constituents are calling for you to do so. Thank you for listening.

Speaker 45 (04:08:27):

I feel like I'm having a really, really bad dream. Contrary to what somebody who was previously up here said, I am against cameras, they're warts. They're a physical manifestation of a spiritual disease that has swept across the country of a disease of paranoia and neighborly distrust. I'll say this, the company that is behind this initiative is a major supplier of tasers. That was their beginning as a company taser itself. The

word is an acronym which stands for Thomas Avery and his electric rifle. This is an overtly racist children's book from the early 20th century about the titular kid hero who travels to tribal Africa, armed with well with an electric rifle. This was the inspiration for this technology, which unsurprisingly was used towards the major end of brutalizing black people. I don't know what you think that this next product of theirs is going to be used for, but yeah, I don't believe that anything is going to stop this. It can be slowed, but it's not going to be stopped. It has to be said though. It has to be said so that it was said. This initiative is an insult to the spirit of life for the love of God. You have no idea what kind of nightmare you're unleashing. Goodnight. Thank you.

Speaker 46 (04:10:15):

Good evening. My name is Cassandra Barrett, zip code 6 6 0 4 4. I'm a lifelong Lian and an organizer with Lawrence Tenets. I'm asking you tonight to pause fuss integration and rollout work with us as citizens to get genuine feedback and develop ordinances to regulate surveillance in our city and make decisions about how or if we implement these types of programs. I have a lot of questions and concerns still. After tonight's presentation, one of the officers talked about using cameras to apprehend a repeat offender, and I truly wonder if arresting that individual actually prevented them from future police contact. Did it help them get whatever support they needed? I think that many of us would argue that we should use these millions of dollars of our type budget for actual crime prevention like housing, healthcare, mental healthcare, arts and recreation programs for young people, things that have been on the chopping block here.

(04:11:12):

Those are the things that make us feel safe, not arresting people and tossing them away into prison. We are not addressing the reasons people steal purses or hurt each other, even ending people's lives with an AI surveillance platform, it does not address root causes. We deserve the chance as constituents to have input on how we address harm in our community, and frankly, I just don't want to spend that much money on training a demonstrably shoddy AI for a third party company. To that end, how does the gender search interact with transgender and IEX people? This is a terrifying feature to me in this political climate. As gender nonconformity is increasingly criminalized, what may not currently be a criminal issue is likely to become one. This is not congruent with the values of this town. Can we actually shut that function off even if we shut it off as axon ceasing to collect that information on their end?

(04:12:08):

Are we capturing people's gender transitions, children's gender transitions, et cetera on these cameras? The police chief said that they heard from folks in January that a policy change was needed for live stream from residences. They were going to move forward with integration into residential cameras. If citizens had not done the digging necessary to learn more about this issue, which I'm very glad that they did, I still have questions about what that kind of policy would look like. What does this mean when one neighbor in apartment complex consents and another does not? Can the landlord implement this without tenant consent or apartment complexes, residences, or businesses? There are so many important insights that citizens have. If you take the time to collaboratively address our concerns and help us answer questions like this, please pause future integrations, pause, use of all AI components and talk to the community. Let's put some safeguards in place together. Thank you.

Speaker 7 (04:13:04):

Thank you.

Speaker 47 (04:13:12):

Hi, my name is Vince Munoz. I'm a resident here of Lawrence. My zip code is 6 6 0 4 4. I'm also a member of Lawrence Tenants and like many people tonight, I'm asking you to pause FU integration.

There's a few points other people have made them, but I'll just reiterate some of the ones that are motivating me. The first is just while Lawrence Police Department sort of paint the sort of integration of multiple systems as a benefit. I also think that it's a risk, right? Friction, as someone pointed out, creates more cyber and information security. The fact that it's difficult to get into different systems, the fact that they're not all connected means that if a bad actor wants to get into them, whether that be the federal or state governments pursuing information that they shouldn't really be pursuing, whether that be a member of the police department not following internal policies or whether it be some sort of private actor trying to hack into information, the fact that systems are separate actually creates security, and so I think that this adopting this type of integration creates more risks for the privacies of Ians.

(04:14:15):

I also just wanted to make just one little observation throughout the presentation. We were told things like minutes are being missed at critical junctures because we have to log in and log out of systems as if it's not possible to have more than one computer system going in a room at a time, right? I mean, surely the police department already has the ability to do that, so I worry that we're also just not really considering some of these claims in a way that's accurate, and so just for all the reasons that other people have made, I would just encourage a pause on the system until we can think more clearly about the privacy risks to Ians from adopting the system. Thank you.

Speaker 48 (04:14:52):

Thank you. Hi, good evening. John Edmond, LPOA chair. Just as a police officer, I just wanted to give that perspective from us. I understand the concern that we are constantly watching. I understand that that is something just kind of nationally we feel as people. I tend to agree that that government oversight and faces recognition and just on a personal level, it can be a scary thing. What I just want to remind the community is that we're not watching you. We're not watching every move. We're not pulling up these cameras to try to find you doing wrong. This is something that we're trying to do when an actual real in-progress call happens to be able to get better resources to help the community. Ultimately, again, this is an aggregation of multiple different systems, so with those I understand one of the concerns is that Axon will be able to be strong armed by other agencies or we would be able to do that theoretically, that could still exist in what's happening right now with the systems we currently use. We have all these other systems. They also cost money to use because technology is expensive. Ultimately, just wanting it to be known that we are trying our best to do what's best for this community. I do appreciate the community input just as a police officer hearing that the community thanks and just kind of look forward to seeing where this goes in the future. Thank you.

Speaker 49 (04:16:21):

Hello, my name is Hunter. I live in 6 6 0 4 7. I value my digital privacy and if I don't like the terms and conditions of some digital service that I can use, I don't have to use it. If I don't like how Microsoft handles my data, I can log out of Microsoft. If I don't like how Google uses my data, I can log out of Google. I can stop using their services, I can use something else, but when I'm outside just walking around driving on public roads in the city that I live in, I can't log off. There's no VPN that I can use to hide my IP address, so this is something that affects me in and everyone else here in a way that we can't avoid, so it's super important that we have oversight of this and that we're a part of the process of adopting it, and you might think, well, people are on cameras all the time.

(04:17:15):

You go into stores, you accept some level of surveillance when you do that, don't you? Well, if the police think that I stole something at checkers on 23rd and they want to see security footage, they need a warrant, and if I don't want to be seen at checkers, I don't have to go into there, but we're talking about is something of a different caliber, the ubiquitous presence of interconnected network of surveillance

cameras in public spaces. If I want to park my car and take a nice walk at 4:00 AM I shouldn't have to worry that somebody or an AI is peering at me from the other side of a camera to determine if I look suspicious. The word Orwellian comes to mind, and if you think you have nothing to hide and only criminals should be worried about surveillance, and I invite you to tell me every place you've been in the past year, when and with whom privacy matters to everyone.

(04:18:00):

Privacy is liberty. The freedom to have private relationships to associate and organize with like-minded individuals to go where you want to go without the government looking over your shoulder as government and tech corporations which are increasingly intertwined, continually erode this liberty, there comes a point where we as citizens have to say, no, enough is enough. I'm not going to let you record my every move, my habits, my relationships because you think it's going to stop crime, prevent terrorism or protect children. We want a safe society, but we don't want to sacrifice our privacy or our freedom.

(04:18:35):

What's happening in the world right now as I've seen over my whole life is we've eroded our privacy rights is we created a society where nobody can be anonymous anymore and it's going to create a society where people are more easily controlled and manageable. It goes against the values of what this country stands for, all right? We want to save society, but we have to stop and find a better way to achieve those goals without compromising all of our rights. Thank you for listening. I urge you to pause, think, and let the people be a part of the process. Thank you.

Speaker 50 (04:19:19):

Hi, my name is Trina Erling. I live in 6 6 0 4 4. While I do appreciate the presentations by the Lawrence Police Department today, there were a couple things that I heard that kind of added cause to my concern. First, in the camera filibuster, we heard that there was not going to be a lot of residential pursuit of the cameras being implemented into the fuss technology, and then in the last presentation that we heard, one of the main anecdotes was about a first degree murder that happened downtown and used homeowner cameras to follow that suspect, which to me feels like a direct contradiction. This is why I would like to stand with the Lawrence Transparency Project and just ask for pause while we as a city like citizens and you as a commission commit to and define greater policies and how this technology is going to be used because when we're leaving it up to the people using the technology and the corporation in providing the data center, those policies can change, and as we also know, I think a lot of people have already brought it up. The way that our federal government is acting has been outside of the law and has been since the beginning of this year, and I just like to think that Lawrence, if we want to remain a safe haven, not only in name, we can actually provide real concrete policies and safeguards into the technology that we're bringing into our community and not just in false promises. Thank you all.

