



CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE
300 Forest Avenue, Pacific Grove, California 93950

AGENDA REPORT

TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of City Council

FROM: Police Chief Darius Engles

MEETING DATE: June 16, 2010

SUBJECT: Direct the City Manager to Seek an Agreement with the City of Carmel-By-The-Sea for Shared Police Services

CEQA: Does not constitute a "Project" under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines

RECOMMENDATION

Authorize the City Manager to seek a shared police services agreement with the City of Carmel-by-the-Sea and bring said agreement before the City Council for consideration and approval.

DISCUSSION

In our current economy, state, regional and local government have theorized and discussed ways to maintain adequate services with reduced revenue. While the City of Pacific Grove has made substantial reductions in police personnel in the past to help balance the budget, consolidation of police services may provide for a better solution in the future.

In theory, the shared services solution could start with the City of Carmel-by-the-Sea and migrate into a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) in which other cities could join. The concept of sharing services is based on two principles: cost reduction and increased services. Absent either of the two principles, the shared services or JPA concept is not viable. The attached "Synopsis" explains why a partnership with the City of Carmel-by-the-Sea may provide an opportunity for both savings and efficiency for police services.

Upon our initial investigation of the shared services concept with the City of Carmel-by-the-Sea, the following are examples of possible savings that we believe are achievable in the short term:

Share the Chief of Police	\$100,000
Share dispatch and records personnel	\$150,000
Reduce overtime approximately 50%	<u>\$150,000</u>
Total Annual Savings	\$400,000

In addition, there are numerous service enhancements that are also possible, including: increased patrol coverage; greater investigative depth; and training enhancements, among others.

Discussions are currently underway to further develop these efforts. Staff intends to bring a proposal and draft agreement back to Council no later than August 18.

FISCAL IMPACT

Savings to be identified and defined.

ATTACHMENTS

A Synopsis of the Benefits of Shared Police Services with the City of Carmel-by-the-Sea.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

REVIEWED BY:

Darius Engles
CHIEF OF POLICE

THOMAS FRUTCHY

Thomas Frutchey
CITY MANAGER

Synopsis of Sharing Police Services between the City of Pacific Grove and the City of Carmel-by-the-Sea

Police Services Consolidation Discussion

The peninsula cities have recently engaged in discussions of sharing resources as it pertains to providing police services to their perspective cities. While the topics of these discussions are not necessarily new, there is a new sense of urgency as our state and local economies struggle.

Recently the Monterey County Chief Law Enforcement Officers' Association met for its annual training retreat. A two-hour block of training was dedicated to the concept of regionalization of police services on the Monterey Peninsula. As discussed by peninsula chiefs, the philosophy for police consolidation rests on two points: more efficient police services at less cost.

While most peninsula chiefs agree that regionalization should be pursued, it is clear that some police agencies will be able to accomplish this task sooner than others.

Similarities of Systems: A Key to Success

The Carmel Police Department and the Pacific Grove Police Department have two critical components that make the sharing of police services likely, successful and expedient; Carmel and Pacific Grove Police utilize the same policy manual and the same records management system (RMS)

Creating, maintaining and reproducing police records are significant functions of police departments. The Pacific Grove Police Department responds to approximately 15,000 calls for service ("events") each year. From those events, police personnel create approximately 5,000 records each year. Police records can be as simple as a field interview card containing only a few lines of information or an extensive police report containing hundreds of pages of narrative and numerous witness, victim, suspect and property items. The overall input to the RMS each year is substantial resulting in literally hundreds of thousands of data entries and thousands of pages of narrative.

Entry of police records is only half of the equation. Quick and easy retrieval of the information is an essential tool in law enforcement. All police records serve as an important intelligence tool, risk management tool and, obviously, critical in the prosecution of criminal cases.

The RMS is used by all employees in the police department. Carmel and Pacific Grove will not have to migrate to a new RMS to work together. This is a substantial benefit and represents a number of "green lights" on our road to sharing services.

California police departments are required to have policies on certain activities; e.g. domestic violence, vehicle pursuits and use of force, just to mention a few. Policy manuals also prescribe the conduct and standards of law enforcement employees. Policy

manuals can take well over a year to reformulate; however Pacific Grove and Carmel are already there except for some minor differences that could be reconciled quickly.

