



MEMORANDUM

Agenda Item #: 12

Meeting Date: November 28, 2017

TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: ANTON DAHLERBRUCH, CITY MANAGER /s/

SUBJECT: OPTIONS FOR POLICE DEPARTMENT BUDGET REDUCTIONS

DATE: NOVEMBER 28, 2017

ISSUE/PURPOSE

Shall the City Council modify the budget and services of the Police Department?

BACKGROUND

At the City's municipal election on March 7, 2017, the question of extending the parcel tax for 12 additional years was before voters. The tax, which generates \$5 million a year, required 66.67% voter approval. The measure received 60% approval and thus failed. Therefore, the City no longer receives the parcel tax. The tax revenue covered approximately 25% of the entire operating budget for City services. Mindful of the City's fiscal situation, notably because the Police Department constitutes approximately \$7.2 million of the City's entire operating budget as the City's largest cost center, City Council initiated an evaluation the Police Department's services in relation to the community's priorities, including an examination of potential cost savings and efficiencies.

On June 13, 2017, the City Council commissioned a Police Operations Study by Michael McCrary with Lewis – McCrary Partners. On September 26, 2017, Mr. McCrary presented his report to the City Council. The study ([here](#)) is over 100 pages and addresses operational as well as organizational aspects of the Police Department. The general purpose of the study was to evaluate services; service levels; opportunities for implementing efficiencies, improvements and streamlining within the Police Department; and provide a comparison to contracting for Sheriff Department services.

On October 30, 2017, the City Council convened to discuss the recommendations and receive input from the City Manager and Police Management. The report, ([here](#)) as focusing on the service and service level impacts of the Police Operations Study, provided management comments and alternative recommendations for the City Council’s consideration.

Recognizing the City’s existing fiscal situation, the City Council is considering the cost effectiveness and efficiencies of Police operations in relation to services provided for the public. Mindful of the recommendations in both the Police Operations Study (Study) and management review of the Study, the City Council subsequently has asked for itemized Police Department budget reductions of 5% and 10% with explanations of the impact on services.

DISCUSSION

The independent review by Lewis-McCrary Partners found no significantly creative ways to structure the Police Department and provide public safety services. In fact, in the field of policing, there are relatively few new ways to provide public safety services other than adding and subtracting personnel. Even the application of technology for policing requires personnel.

With the intent of showing how the Department would be structured anew (*without dialoguing with staff about priorities, workloads, and community expectations*), the Police Operations Study (Study) simply upgraded a Patrol Officer to a Corporal and added part-time civilian support staff¹ while eliminating 3 sworn positions² and 4 civilian positions³ with the Jail. As such, positions are eliminated that are directly dedicated to multiple aspects of public safety, particularly the availability of 3 of 25 positions that are qualified for responding to an incident for maintaining current service levels. The Lewis-McCrary Partners report was purposed to identify new, better ways for City policing, and none were found. If options existed for maintaining service levels, the City would have been informed by the Study, and as a result, the City’s existing services, structure, value and personnel were validated.

The City Manager and Police Management have since reviewed the Police Department operations and budget mindful of recommendations in the Police Operations Study based on the premise of maintaining and sustaining current levels of public safety services. In other words, the menu of budget reductions presented herein strive to maintain fundamental and essential policing services such as patrol, crime prevention, detective, and emergency response. The list herein sustains the critical mass of sworn officers “on the street” necessary for expected and unexpected responsibilities and public safety.

FY 2017-18 Budget (with one-time adjustments)	\$7,147,038
One-time adjustment for Equipment Replacement Allocation	\$260,258
Base Budget	\$7,407,296
Goal: 5% Reduction	\$370,365
Goal: 10% Reduction	\$740,730

¹ Additional hours for part-time Police Aide for traffic control and the Volunteer Coordinator.

² 1 Officer assigned to the Canine Unit, 1 Sergeant for Personnel and Training, and converting the Administrative Captain to a civilian Support Services Manager position.

³ 4 Service Officers

List of potential budget reductions to achieve 5% and 10% savings in the Police Department

<u>Program / Line Item</u>	<u>Annual Savings</u>	<u>Adjustment</u>	<u>Total Savings</u>	<u>Operational / Service-Level Impact</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Reduction in employee compensation: additional 4% employee payment into pension	\$100,000	\$0	\$100,000	None	Approved by City Council 10/10/17
Convert sworn Captain position to civilian Manager position	\$79,537	\$11,914 (2 years of fund transfer into the Equipment Replacement Fund for the vehicle.)	\$91,451	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Eliminates 7-day-a-week, 24-hours-day availability of a sworn Officer for response to routine calls, incidents, as well as emergencies, and disasters (i.e. fires, cliff rescues, containments, etc.). 2. Eliminates the availability of an Acting Chief when, for example, the Chief is on vacation and the Operations Captain is not accessible. 3. Eliminates leadership position for employee retention and internal succession to Chief. 4. For internal succession, civilianizing the position results the future Chief having limited experience with preparing / administering the department's operating budget and overseeing Dispatch/Jail functions. 5. May present a difficulty in filling the position with a person experienced in Dispatch/Jail functions. 	