Speaker 51 (04:21:03):

Hello. Hello, commissioner, commissioners, and mayor. My name is Mac. I live in 6 6 0 4 4. I'm going to try to keep this short, sweet and to the point. While internal police policy may be well-intentioned, it can change at any moment. Only an ordinance passed by this body can guarantee lasting safeguards for this community. It is your responsibility as elected commissioners to protect the people of Lawrence without community input, oversight, and strict ordinances. This program puts our community at risk. If this moves forward without oversight and community guidance, you're not protecting us, you're exposing us. Your first duty is to the people of Lawrence, not to vendors and not to timelines. I urge you protect us by pausing this program until community oversight is implemented and an ordinance adopted. Thank you.

Speaker 52 (04:21:59):

Good evening, commissioners. My name is Micah Cox, 6 6 0 4 4. I'm going to keep it really short and sweet. You're tired. I'm tired. We have a really cool opportunity before us to be responsive and not reactive. The police said their presentation that they're reactive. We're all reactive. We were reactive in seeing that this contract existed and was passed on consent agenda. You were reactive to the amount of emails you were getting. We have an opportunity to be responsive. We have collective buy-in here. We have the commission moving this item today to the agenda, to the general agenda and a position in which it can be moved on to where action can be taken. That was your buy-in. We have the police saying that they're not going to do these things, so they should be more than willing to be a part of the conversations to codify ordinances that will make sure they don't do what they say they're not going to do.

(04:22:52):

We have said Lawrence Transparency, the community has said that we want to be a part of this conversation. We spent three hours on this item alone tonight in this meeting. Can you imagine what sort of movement we could make together if we actually had time to meet and discuss these things in a room that wasn't full of tensions, that weren't at the end of necessarily a full workday for everyone? If we take the time that we have now, the collective buy-in that we all are showing by still being here, the 37 people who wrote in comment today, people who may have seen online who are listening public comment showed just two on the general. That's because this agenda item was on the agenda, so if you want to go read more public comment about this, it's all on there. We have an opportunity to really change the way that we govern ourselves. This was passed and not a lot of people on this commission could answer questions about it. A decision was made and that's the past. All we can do is be in the present and move forward, so I ask that you pause any further integrations with fuss so that in good faith we can use what we've done these past few weeks and specifically tonight to codify an ordinance that protects people. Thank you.

Speaker 53 (04:24:20):

Good evening commissioners. My name is Maria Relo. I am an immigrant's right advocate and organizer with Sanctuary Alliance. You all know me well. You all also know me very well. Back in 2019, we had the opportunity to go into process of creating ordinance and police policy that helped create sanctuary for our community and particularly for the immigrant population. I have a lot of experience working with city staff, with the city attorney's office and with the police department on how we hold each other accountable. I also have a lot of experience with administrative policy and how it can greatly fluctuate without a lot of public input. Between 2019 and today, we have gone through three police chiefs every single moment, including the passage of House Bill 27 17, which limited the municipality ability to restrict law enforcement from interacting with federal immigration. We have seen not only the ordinance shift understandably, but we have seen the police policy change several times.

(04:25:38):

That does not have to go before you for decision that does not have to go to the public. We are relying on best practices, not codified practices that have accountability measures, and that is my problem with the continuation and expansion of technology and the assisting software to promote that technology. It greatly impacts immigrants. We understand, and I've had heard many public commenters talk about what is going on at a federal level. I have experienced this my whole life, but right now I can say this is certainly unprecedented times. We are seeing the Rogue agency known as ICE Act in ways we have never seen before with an administration who is allowing that they are tapping into surveillance technology without knowing, waiting for it to be fought out. In courts, we are seeing people kidnapped in real time utilizing technology. Since January, even before that, the Department of Homeland Security has requested expansion of surveillance technology, I am imploring you to pause to allow community input. There were many experts in this room who have put time and dedication to understanding what is going on in front of us. We can create actual codified ordinance that protects our community, that rolls us out in a way that has community participation and prevents as much as possible federal rogue agencies from harming and

kidnapping our community members. Please pause this program and codify some ordinance with community. Thank you.

Speaker 54 (04:27:29):

Good evening, mayor and commissioners. My name's Moot Bay. Zip code is six six. Oh four four. I've been before you all many times I've been before other city commissioners before and I tend to generally speak about two themes, mainly whatever the issue is, but two things that I come back to over and over, which is the soul of Florence, Kansas. What this town is, what its history is, the laurels that we like to stand on and also my personal experience as an immigrant turned naturalized citizen. I feel my role in this year in 2025 past the inauguration is to be a quote Cassandra from Greek mythology. Someone who comes up and says, I have seen this before growing up in my second, third world country, whatever you want to call it, and seeing how it escalates and I have come time and time again before you all, most recently for ordinance 7, 5, 9, 9, which I thought was really ill-advised.

(04:28:29):

I really worry that the gravity of the situation and the urgency of the situation is lost on a lot of folks with privilege who may not know community members at that risk. I feel as though a lot of, because there are so many examples on a national scale and from bigger cities, bigger publications, law firms, there are a lot of people think that capitulating in advance, obeying in advance is the answer. And again, I beg of you to listen to those of us who have been through this that there is no capitulating in advance, there is no obeying in advance and as Mariel rightly pointed out, we're dealing with a rogue federal government right now and whatever assurances we try to get from our local government administrators, city officials, I feel as though your good faith will be overrun. They will not listen to you.

(04:29:24):

They will not just agree with our police chief that, nope, I'm not going to give them permission for ice. Just yesterday the Supreme Court of the United States just made racial profiling in this country. So it just goes to show you how fast this has advanced in the last eight months and how fast it will continue to advance. If cities like Lawrence with a proud history of abolition don't stay up and say, we know better. We can do better. We will demand better. Please pause this, please codify this in ordinance so people like us the most vulnerable, the most at risk people will feel safer and feel like you actually care about us. Thank you. Thank

Speaker 55 (04:30:18):

Mason Coger. 6 6 0 4 6. Now today we had shared with us a lengthy demonstration of the ways camera technology can be used to assist in police work apprehend suspects, and those examples were used as arguments in favor of use of this fuss technology. But I think it should be noted that those success stories were not due to that future technology. They were due to what we have now, cameras in general. What we need is camera technology in general, not that one specifically. I think we need to spend some more time as a community considering what specific solutions that we want and I hope that we can find a specific solution that is not so written with questionable complications that worry the community. Thank you.

Speaker 56 (04:31:44):

Hi, my name is Mazie 6 6 0 4 4. You've heard my point over and over. You've heard the point belabored over and over. I just wanted to come up and reiterate that this primary ask by many of our community members is for more oversight. We're asking for order to go along with the law enforcement. I do not believe that this is an unreasonable ask by the people to essentially ask for more rules. This applies to everyone. It protects us and it's not lost on me how dystopian it is to sit here and implore our local government to protect us from the federal government, but that's what we're here to do tonight and we ask you to listen to us and we ask you to call back to the turtle in the hare. If we try to move fast and come up

with policies as we go, we're going to lose in the end. We need to pause and take it easy and make sure that we're coming up with lasting policy, an ordinance to make sure that these go past Chief Lockhart, who while seems to be a beloved member of the police department and member of this community, is not guaranteed to always be the police chief as well as internal police policy is not guaranteed What you might have read their policy is one day can be a different thing the next week.

(04:33:29):

To keep it short, I'm going to ask again, pause further fuses integration so that we can as a community have a discussion, understand further there are experts that were in this room to work on creating an ordinance that will slow this down, but the slowing down of it will keep us safer in the long run than trying to make it up as we go along, which is the current plan. Thank you.

Speaker 57 (04:34:10):

Hello, mayor, city commissioners. My name is Jerron Lewis. I live at 6 6 0 4 4. I am a Lawrence citizen and a local diva here and I just have a few things typed up for you. I would like to say thank you for all of your time and energy here tonight. I'd also like to thank the Lawrence Transparency Project for all the time and energy they have exhausted organizing, informing and educating local citizens Better than any of you have all done actually, so in fact, I'm so glad that we could all have this issue on the agenda tonight after the diligent asks from the community members over and over again. I think we have all learned an important lesson on effective communication throughout this whole process. With that being said, the lack of transparency and proper education to citizens about this issue specifically is very telling to the Lawrence Police Department. I wish I could say I appreciate your slideshow, but unfortunately it came across as a last ditch effort to pacify everyone here. The lengthy presentation in q and a tonight should have been proactive and not reactive. That's not how you build trust amongst your citizens. I urge you along with many others of my community members here tonight to pause the rollout of the fuss program and prioritize transparency with your citizens, especially pertaining to something as serious as public safety and privacy. Thank you. Thank you.

Speaker 58 (04:35:38):

Hi there. My name is Claire Catchall, 6 6 0 4 4. I'm a lifelong Lawrence citizen and I just wanted to express what you've been hearing from many people tonight. Disappointment, frustration with the process in which this system has been discussed. Like I said, I've lived in Lawrence my whole life. One thing I've learned about local government living here is that it's a slow process. Bureaucratic red tape is always the kind of thing that you hear about getting things done in government, so it is a little bit baffling to me how quickly all of this was pushed through without proper public or community input. I was on a comprehensive plan committee for the city many years back and we spent extensive periods of time discussing pickleball courts where to put the pickleball courts policies about the pickleball courts and I think if the energy and time can be dedicated to that from both the city and its citizens, it can absolutely be dedicated to a project as important and obviously something that instills fear and significant concern in this public.

