

Public Comment to the Village Board on October 17, 2011 by resident and former village trustee Maureen Pratscher:

The village web site mentions absolutely nothing about the change in service – one brief news item about a review of current police service that was posted a number of weeks ago appears to have been deleted. In addition, the agenda and board packet for tonight's meeting were not posted until late Sunday evening, less than 24 hours before the vote was scheduled.

When I was on the village board, President Kellermann insisted that the board conduct a survey of residents to validate the mission and vision statement we had approved for Vehe Farm, despite the fact that a village-wide survey less than a year prior had asked many specific questions about how residents wished to see the farm used. Where is the call for public input on this important issue? How many residents' opinions have been solicited?

President Kellermann also authorized the use of the village CTY alert system to announce a visit to Vehe Farm by Rep. Joe Walsh. In my opinion, the vote tonight is of much more importance to residents than a political forum and should have merited a CTY call from the village.

I would recommend that the board defer a vote on the agreement with Lake County until, at the very minimum, a public forum is scheduled to discuss police service options and each and every resident is notified of such a forum via the CTY alert system.

As for the contract itself, I haven't had much time to review it given the time the packet was posted, but I do have several concerns after just a quick reading. I will read these concerns in question form and look forward to answers to these questions during your discussion later in the evening.

- 1) Section 1E notes that all reports from Lake County are confidential unless specifically designated otherwise. Does this mean we will no longer see any police reports as part of the agenda package? If not,

how can residents obtain this type of information? Will this mean everything must be FOIA'd? Is the clerk prepared for this potential influx of FOIAs?

- 2) The agreement talks about the potential for providing office space for deputies sometime in the future. In the meantime, where will the deputies be based? Will travel time to and from this base be part of their normal shift, which could mean significant amounts of time deputies will be out of the village limits but still on the village's timeclock? Will paperwork be performed in the village or at a remote substation? Will time spent on paperwork at a remote location count as part of the 24/7 patrol guarantee to the village?
- 3) The agreement calls for a 4-minute response time. What penalties are in place if this response time is exceeded on a regular basis?
- 4) Kildeer Police appear to have cultivated close working relationships with police departments in surrounding towns, such as Palatine and Lake Zurich. How much interaction between departments can we expect with the sheriff's department located in Waukegan? Will this diminish information sharing about incidents or crime patterns that might be crucial to Deer Park residents?
- 5) President Kellermann's letter alluded to a counteroffer from Kildeer in response to the Village's complaints about service. Could this counteroffer be made public so residents will have a basis of comparison for the Lake County contract? From my brief review, it appears the village will save a couple of hundred thousand dollars per year, but that savings will be eaten up the first year by the purchase of five squad cars. While I was on the board, we heard from a number of residents who had been dissatisfied with Lake County's service in the past. I'm sure some of these residents would prefer to hear what Kildeer is offering before a new contract is signed.