A Unique Common Bond

Commander Nyunt came to the Pacific Grove Police Department in July of 2007. Prior to his employment here, he was a Carmel Police Officer for 16 years. The Carmel Police Department is similar in structure and organizational culture. The fact that Commander Nyunt knows the personnel, the “ins and outs” of the department, the city government, and the politics of Carmel, is a real bonus.

A History to Consider Concerning Consolidation

In recent years our cities have struggled with the realities and uncertainties of the financial landscape. As a result, we have cut, reduced, tweaked and rethought just about every service we provide. The theory of consolidation of police services must not leave out the “right sized” component. Granted, financial constraints are clearly the catalyst for this consideration and cost savings is one of the driving forces, but it should not be the only benefit. If we save money through a consolidation, but lessen or put our police services at risk, we don’t need a partner; we can do that on our own.

The Pacific Grove Police Department has already cut over 30% of its personnel allocation from 10 years ago. At today’s budget level, that represents approximately \$1.5 million a year in savings. This is mentioned because yesteryear’s analysis and subsequent reductions in service and effectiveness are sometimes overlooked. As we theorize about police service consolidation, Carmel and Pacific Grove can have a stronger police department than if we remain separate and, theoretically, we can reduce costs for better service. But it may be as much about consolidating to restore as it is to save.

As we look to more efficient and cost effective police services, it is important to be aware of a subtle but costly reduction in service as compared to reductions in police personnel. A reduction in service also occurs when police staff are asked to take on tasks that remove or prevent them from their primary duties and responsibilities. Arguably, city governments do not have an acceptable failure rate in any city department, but police departments will produce the greatest liability if they fail. Tasking police department personnel with duties beyond their training, scope and discipline does not ensure success. Emphasis should be on the consolidation of sustainable police services that remain in that discipline.

We are entering a tough time for police agencies and their respective communities. The financial crisis will have effects on communities as we will certainly face an increase of victimization and crime. As other police agencies, both regional and state wide, reduce resources in combating crime, the less effective they become. The less effective law enforcement agencies are as a whole, the more likely or susceptible our communities are to experience an increase in crime.

Sentencing reform, early inmate release, and less parole resources are all being implemented to save the state money. All of the cost saving measures have come with warnings to law enforcement and communities; “crime will go up”. Now is not the time to have your police departments distracted by taking on tasks outside the discipline.

In this process of consolidation, whatever model we arrive at, we must first think of being right-sized. What does that mean? In part, it means that the police agency is adequately staffed to:

- Quick and proper response to 9-1-1 calls for service
- Respond to non emergency calls for service
- Criminal Investigation
- Crime Prevention
- Traffic Safety Enforcement
- Parking Enforcement
- Animal Control
- School Resource Officer
- Disaster Preparedness
- Safety at Special Events

What We Hope to Accomplish

- Unify management police positions (share a Chief of Police)
- Share officers to increase capacity
- Share officers to decrease overtime
- Share records staff, non-sworn, and dispatch services reducing redundancy and cost

Approximate Cost Reduction

• Chief of Police expense	\$100,000
• Decrease overtime	\$150,000
• Records and dispatch service	<u>\$150,000</u>
Total	\$400,000

Next Steps

Step 1

Within the next two months:

- One Police Chief retires and acts as facilitator in the consolidation process
- Both city’s risk management consortia fully define needed protections
- The cities reach an agreement as to scope, duration, and compensation for the consulting services of the retired Chief
- Each city (City Councils and City Managers) agree to the concept of combining police services and agree to take the interim and investigative steps to do so

Step 2

July 1, 2010 through December 2010: a feasibility and analysis on establishing a JPA or other beneficial model for police services.

- The facilitator works on consolidation issues.
- The remaining Police Chief acts as the Interim Police Chief for the other city during the feasibility process.
- A temporary sharing agreement for police services is established between cities.
- The Police Chief and facilitator work in concert on consolidation issues and render analysis on feasibility and next steps.

Step 3

January 2011 through June 2011: If the analysis reveals that police services could be enhanced and at the same time be more cost effective then;

- City Councils agree to the proposed organization and structure of the police organization as it will be in the JPA or shared services agreement
- Satisfy consolidation concerns
- Establish the JPA (or service agreement)