(04:36:45):

I think that deserves as much if not more public input than pickleball. I think I don't want to go too far into restating what's already been set up here by people that have a lot more knowledge than I do. I can just say as a citizen, it does not make me feel safe to feel like I'm being watched, especially when I know that that is being governed by policies that are subject to change, policies that are subject to individuals within the police department, policies that are subject to the whims of the federal government. All of those things do not make me feel safe. In fact, they make me feel pretty concerned. So I would just implore you to listen to your citizens, listen to the people that have democratically elected you and are begging you to include them in your democratic process and allow us to voice our opinions, voice our

input, do what we've done here tonight, but hopefully way earlier than this has happened, I would urge a pause on fuss, immediate pause and thank you all very much for your time. Thank you.

Speaker 59 (04:38:00):

Hello there. My name is Megan Dietz, 6 6 0 4 9. I've been practically a lifelong resident of Lawrence ever since the fifth grade and I also echo the sentiments that were already said here. One sentiment though that I have not heard very much talked about has been the use of ai, especially watching the police demonstration about how the AI will be used and how it is severely lacking in that clarity. It does not seem like it was necessarily at this moment a product worth paying for. Not only does AI have incredible environmental costs when it comes to water and energy, which is something that I find in Lawrence, our dedication to the environment is something that I take such great pride in our city for and to know that an implementation of this AI program would just absolutely undo years if not a full decade or more of all of the environmental progress that we have made is very distressing for something that the police themselves have admitted that at this moment the AI program would be a last ditch effort at best and I am all for definitely having programs that help keep our police safer as they do their job and help keep the community safer and from what the data has shown, what that is more is more as was said earlier, not only community projects, more funding for housing and even more just so funding for the police to be able to be safer with just police outreach.

(04:39:34):

I am all for doing all of these things, but implementing this project with this AI environment hurting, I am very much not for Thank you for your time. Thank

Speaker 60 (04:39:45):

You very much. I want to add a few things to the conversation that people may not be aware of. There was more footage released here in that little promo footage that the police department gave you then in all the core requests combined in the last five years that I've submitted to the LPD, so they can use that footage to sell themselves, but they can't use it under the law to provide to citizens. This may have been an effective tool. This whole surveillance, the part that's problematic as Drew put it several times, he said problematic too many times LPD has not earned the level of trust needed to know that this system isn't being pre judicially administered.

(04:40:53):

There's quite a few more bad cops than just Brad Williams. I heard somebody mention his name. He had a long history here. There were quite a few that covered for him. Let's not forget about Brinley blood, who shot Mary Lucas or Lewis down here at sixth and Kentucky and then let's not forget Sergeant Burn, Sergeant Neff and Major Troy Squire who retired quickly from LPD after we came out filming in 2020 because they thought lawsuits were coming that I didn't have an intent to file at that point. It's pretty important to remember that Myron Grady, a current lieutenant in court, the judge says he's not believable.

(04:41:36):

Your LPD leadership, how about the costs? We already know that we're out of money. You guys have all approved maximum mill levy discussions. You guys, the city, the county, the school district going to tax the hell out of us if the police need footage that they don't already have and we've seen how much they actually have, why can't they do police work to get it right? Why can't they do police work to get it investigate the crime when they're out getting that footage from the neighbor? The neighbor might actually remember something to tell 'em. Yeah, last thoughts here. They might have time to do that basic investigative work if they weren't so goddamn focused on violating people's rights and criminalizing people for free speech issues. And let's not forget your chief in here lying to the police review board. Ask yourselves why you still don't have a functional police review board.

Speaker 61 (04:43:04):

Hello, my name is Adam Lang 6 6 0 4 4. I'll make this really quick. People have made some really good points in this room. I would urge you guys to pause on this. This is on the agenda as an update about all of this and they spent about a minute talking about the actual features of looking at a person on there. We weren't given any breakdown on how it might look like. You might be able to look up someone based on race, on gender. Like Cass said before me, there's a lot of troubling things with non-binary and transgender people with this and they spent all of more than a minute, I said a minute, but they spent all of about five or 10 minutes on that and they spent about half an hour talking about identifying cars and that was very concerning to me. I don't think that we have all the information and I would just recommend that you guys put a pause on this so that the community and all of us can get information. Thank you. Thank you.

Speaker 62 (04:44:18):

I'm Glenda eam. I am a North Lawrence resident and I'm very concerned about all of this being investigated. More people have talked and talked and shared many things that I agree with and I really do hope that you will just consider pausing and I appeal on behalf not only of the three generations of Ians for my past, but the three generations that are here in Lawrence now. And I'm concerned for their safety, not only here in Lawrence, but also within our country and very concerned that they can come in and even though our officers, I'm unsure, want to do the right thing, we see what's happening in Chicago. We see what's been happening in LA even against the wishes of the mayors and the people in control. I don't envy you all your jobs. These are going to be hard times and I'd like to stand behind everybody and help strengthen everyone who makes the right choices, whoever they are, but you better believe I will stand against those who don't. Thank you.

Speaker 63 (04:45:50):

Hello, my name is Barbara Farris, 6 6 0 4 4. I'm a grad student at ku. I stood here before begging you all to reconsider the system and the contract. Unfortunately, I don't trust you. I don't trust you all. You said that the police department said that this was not a surveillance system and then they showed us all this evidence for how it is a surveillance system. That doesn't make sense to me and I want to trust you. I want to trust you so bad, and if you would just involve us more in your decision making and consider what we have to say, I could totally trust you. So please, please put a pause on fuss. Please just put a pause on it. Thank you. Okay.

Speaker 19 (04:46:57):

Hi, my name is Cliff 6 6 0 4 4. Thanks. Surveillance does not make people safer as everyone has said before, definitions change and policy changes. So this technology is supposed to be finding our criminals for us, right? Okay, what is the definition of a criminal? What is the definition of a criminal in this year or in the upcoming five, 10 years? Because it looks like the definition of a criminal is going to be abortion seekers, trans people, activists, anyone with any kind of political ideology that maybe leans a little left or independent journalists, people who perform mutual aid and care for their community care for unhoused. Folks care for just like their community asylum seekers.

(04:47:51):

It feels like our identities as people are becoming criminalized. And that's what this AI technology is going to find out about us and store. And then when some kind of federal law comes out to be like, all right, now it's time to take all the trans people and put them somewhere, they're going to say, great. We have a database for that. All money, money going towards the police departments instead of towards community does not make a community safer. Whether it is a IDF partnered training facility like in Atlanta or whether it is AI technology surveillance. And I guess my last thought is that maybe more

people will have to walk around town now in black block not to commit any more crimes, but to just feel a little bit safer from you. Thanks.

Speaker 64 (04:48:53):

Hi, Dave Wesley, 6, 6 0 4 9. These guys are people just like you and all people have the same problems. They all succumb to power and power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely. It's been known for generations. These guys may seem really nice just like these folks, but they succumb. They're human to these bad urges just like you guys. You should know that. And I'm surprised that we've gotten to this point where you're giving the police force this type of power. Power corrupts. This is not a small issue. A lot of people showed up tonight because they're very concerned. You guys need to take this seriously and put a pause on this. This is something that affects elections. This is something that will affect whether you're elected in two years. This you need to take this seriously and put a pause on this program because this is beyond the pale. Thank you.

Speaker 65 (04:50:34):

Thank you. Hey guys, it's been a long one tonight. Patrick Ross, 6 6 0 4 9. I think this is a tough issue because I see both sides. I see the community wanting to be protected. I see the police saying that the system will help them do their job. So at the end of the day, I see this as an issue where we just need to come together as a local government and as a community. And the opportunity before you tonight, as I see it is for the public to, in my opinion, finally feel heard on this side of the podium. And I've come here on countless issues. I've seen amazingly well organized groups, coalitions come here. I've seen neighborhood groups that aren't as engaged and they come up and they all give all these really great articulate points on issues and it's always the same result and the prevailing notion throughout the community in what is afforded to us to be able to speak our minds on issues and implore our moral stances and our viewpoints on things, the prevailing notion within the community is that we come here and we are ignored.

(04:52:06):

Now, I don't know how much you guys actually listen to what we say at this point, if your decisions are already made beforehand, if you guys are privy to other information, but I'd say at least from hearing tonight and one of the largest outpourings from the community on an issue, both in the public comment, documentation, upload and people coming here in person, I think it's clear that this is one that we have to get right. And I think it's a pretty easy and obvious answer that if you want to send the message that you are listening to the public, then at the very least let's at least just slow roll this discussion and continue discussions. And I think that would be almost a miracle from what I've seen in the last year given the structures that we have as a local government. Now, that's not an insult to you guys because you guys know that I respect you guys and I want to respect the system and the place, but I think if the commission wants to show respect to the community that wants to be engaged and that you represent and you are voted on by then, let's see the outcome of this decision now because I think it'll speak volumes.

(04:53:30):

So thank you very much.

Speaker 66 (04:53:46):

My name is MU 6 6 0 4 7. In my 31 years in Lawrence, this is the first time I attended one of your meetings and I came with the intention to listen and no thought of speaking, but after what I heard today, I felt that I had to give my 2 cents. We heard a lot of things from good people from the police department with a lot of good words and good intentions, and I have nothing but respect for the Lawrence Police Department, but I also come from a community that has been victimized by law enforcement at all levels, from the local level all the way to the federal level, F-B-I-T-S-A and Homeland Security and so on.

(04:54:38):

And as someone that serves for the last four years on the United States Civil Rights Commission, Kansas Advisory Committee, the protection of civil rights is my number one priority. We have heard something saying we're not going to give the information to ICE or the immigration, but I haven't heard anything saying, we're not going to share it to the FBI or TSA or Department of Homeland Security. Even if they claim this is for protection or for terrorism without a court order, they shouldn't get it. The technology that we heard is a good technology and we always want the police to have the best technology on their hands. But as someone that comes from a healthcare background, it reminds me of x-ray and radiation, x-ray and radiation are great technology, but you never use them without putting all the safeguards and protection to guarantee the safety and protection of the patients and the care providers. And what I see here is we put all the x-ray equipment in place with no protections. We started using them. We should never have done that and we should not do that. Stop everything. Stop using x-ray until you have all the protections in place, the protections guarantees the people's rights are protected. Whatever those guarantees are, make sure everyone is 100% protected. Then you can use the technology if you want. Thank you.

Speaker 2 (04:56:32):

Anybody else in the room? Okay, Sherry, is anybody online?

Speaker 4 (04:56:41):

Yes. Steven Watts.

Speaker 67 (04:56:45):

Hi Mayor. De picked up on a point he was asking in six months to keep the license plate numbers and after they keep 'em for six months, then they send them into the cloud. They don't delete the mother. No, they got to go unless they're used in a subpoena process. Did you notice that mayor, that he didn't really answer that question and he slipped a little bit there. But at any rate, cameras are good things. I believe in them, yes, good technology. Why don't we use them however, to do things like slow down the speeders in our town or maybe we could put the camera systems up by the school zones. And so yeah, you speed through the school zone, a picture is taken and an automatic ticket is generated. That's what time it is. It's the way it's done in other communities. Why aren't we looking to use technology for those kinds of issues instead of for crime?

(04:57:49):

Rich has already said crime is down in Lawrence, Kansas. It is. I don't understand why they want to use the technology for abusive purposes when it could be used for the good stuff. It's something else. And these guys are always complaining every time you go or listen to them, they don't have enough people. We are supposed to have these many people that we only have this many who established the standard for the number that they came up with For how many is it right number? Well, it might've been a think tank. Kind of like the same people that write our policy manual, very, very pro, give 'em whatever they want. I don't know. Isn't it a management challenge to make work with what you got? That's what I always believed in. And there were a lot of videos of cars by the way that were shown in the sales pitch, and I think most of them were speeding and going through the red lights, which are pretty prolific here in town.

(04:58:51):

Oh, yes, they are. Oh yes they are. Hey, and did you guys know? And I'm sure Rich does because Rich, I'm sure Rich voted to get rid of this dirty cop, this chief of police in Sedgwick, Kansas. He got caught abusing license plate reading software 164 plus times following his girlfriend that he was jealous about. And this was last year just down the road, Sedgwick, Kansas. So yeah, let's pause this and think about it. And if we had a functioning police review board, this could be dealt with. And Brad, please remember

that three or four years ago, you and I had some exchanges about the reality that our town has no digital policy with respect and has no digital information policy time. We need to establish that. Thank you.

Speaker 7 (04:59:49):

Thanks Steve.

Speaker 68 (04:59:56):

Bo Horowitz. Hi, my 6, 6, 4 4. Thank you. I don't know how well you can see the old newspaper clipping in my photo, but it's an article about my dad being jailed during the McCarthy era for using an assumed game. Paul Brown to buy a car. And it was constant in driving that car in Minnesota, which was legal in one state and a misdemeanor that carried a small fine in the other, but it was hard period. My dad was a member of the Communist Party, so he spent 15 months mostly in solitary being shuffled between jails and state lines. During that time, his father died. He wasn't allowed to go out and attend the funeral.

(05:00:40):

One of the times he was not in solitary. A cellmate died in his arms while my father called her guards didn't come. I am sharing this in the hope that helps you better understand the human cost of times when it's normalized to escalate cooperation with governments that persecute people they don't like in the name of public safety. Looking back, it seems like a shameful time in our country's history. And the McCarthy period was a walk in the park compared to what we have now. When yesterday we had a Supreme Court ruling that to justice, had minor dissent, made it legal to see anyone who looks Latino speaks Spanish and appears to work low wage job. So many people have come up to speak and sent letters because it's obvious. The next stage in absence $3.2 million contract does not keep us safe. It's terrifying. So is Axon.

(05:01:34):

ICE is abuse of surveillance and AI technology is well-documented. We don't need tools that'll make it easier for ICE to target immigrants. We also don't need tools that'll increase inequities in policing and make it easier to track and penalize people seeking abortions or gender affirming care. We need mechanisms for community input and public control. Respectfully. I'm asking that you don't choose full ignorance or the pretense of public safety. This is a time that tests all of us. It's a really dark time in our country's history, and we will all have to live with the consequences of our actions. You literally have the power to save lives with this decision. Please pause any more T integrations and work with the community to adopt a robust oversight ordinance before expansion continues. Thank you. Thank you

Speaker 4 (05:02:40):

Taylor.

Speaker 69 (05:02:43):

Taylor Berger, 6 6 0 4 9. Last commission. I told you surveillance is not safety. This week. I'm asking for something even clearer, a complete stop to the fuss program. Not a pause, not more input, a full fucking stop. Other cities are already living with the consequences of this technology. They've paid out a million dollar settlements after fuss linked systems. False, CID people, innocent residents were arrested, detained, humiliated, and traumatized because this surveillance tool that was sold to city governments just like ours, has smart policing and it didn't end there. Police officers have used these systems to spy on women as somebody just said, not to protect the community, but to abuse their power. And now you are city leaders are choosing to hand over the same tools to our police tools that will not land evenly, tools that will land hardest on black, brown, and poor residents of Lawrence. And you are doing it without transparency, without independent oversight, and without the consent of the people you represent.

(05:03:51):

You say you want to build trust, but you cannot build trust by watching us instead of listening to us. You cannot build safety by expanding the power of police who already have more than enough tools to target and intimidate. What you are building is the surveillance state. The truth is this, you were choosing to decide with corporations and cops over the very people you claim to serve who are prioritizing control over care, who are pouring money into a system that harms us instead of investing in the things that actually keep people safe, like housing, healthcare, community aid and justice. So I'll ask each of you directly, which side are you on? Are the side of the people or on the side of a surveillance machine already proven to abuse and fail? Stop uses, stand with your people and Free Palestine.

Speaker 7 (05:04:43):
Thank you.

Speaker 4 (05:04:57):
That's all the comments.

Speaker 2 (05:05:00):
That's it online. Okay. Very good. Thank you everybody for coming and sharing with all your thoughts with us. And I know it was a lot of time, but I think it was important for us to have the kind of insight that we received tonight. Commissioners, do you have any feedback, want to talk about questions you want to touch upon?

Speaker 3 (05:05:23):
Is still here from Lawrence Transparency Project?

Speaker 2 (05:05:27):
I think he's in the back right now.

Speaker 3 (05:05:32):
Kin. K. Can you share a little bit, I know on the packet we received some sample language from the ACL U. Can you tell us a little bit about where that came from and just what city was it applicable to or what was the guidance or the genesis for the ordinance?

Speaker 18 (05:05:48):
Sure. So I found that ordinance from looking at what Columbia Missouri had done, which LPD did mention earlier today, it seems like LPD or not LPD, it seems like Columbia, Missouri. I was further researching what's going on there. And it's a bit more confusing with the flock situation, but the A CLU ordinance is part of a national campaign because believe it or not, we are not the only city that is dealing with this sort of technological integration system. So what its goal is, is to set certain things up so that technology contracts don't slide through commission on accident. It also establishes an oversight, not necessarily board, but an oversight sort of working group

(05:06:47):
That reviews quarterly or however we would determine it Here. The basic principle is to just automatically set the default be to some kind of democratic oversight. So before anything gets put in place, everybody we can confidently say everyone has had a chance to look at it. I think the A CLU ordinance would definitely need work for here. And I've done a lot of typing, I've done a lot of reading. I didn't get far enough into writing one. But after reading those, it seems like a lot of what is in that ordinance would be really helpful here, especially because it seems like we're sort of in an inflection point

with how technology is coming together and with artificial intelligence, it seems like it could be a productive step forward now,

Speaker 3 (05:07:44):

And I did perhaps in their Lawrence Transparency project and I didn't know if, are you here speaking on behalf of the project or are you here speaking as yourself?

Speaker 18 (05:07:51):

Sure. Which

Speaker 3 (05:07:52):

One you want to wear, which hat you want to wear.

Speaker 18 (05:07:54):

I can speak on behalf of Lawrence Transparency Project if, yeah.

Speaker 3 (05:08:01):

So my question is, because one, I don't believe in preempting a time, and this is something that in your request to the commission to look and to examine and you're wanting for the pause. So walk me through, because this is, and I don't want to get into comments before the question, but walk me through what does the engagement process look like? Not to say that we don't know how to do it. I mean we don't know how to do it well and we're learning how to do it. We're evolving because the climate requires that of us. So help me understand what this process would look like as far as the engagement as this work has been and where it could potentially go and what that looks like as far as what you've asked for or what the project has asked for in regards to that oversight and mapping that out. So what does that look like for you?

Speaker 18 (05:09:03):

Yeah, so I think what it would look like for me is first this pause so that we're not working against something so that we're working together into the future, not while something else is kind of metering itself out. And from there, I think even tonight, the people that are still here right now, there are folks in this room that I think could be readily identified as willing to offer their various expertise. I would imagine, and I would really look forward to a group working with city staff, city attorney's office, Lawrence Police Department it and identified community stakeholders. I think Sanctuary Alliance has experienced doing this before and I think that they also have that working relationship with Lawrence Police Department from the previous work that we've done. So I think they would be, am I answering your question? Okay. So that's kind of what I'm envisioning is identifying stakeholders who have identified various issues that stand out to the commission. And I would also defer to y'all's ability to convene a group that would be effective for doing this kind of work and making sure that we get it right. Thank you. Anything? I think

Speaker 3 (05:10:36):

It Thank you. Thank you for that. Okay, thank you. I didn't know if Brooke was still here.

Speaker 18 (05:10:43):

Brooke left.

Speaker 3 (05:10:44):

Brooke Miller. Brooke left. Okay. Sorry, I had a question for Brooke, but

Speaker 18 (05:10:48):

I did also want to add, I don't want to because Brooke isn't here. I don't want to volunt and tell her, but we were talking earlier and she was profoundly interested in helping to facilitate something as sort of like a bridge between community. And

Speaker 5 (05:11:04):

Thank you

Speaker 18 (05:11:05):

For that.

Speaker 5 (05:11:06):

All the questions I have, mayor very much got one question. Come on back up. Thank you. Can you give me an idea of what you mean by pause or what the group, I should say, the Trans Transparency group?

Speaker 18 (05:11:19):

Sure. I think a pause would be to stop the integration process of cameras and no longer and pause the utilization of the advanced analytics for the time being until we can figure out limits on those as well.

Speaker 5 (05:11:38):

The ai? The ai, yes. But what we're doing with it now, what we're showed tonight through our officers solving crimes, to me that seems like a very helpful tool for our community.

Speaker 18 (05:11:52):

I do believe that the cameras are a helpful tool for our community. I think that what's been identified is a registry seems very effective and seems to save people. I live in the Orad neighborhood. I've said that to y'all like six times, six different weeks now. But I've had police and I think volunteers with the police department come knock on the door because we have a fake camera outside of our thing. And I remember just thinking that is dedication and a lot of extra work. So this does, a registry does seem like it could potentially create efficiencies and things like that. So I do think that it is good for cameras to solve crimes and I do see a place for that. And even with this pause, the idea is to keep what is there in place so that we're not ripping something off and then, you know what I mean? So what is integrated with the traffic cameras that we saw in the presentation, letting those continue and not try to undo something seems to me to be the most reasonable kind of way to actually be able to move forward without a lot of hurt feelings. Like we're not trying to attack or take away. We're trying to put protections.

Speaker 5 (05:13:21):

Thank you. Okay, thanks. I've got one question for our chief chief. How would we go about if we wanted to do any sort of pause at all, how would that impact you and what your plans are for the future?

Speaker 28 (05:13:49):

So we need fuss right now to run our body cameras and our dash cameras. That's not anything we can pause or else we'll lose functionality that we need to do our jobs. This project, as Drew mentioned, isn't anywhere near being completed. We're still working on integration of several things. We can still use the

cameras. We've been using the cameras for years without fuss. It's just not as efficient logging out, logging back in to systems and one would think is, somebody mentioned that you could be logged into two systems at once. I don't know why we can't, but welcome to government. We have a lot of weird things like that that aren't there in the private sector. So I don't know how many systems are integrated already. Drew Body Cameras. Cameras, dash mobile. Okay. So we've only got one other system other than Dash cameras and body cameras are integrated, so most of what we have isn't integrated yet.

Speaker 29 (05:14:50):

Great.

Speaker 28 (05:14:51):

I did want to clarify something too. Tony pointed this out to me. So I mentioned something about who can release video and our policy says that a shift supervisor, it's on page 27 of the packet, can release a video in accordance with a specific and legitimate law enforcement purpose through the records division unless there's an exigent circumstance. And I believe what I said is I was the one that had to approve that. So I just want to clarify that. I misspoke on that one just to make sure we have all the correct information out there. Thank

Speaker 6 (05:15:22):

You. Question on the ability of fussy or Axon or some company to access our data. I mean, I know I have some computer programs in my office that in theory Outlook and Microsoft can come look at my emails. They have access to that, but I have other programs in my office that it's a program, but the people who own the program can't get to my information, can fuss get into our server and look at our camera.

Speaker 28 (05:15:58):

I don't believe so. Go ahead, please. There's a difference between what's on evidence.com, which is where all of our digital evidence is stored and what's on our server. So what's on evidence.com, we're a customer of they can't share our data now they can access it, but they have to have a legitimate purpose for it. That's all outlined in our contract. And so they have contracts with thousands of law enforcement agencies in the country. If they were to violate their contracts, we would all go somewhere else for a digital storage. They're not the only game in town. So I understand folks concerns about them getting in there and accessing our data and giving it away. They would go out of business if they did that and they're a business, they're not going to do that. But we own all of that data. That's in evidence.com. That's everything from our uploaded patrol video, any digital evidence, pictures of crime scenes, child sexual abuse material, digitized reports, all of that stuff is in evidence.com. It's a huge expense. We have unlimited storage there because we generate so much stuff. The video that's on our traffic safety cameras and public safety cameras and APRs, that doesn't go to evidence.com unless it's part of a case. So that information is all somewhere else. Axon doesn't have access to that because they're not on our servers. So if you want to just clarify

Speaker 29 (05:17:28):

That. Yeah. Sorry, Adam halfway, deputy chief, to reiterate what chief said, two different things, two different kinds of digital material evidence. If it's uploaded to evidence.com, it is just like an evidence fault at the department though it's housed somewhere else. There's an audit trail which says when it's gone out, when it's been viewed, all those different things. The second is video and material that goes through the fuss platform. They have, while there's been plenty of people talk to tonight about it's a company, it's how to make money, this kind of thing, and that's not inaccurate. Their business model relies on you all being okay with us utilizing this system. If they violate that agreement and that contract, they're going to

start fighting with our attorneys. You all are going to tell us no more, not another dollar. And their business model goes down the tubes.

(05:18:31):

Now that all being said, everything connected to the internet has a risk of bad actors, those kind of things. And I can't sit here and tell you that anything is 100% secure because every device in here, every phone that everybody's come up in here has a connection to the internet. So there is that risk. But this company, which like it or not business model is dependent on the ability to keep that information private and under the control of their customers and not 'em, quite frankly, they would go out of business pretty quick if they started violating that.

Speaker 6 (05:19:09):

Well, flock is having that problem now. But again, I guess I want to be sure though that the traffic cameras, the fact that we used to look at the traffic cameras through whatever the system was, now we look at 'em through fuses, that doesn't give fuses the right to access. I mean that technology does not give them access to our computers,

Speaker 29 (05:19:30):

Correct?

Speaker 6 (05:19:31):

Right. I mean if you watch the movie, semi Iranian can probably get on their own hack control, whatever. I mean everything's not safe, but

Speaker 28 (05:19:40):

Still got all the firewalls

Speaker 6 (05:19:41):

In place. But that's different than the evidence.com. Okay. I just wanted to be sure I understood the difference between those two systems.

Speaker 28 (05:19:48):

All the camera video is still on our servers under our control and we own it.

Speaker 6 (05:19:53):

The

Speaker 28 (05:19:53):

Only thing that goes to evidence.com is stuff that's related to a criminal investigation. And so it's not like even the whole

Speaker 6 (05:20:00):

Things like

Speaker 28 (05:20:01):

People would send us. And then the other thing I want to clarify too, somebody accused me of not answering a question. A LPR data is deleted after six months. It doesn't go to the cloud, it's gone. So if you ask me on six months and one day for a license plate that was run six months and one day ago, I won't have it. So question answered

Speaker 2 (05:20:19):

Clearly. I have a question about what you just spoke to related to the data itself. Right now we're using a platform of some sort to view the traffic safety data on the cameras that are mounted on our lights. There's some sort of platform we're using to view that data, correct?

Speaker 28 (05:20:37):

Yeah, it's

Speaker 2 (05:20:38):

Genetech

Speaker 28 (05:20:38):

And what's the other one? Access, what is it?

Speaker 2 (05:20:42):

Access.

Speaker 28 (05:20:42):

Genetech and Access, yeah.

Speaker 2 (05:20:44):

Okay. So there's two software platforms we're currently using that had some of the features we spoke to. Do those platforms have the AI when we were showing those features, that was actually on the fuss platform, correct? Correct. Okay. So none of those tools exist currently in the platforms we have? Correct. Okay. So we don't have the skill or ability to delve into some of these higher level AI slash data analysis with what we have?

Speaker 28 (05:21:12):

No. Okay. No. And I would hesitate to call what fuss does data analysis, it's a very rudimentary search video.

Speaker 2 (05:21:21):

Sure. Somebody I saw in the platform mode, there was a toggle switch, you could turn on X, Y, and Z. Those are the features that are exposed.

Speaker 10 (05:21:28):

Yes.

Speaker 2 (05:21:28):

And then you run that platform. So what you're looking for is simply to move from one platform that we're using to this lastly, to integrate the last of our devices into this fuss platform, we'll call it, for no

other good reason, a platform, a single source for all of our video needs. Basically. Yes, we can continue to do everything we're doing can continue to be effective in law enforcement without that integration currently. Correct?

Speaker 28 (05:21:57):

Yes.

Speaker 2 (05:21:57):

It's not as efficient and I think there are more security risks by logging in and out of platforms. Frankly, I studied this and I'm surprised that people think that that's a better way to do things. But the more times you log in and on and off, the more likely you are to have a keystroke, logger catch anything that's going on. And more importantly, you're typing more and more frequently and so people can see those keystrokes more readily. So I don't know if this is a good or bad thing, but right now we can do our job using the platforms we have while we study how to properly integrate the software capabilities of fuss. I think that's kind of where we're at today. I think that's what I'm hearing from the public. That's because all the things that they're worried about, we can't do currently with the platform we have, but we really aren't looking to do anything more with this platform other than integrate everything into one place. I think that's what I'm getting from you. Is that correct?

Speaker 28 (05:22:49):

Yeah. And I don't know that, and it's just not going to hitting me we're it not for our body cam and dash cam functionality being tied to fuss. We may not even be talking about fuss right now. There's a lot of neat stuff that it does with getting everything in one place, and I think that's really something that will help us do our job better. But the reality is it was a very small part of this overall contract, and we don't have the people to staff a real-time information center right now absent using our limited duty officers. So,

Speaker 2 (05:23:29):

So if we were to pause, quote unquote, and to come up with some sort of codified process or procedure by which we can protect the safety, security, that's the kind of stuff we're not interrupting our current ability to use our tools. We're just slowing down our ability to be more efficient to use the tools we have. I think that's where I'm kind of,

Speaker 28 (05:23:50):

As long as we were allowed to use fuss for our body cameras and our dashboard.

Speaker 2 (05:23:54):

I mean, I feel

Speaker 28 (05:23:54):

Like that's right. Was there something else? They're

Speaker 5 (05:23:56):

Already doing that.

Speaker 30 (05:23:57):

Yep. Yes, please. The only integration that we're currently working on that provides greater access to the department is what I talk about with the city camera system. We have a limited number of logins for that system. We only have 13 logins for that system. Most of those are housed in investigations. As a matter of fact, they had to remove someone's access to the city camera system to give me access to the city camera system. So that's the process that we're working on currently that we've almost got the information we need to integrate, but that is not a widespread tool at this time.

Speaker 2 (05:24:33):
Okay. Thank you. Okay. So I just want to make sure I understood. Everything was clear for me when we're talking about pausing and then also how much time we really need to move forward if we were going to do any further studies. So thank you very much. Yeah.

Speaker 28 (05:24:49):
Again, we've tried to address a lot through policy, and I think I hear folks saying policy can be changed. The sanctuary alliance policy has to come to you all to be changed. So that's another option outside of creating an oversight body or an ordinance, we could just bring up the public safety camera policy or the fuss policy to this body to be changed. That's something we do with the sanctuary alliance policy,

Speaker 5 (05:25:14):
But there's other policy you do that doesn't come before us,

Speaker 28 (05:25:18):
Every other policy, just like every other city department.

Speaker 5 (05:25:20):
So we can just make that a stipulation that,

Speaker 28 (05:25:22):
Yeah. Yeah. I mean most city departments don't bring their policies to you, but they

Speaker 5 (05:25:26):
Also

Speaker 28 (05:25:26):
Don't have the same level of authority and responsibility we do. So we have some unique situations and certainly that's something we can explore and bring back to you.

Speaker 5 (05:25:37):
Correct. Okay, that sounds reasonable.

Speaker 2 (05:25:41):
Thank you.

Speaker 3 (05:25:43):
So a couple of things want to be first, we have a lot of different balls in the air right now. We have something that wants to be expanded that we don't have the money to expand it. We have something that

currently works with our current systems that was approved by the body to continue to have that. And then we also have a piece where there is new technology being infused into with the hopes of expanding a system to help with public safety. Okay, I'm not going to try to use dog whistles when I share today. Where we are at right now is the current climate of our country is everything is a moving goalposts.

(05:26:42):

Some of us have had that experience more than others, and I think you've heard that in a lot of the EE this evening. And with that, it has kind of eroded what is at the basis of governance and government bodies of trust and empowerment. A governing body trusts its police chiefs, its department directors to do the work, to bring the work back to do right by the constituencies. They are empowered by the governing body, they're empowered by the city manager's office or whatever. So empowerment is built in trust. And when you have trust in those folks, they're able to do that work we have and we have a foreign agent that's impacting our ability for that trust to be seen across different bodies, whether it's public safety, the public works, fire and safety, city managers, governing body, everybody.

(05:27:59):

So we can acknowledge that. And so while this is nuance to some in the governance world, for those who have experience on several occasions and several iterations of their life have experienced the moving goalposts, it is something that they've had to normalize. And at some point, folks who have had to normalize this behavior say Enough is enough. And government's not used to dealing with that. We're used to dealing with the technical, the procedural, the process, whatnot. And we've talked about trusting the process. It's hard to do that right now. Hell, I don't even trust the process in the federal government right now. And that's saying a lot as a member of a governing body that has that relationship. And I have a relationship closer to the people who are impacted just as much as the federal government as they are in state and local government.

(05:29:04):

So when we have situations like this that come up, the idea is that we trust people to do the right thing. We know they're going to do the right thing. And that's in the back of your mind. But you have to acknowledge that there is a foreign agent that is in our midst that could just flip the tables on all of this. And it's not about, we have to acknowledge that that is people, that is a truth. And when we do that, we start to rebuild that trust. Some we rebuild it, some we strengthen it. And so I want to make sure we're doing something that strengthens that trust that our community has within its governing body and within its city public departments so that we can be stronger together to thwart foreign agents. And so what does that look like? We've talked about it, we've seen many iterations of it with community engagement.

(05:30:12):

And I said, I don't like that word, community engagement because we've kind of sed it and it's, it's just bigger than that. It's not just about community engagement, it's about the experience. And we have to, we're seeing where folks are more aware and they're wanting to understand and provide their interpretation of what that engagement and oversight looks like. And fortunately, I don't want to say unfortunately, I want to say fortunately, I see this as an opportunity, like I said, to strengthen our community, not to divide our community. Because what I don't want people to think of is they can't trust the federal government, that they can't trust us. Then it becomes, it does make our work harder. It does to want to show up and be present here knowing that the very people that you're trying to be present for don't believe in you, period.

(05:31:05):

So there's that. So I see validity and wanting to pause because we need to build that trust. We've heard from different individuals. There are some that are on the spectrum as far as some are saying I don't want to see it at all. Some are saying there's value in it. We know that there are individuals who were not here who by their own omission and not participation are fine with it. We have to acknowledge that as a board.

We have to acknowledge that. And the thing is, is that unfortunately, if we continue to move forward without acknowledging that in doing the due diligence to bring community together and to have these conversations because we have to have them, I know I don't want us to be in a situation where we're doing more with less, but when it comes to community and the fact that we do this work for the community than this is something that I want to listen to the community for.

(05:32:07):

It's not that I don't want to see what this program, this project can do for our community, but I also want to make sure that we do the due diligence because there is a growing number and their number is probably going to grow as those foreign agents continue to move the goalpost on us. And so that's what I want this to be. I want to get us to a point where if we can do that, we have two things that are currently integrated, and that's all we know, that there's a ticket item that has a ticket price, that it's not in the budget and it's not going to be budgeted this year. And who knows if it'll get budgeted next year. So I don't see a concern with pausing because it's about community. If we're doing this to help the community, and we have members in our community and a growing number of members in our community who are not comfortable with this, that's dissonance.

(05:33:09):

We're we're not doing it. We're not moving the needle, as we say. So I wanted to go first as a way of not necessarily lobbying. I don't know what everyone's thoughts are and what the mood or the consensus would be of the commission, but I want you to understand, I know a lot of people have brought up desperate impact, whatnot. And I know what I kind of heard through all of this is, I dunno if everybody's familiar with the first, they came poem by Pastor Martin Ne Moler and where it talks about, first they came for the communists and I didn't speak out because I was not a communist. And then they said, then they came for the socialists. I didn't speak out because I wasn't a socialist. Then they came for the trade unionist and I didn't speak out. I wasn't a trade unionist.

(05:34:00):

And then they came for the Jews and I did not speak out because I wasn't a Jew. But then they came for me and there was no one left to speak out for me. And so this is what our community is saying is that we're here and they're wanting to be heard, and they want to know that their governing body, that their city hears them. And I don't see this being hugely impactful. I don't want to say hugely impactful. It's going to make things rough probably. But I'm willing to take that risk if that means that we're going to create a sense of safe, secure, and rebuild that trust that our community is really wanting from us, which I've heard that. So I've heard the anger, I heard the frustration, I heard the fear and everything, but I also heard a community that wants to trust its governing body. It wants to entrust its public safety folks. So just think

Speaker 2 (05:35:02):
That, I appreciate that.

Speaker 5 (05:35:07):
It seems to me like we're at a good place to possibly look at the idea of let's reevaluate, let's reflect on what we've got, which is what we've been doing tonight, and then see what's the proper way to move forward and with the input from entire community.

Speaker 28 (05:35:23):
Yeah, I mean, I think the first meeting where it came up after we announced Community Connect was a public engagement. This is a public engagement. I mean, we haven't implemented this and we're rocking and rolling with it. I look at it as an opportunity for us to get more public input. So I mean, it's just maybe

redefining what it looks like. But with this program, we were already using existing technology that had been before the commission. So in our minds, the community engagement took place years ago. And so it's just if we need more community engagement, we do more community engagement.

Speaker 5 (05:36:04):

And I remember that community engagement when we did the

Speaker 28 (05:36:08):

Cameras, I don't, wasn't here

Speaker 5 (05:36:10):

But

Speaker 28 (05:36:10):

I remember moving here and thinking how shocked I was that y'all had cameras. It doesn't seem like that would be something to get through, but Adam can probably tell you how that was.

Speaker 7 (05:36:20):

Yeah.

Speaker 3 (05:36:24):

And Chief, I will add just briefly, I didn't touch on, this is what's guiding me in my comments. It goes back to that DOJ report, that strength police and community partnerships. There's so much of that was being asked of by community members in that report that I think this is one of those things that we could be that piece to show that there is a, it's not just a willingness, it's a commitment to doing that. And like I said, this is going to, everybody's interpretation of community engagement is different and we've seen it manifested differently. Advocacy is not a, I mean there's books on advocacy, but there's no right or wrong way to do it and everybody's going to do it their own way. But a lot that was called out in this report that I think just that this could be something where we talk about the ability to respond and convey transparency, expectations, realistic versus not, while maintaining trust. There's a general negative perception of police officers, even though there has not been a personal negative interaction that's driven by social media since the sense of them versus us lack of transparency. So I mean, all of these things are kind of in there and I don't want to, it's, there's a lot of these things that people can attach to that I don't want us to do. And I think this is a way to truly strengthen that relationship and edify our community as well.

Speaker 28 (05:37:54):

Yeah, it's a profession where something can happen a thousand miles from here and it still affects me and it's very unique. Lawyers aren't that way. Lawyers can do things and no one thinks that Commissioner Finkel die is doing that. It's a unique profession. I've been doing it for a really long time, and quite honestly, there's not a lot that surprises me

Speaker 7 (05:38:13):

Anymore.

Speaker 2 (05:38:18):

You want me to talk?

Speaker 3 (05:38:19):
Yeah.

Speaker 2 (05:38:19):
Oh, that's unusual. I like that

Speaker 3 (05:38:21):
Rock paper service.

Speaker 2 (05:38:22):
So I think that what we're learning from all this I know, is that maybe we as a commission, I know I didn't quite understand how the community would respond to the DFU name, let alone its history and or integration or past potential for abuse. But I think for me, it's clear that I saw a couple things identified that concerned me. And I think when we talk about integration and giving ourselves more power to be more effective in using these tools faster, it allows people to be quicker at using it for improper reasons as well. So when you give somebody a really fast tool, you want it to be used in the right fashion. I trust you and I trust the reasoning behind all this. And I don't think there's been any intentional misconception for me. I think it's just I understood it to be associated with the Axon devices and fuss being a body cam and an in car cam software package.

(05:39:26):
Okay. Now we talk about integrating it to this point. It feels like there are options in the system that are probably more intrusive than we ever imagined I was around when we put up the first cameras in Lawrence. So I can tell you all about that. I realized how intrusive it can be. And I also realized that how useful the tool can be and our society demands instant information these days, and I can't believe or understand how we can live in our society without these cameras and still serve the community that demands this sort of law enforcement and conclusion to these acts that we can provide with the cameras. So I like the cameras, I like the surveillance understandably for the right purpose, but I also see the loopholes where somebody could abuse the system and have abuse system in the past. Therefore, I'm concerned about making sure we put in place firm rules once we give this tool with all these bells and whistles to our people.

(05:40:25):
I think we need to make sure we have the proper tools in place when there are others in these roles, that they can be seen by the community and that they all understand that. As I think Commissioner Sellers pointed out, there are others now that I never imagined that I would have to be concerned about providing my data and our information to, but now I'm more concerned than ever. And I think we need to realize that we put the right tools in place, but we also put the right constraints in place and how we use those tools. And for me, that's the thing we skipped. And I want to make sure that now I understand its capability, I'd be willing to do whatever it takes to get the engagement, but I want to make sure it's clear. I believe in these tools. I believe without integration that we aren't providing our citizens the right level of service and we're really not using what we're paying for.

(05:41:16):
But AI using this tool as an offensive as opposed to a defensive weapon, I think it's something that we don't want to even get into. And I don't really have any funding. Some sort of center where we surveil people is just something this community isn't going to be ever part of, I don't think, nor can we afford it. So for me, those are talks about how things that I want to move forward, but I think we're in a good

enough place where I'm not stopping you from doing your job. And that's what I care most about is I want these people to feel and believe they're heard and that we get the best possible policy out of this, but I don't want to do it at the expense of our law enforcement capabilities. And it sounds to me like that's not the case. And I feel like I'm really pushed on that one tonight. So thank you.

Speaker 6 (05:42:07):
Yeah, I mean, as the lawyer in the room, I jumped to solutions faster than I should. I mean, I do think we heard two different, I mean, we heard a train of discussion between should we have cameras at all

Speaker 7 (05:42:26):
Versus

Speaker 6 (05:42:29):
There's a strain there.

(05:42:32):
What I hear from the transparency project is let's talk about a smaller subset of that, which is policy and procedure and how we use some of these future integrations. Not necessarily going backwards and listening to kin K, listening to Mariel and others. I think there's some things like you said, that you could easily jump to. Like, okay, I have a policy against no facial recognition. Well, okay, we are not planning to do it. We haven't done it. Okay, put that in the policy, not using AI for that. I mean, so again, I think one, there's some low hanging fruit tale that, again, my mind jumps to solutions more than the process, but I hear what you guys are saying, which is we should let the process woke and not jump to an immediate solution. So I'll back off of that, but I will say, I mean, I guess the Mayo, I believe the cameras are good. I believe how we're using them all good at the moment. I do. I believe there's a chance for risk for home that we want to control. I'm fine with Yes, I agree with that. We can walk around that. But as I read what Lawrence Transparency project says, direct staff to pause further integrations or use of advanced analytics within the fuss platform entails surveillance oversight can be developed with community input. This keeps currently integrated cameras in operation and gives commission time to adopt clear, durable oversight rules, full future expansion, hood kinka to answer those questions.

(05:44:34):
I can work with that. I think that's, personally, I'm okay with moving ahead with integrating our building cameras with our system. Again, I don't know exactly what the pause means and if I know we're close to that, we're not very close to a lot of other things. We have access to those cameras now. I'd be okay with that. But that's a detail that someone can walk through. But that's kind of where I'm at.

Speaker 3 (05:45:06):
And I think likes mayor, to your point, we had a couple of folks that say sometimes the process is slow,

Speaker 7 (05:45:13):
Sometimes

Speaker 3 (05:45:13):
They can go fast. And I think for this, and I'm not wanting to use, not speak for what a defined term, what the defined term of pause is, but what I think this gives us an opportunity to do is it's a window for our community members to understand how we assign scope and authority. And I've always talked about that with the governing body, that we have authority and we have the ability to assign scope and authority.

And sometimes we don't wield that. And oftentimes we do. And maybe not in ways that we could do it in other, we do it in some ways and maybe sometimes not in others. So I love how you say your solutions. I am the same way. I want people to be solution creators and not problem articulators. And I've said that many a times. I think there is a time and space that has to be given for that. Oftentimes the community can allow us that authority and scope to do that. And oftentimes in other things, it calls for a time and space for the community to be more involved in it than maybe the authority could. So

(05:46:25):
This is a way of acknowledging that and trying and stretching and learning a new tool. Oh

Speaker 2 (05:46:32):
Yeah. A lot about it.

Speaker 5 (05:46:34):
Yeah. I think as far as we talked a little bit about policy, Brad, what I'm hearing tonight, part of what I'm hearing tonight is whether or not it should be policy or ordinance. I keep hearing that reflection from the community. And so that's a decision that would have to be made in conjunction with discussions that we have going forward. We're definitely in a different time right now with the feds the way they are, and we've got to be careful.

Speaker 3 (05:47:03):
And that may come out of the conversation. It may be, we may have a consensus on it being an ordinance. The group may see that there's a consensus on it being policy. I think we give them the authority for a work group to have that discussion and bring that back to us, and then we have the final say on it.

Speaker 7 (05:47:21):
Yep.

Speaker 5 (05:47:22):
Okay. Sound

Speaker 3 (05:47:23):
Works.

Speaker 28 (05:47:24):
So if I may, just to clarify, what you would like for us to do is to do some community engagement work with our folks that were here and others of interest to look at policy and look at oversight with this system.

Speaker 7 (05:47:38):
Yes.

Speaker 28 (05:47:39):
Including

Speaker 2 (05:47:40):

Access and Yeah,

Speaker 7 (05:47:41):
Including,

Speaker 2 (05:47:41):
Yeah, that would all be all those issues brought up by some of, we'll call 'em security and safety issues of the data and access thereof.

Speaker 28 (05:47:49):
Okay.

Speaker 2 (05:47:50):
Yeah.

Speaker 28 (05:47:51):
So data security, oversight, policy, those three things.

Speaker 3 (05:47:55):
Yep.

Speaker 28 (05:47:56):
Got 'em all

Speaker 3 (05:47:57):
Data security. Yes. Security as it relates to AI technology. Yes. Yeah. And whether ordinances need to be written,

Speaker 5 (05:48:02):
I don't know. I mean that would be legal

Speaker 3 (05:48:06):
Now. We said we would want them to bring back the recommendation. So let the work group bring back recommendations and ween with the input of legal decide how best to,

Speaker 2 (05:48:17):
Because I think the number one thing I hearing is there's uncertainty as to how easy it would be for us to change these policies. We sit here today, as the tool becomes more powerful, that policy becomes more important. I think that's the message that I got. Thank you all. Thank you very much. Thank

Speaker 3 (05:48:37):
You.

Speaker 2 (05:48:41):
Okay,

Speaker 4 ([05:48:42](#)):
Mayor,

Speaker 2 ([05:48:42](#)):
Go ahead and move on to our

Speaker 4 ([05:48:44](#)):
Mayor. I just want to remind you, you do have in your procedures a time limit for meetings. So the meeting ends at 11 unless you move.

Speaker 2 ([05:48:51](#)):
Oh, that's right. I forgot

Speaker 4 ([05:48:53](#)):
To extend the meeting

Speaker 2 ([05:48:55](#)):
Commissioners. How do you feel about extending the meeting or finishing up our business or what are your thoughts this evening?

Speaker 3 ([05:49:04](#)):
I think we're done. I think we're finishing the time. Well, we are not done because we have general public comment. And you all made a decision several months ago that if came a time as this, we would not in the meeting, we would continue.

Speaker 2 ([05:49:18](#)):
Well, I haven't had this problem come up lately, so I'm happy to, I don't

Speaker 3 ([05:49:22](#)):
Think we have either.

Speaker 2 ([05:49:23](#)):
We can terminate. It's up to you. It's

Speaker 6 ([05:49:26](#)):
Only one we extend for a certain amount of time and then we can see what issue we're on period

Speaker 4 ([05:49:31](#)):
Of time. Yes.

Speaker 6 ([05:49:32](#)):
Okay. So I'd move we exchange for 20 minutes and see where it gets us

Speaker 3 ([05:49:39](#)):

Not to exceed 20 minutes.

Speaker 6 (05:49:41):
Yeah, not to exceed. Yeah, not to exceed. Well, I mean 20 minutes I think to exceed.

Speaker 3 (05:49:45):
Right.

Speaker 6 (05:49:46):
Second, I second it.

Speaker 2 (05:49:48):
Okay. There's a motion to extend the meeting for not to exceed 20 minutes. Was that by you or by

Speaker 6 (05:49:53):
I made motion.

Speaker 2 (05:49:55):
Ye Seconded by Commissioner Larson. All in favor say aye.

Speaker 6 (05:50:00):
Aye. Aye.

Speaker 2 (05:50:01):
Those opposed? Motion passes. Four zero. We got 20 more minutes on the clock at maximum.

Speaker 6 (05:50:06):
Yeah. So commission items quick. I

Speaker 2 (05:50:10):
Don't have any. I have none this evening.

Speaker 6 (05:50:13):
No.

Speaker 2 (05:50:16):
Alright. Okay. Future agenda items then, right? Is there

Speaker 3 (05:50:20):
Public? We haven't got there yet, Eric. Just a

Speaker 2 (05:50:25):
Minute. Future agenda items. Got the budget adoption on the 16th. Looks good. Okay. Alright. Next on the agenda is the city manager's report

Speaker 70 (05:50:43):

Very quickly celebrating. We have the tastiest water, we've got the ED award again, we had it in 19 as well. So just wanted to give kudos to them and that competition. And then the other is just your ex parte regular report. Got it.

Speaker 2 (05:51:03):

Very good. Any comments on the city manager's report?

Speaker 60 (05:51:14):

So this item concerns the city manager. I'm not going to bother trying to explain all this from the podium here for you. There's a report that's about to release on my channel that details how city staff have willingly and knowingly violated coma and Cora in a spiteful attempt to censor those they disagree with or do not like. So it's just to flip a switch for them over there. Because what's happening right now is Kurt's actually live streaming this. He hasn't been honest with you about that, but he's live streaming it right now in a private format.

(05:52:04):

Did you know that according to the Attorney general, if you live stream a meeting like this, it needs to be live streamed in its entirety. So I guess I would question that, but it's just a flipper of the switch over there for your city staff to tell the attorney general to go fuck himself. What's worse is he couldn't have come up with this on his own. These folks over here had to be a part of it. This is expert level manipulation of a public record. And it didn't come locally either because we've researched this enough to find out that it's happening at several other municipalities nationwide.

(05:53:00):

I personally think it's probably coming through the League of Municipalities, but we'll find all that out later. Y'all are busted. If you were to visit the city of Lawrence YouTube channel, hopefully before Kirk over there has a chance to shut it down or whatever, go to the playlist tab and pull up the city commissions. And you can do this from different devices and depending on what device you use, you're going to see different results. See, they lie around here, kind of like that Chief of police over there lies to you guys. Go to the playlist tab, pull up the city commissions and look at all the blocked, limited and private videos. Why is it that our city has private videos and unlisted videos on their YouTube channel? Why do we as a municipality have private and unlisted videos on our YouTube channel? Brandon, are you going out to check that right now? Why is that, Craig? You all have to act. You have 24 hours on Thursday. I'm going to the ag

Speaker 4 (05:54:16):

I'm

Speaker 60 (05:54:17):

Thank you.

Speaker 4 (05:54:22):

City manager's report.

Speaker 2 (05:54:24):

Anybody in city manager's comment on the city manager's report? This is on the city manager's report.

Speaker 53 ([05:54:29](#)):

Just a point of clarification. I'm so sorry to interrupt. On the last previous agenda item, we didn't hear a formal motion or anything, so there was not a lot of clarity as to what the staff was.

Speaker 3 ([05:54:44](#)):

Sorry,

Speaker 53 ([05:54:44](#)):

I don't know if there's an opportunity that

Speaker 3 ([05:54:47](#)):

I am not the preside.

Speaker 2 ([05:54:49](#)):

Okay. For clarity purposes, would you like to help clarify what we've done since

Speaker 3 ([05:54:54](#)):

I was just saying Mario, to your point, it was that the direct staff, so we are the direct staff to go back and put this together so there wasn't a need for a vote because there wasn't an action for a vote. So thank you.

Speaker 2 ([05:55:04](#)):

Thank you. Alright. Any other public comment on the city manager's report? Okay, any online?

Speaker 4 ([05:55:19](#)):

No mayor.

Speaker 2 ([05:55:21](#)):

Okay. Alright. Onto the commission calendar. If there's any comments on that.