Eliminate 2 Service Officer positions	\$197,396	\$0	\$197,396	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduces 10 positions to 8 positions. 2. This will result in overtime; minimum coverage if there are vacancies; potentially lower response time to calls, in-person visits, Jail responsibilities, administrative responsibilities; and / or increased work hours of existing staff that may influence quality of work. 3. Experience is that 4 of the 10 positions may be on scheduled or unscheduled leave at any time. In Fiscal Year 2016-17, with 10 Service Officers, there was 3,432 hours of leave and 3,401 hours of overtime for covering the leave. A variety of factors cause the leave and with 8 Service Officers, the proportionate impact of such leave on overtime, work load, and service will have greater impact on staffing (in comparison to 10 Service Officers). The “over hire” of 2 positions for 10 Service Officers allows for more constant staffing with less impact on personnel and overtime for filling vacancies. 	One position is currently vacant.
5% (\$370,365) Subtotal	\$376,933		\$388,847		

Eliminate Training and Personnel Sergeant	\$193,174	\$0	\$189,621	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Eliminates 7-day-a-week, 24-hours-day availability of a sworn Officer for response to routine calls, incidents, emergencies, and disasters. Moreover, eliminating the Training and Personnel Sergeant will eliminate the regular substitute for when a shift Sergeant is on leave or a Sergeant is needed for a special event detail. 2 Annually, approximately 12 background investigations of Volunteers would be completed by a Service Officer as recommended as an alternative. 3 Annually, approximately 4 to 5 internal affairs investigations will be distributed among the Sergeants. Each investigation requires approximately 10 hours of overtime for interviews and 10 hours of office work for a total of 20 hours. This will result in approximately 40 to 50 hours of overtime and 40 to 50 hours that Sergeants will be precluded from being in the field for routine, daily patrol-related work. 4 May necessitate an increase in the budget for internal investigations conducted by a private contract service. (The budget will vary year to year as it is necessary to conduct internal investigations.) 	
5% Service Officer assignment)	<u>(\$3,553)</u> \$189,621				

<p>Eliminate 2 Patrol Officers</p> <p><i>Add 1 Corporal per Police Operations Study (promoting an existing officer).</i></p> <p><i>Add 5% Motor Officer assignment</i></p> <p><i>Eliminate Canine Unit</i></p>	<p>\$235,040</p> <p><u>(\$165,881)</u> \$69,159</p> <p><u>(\$8,569)</u> \$60,590</p> <p><u>\$7,700</u> \$68,290</p>	<p>\$0</p>	<p>\$68,290</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Eliminates net of 2,080 annual hours of patrol because one of the positions is converted into 1 Corporal. 2. Eliminates opportunity to “over-hire” to maintain constant staffing when a vacancy exists. 3. Eliminates position that maintains 4 Patrol Officers when a Patrol Officer is on leave. 4. Creates consistency among 4 patrol teams. 5. Provides a Motor Officer on every daytime shift for traffic enforcement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Patrol Officer position is vacant (\$105,440). • Average of positions is \$129,600. • Canine Unit costs have been eliminated and vehicle repurposed.
<p>Eliminate Parking Enforcement</p>	<p>\$60,937</p>	<p><i>(\$70,000)</i> <i>Approximate \$90,000 in parking citation revenue minus \$20,000 in processing fees.)</i></p>	<p>(\$9,063)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Eliminates parking enforcement in Malaga Cove and Lunada Bay Plazas, Malaga Cove parking lot, around schools and in permit parking zones. 2. Will necessitate Patrol Officer be tasked with enforcement of permit parking zones, reducing patrol time, speed and traffic enforcement, school patrol, general crime prevention, and / or consequently not be as high a priority for Officers. . 3. For parking enforcement in time-limit zones, alternatives would be explored, but consistent enforcement would be difficult. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Position is currently cost neutral. • Savings is rising cost of pension and health benefits (currently approx. \$21,600/year). • Equipment Replacement Fund already includes full replacement cost of vehicle. • Does not reflect variation in revenue.

Eliminate part-time Volunteer Coordinator	\$10,125	\$0	\$10,125	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will require approximately 8 hours a week of the Community Relations Officer to be dedicated to training, supervising and managing the volunteer programs. 2. Results in the Community Relations Officer not performing emergency preparedness responsibilities. 	
Eliminate part-time Police Aide positions	\$14,150	\$0	\$14,150	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Primarily results in assigning Patrol Officer to traffic control at Via Corta and PV Drive West for 1 hour daily, 5-days a week, for 12 months (as was existing approximately 3 years ago). Eliminates a total of 260 hours a year of citywide, and specifically school, patrol in the mornings, or results in no traffic control in the morning if a Patrol Officer is needed for an emergency response. 2. Additional service eliminated, and ultimately fulfilled by adding to work load of other staff, includes pick-up and drop-off of evidence, animal care, traffic control at incidents, preparation of weekly crime report, research, transporting vehicles for service, preparation of Department statistics, pick-up of supplies, etc. 	
10% Total (\$740,730)	\$720,056		\$661,970		

Inclusive of the one-time adjustment for the Equipment Replacement Allocation added back into the Police Department operating budget (\$260,258), the list above is \$74,760 short of achieving a 10% reduction in costs. As such, one additional option is to endeavor to negotiate changes in the Memorandum of Understanding with the Police Officers Association in the next agreement. Because of the City’s critical financial situation, another is to reduce the City’s \$50,000 contract with the Santa Monica Mountain Conservancy Rangers (Rangers) for coastal patrol. A reduction of \$25,000, for example, can be justified because of the budget crisis and the lack of problems and complaints with regard to coastal access issues reported to the City. However, in recognition of the Police Department’s strong and long-standing commitment to assuring beach access and the public’s safe use of the Palos Verdes Estates shoreline, overtime may be necessary to supplement the Rangers during periods of high surf.

In addition, the Police Department budget currently already includes reductions in fiscal year 2017-18 totaling \$103,395 to address the fiscal situation as follows⁴:

	Description	Savings
1.	Freeze recruitment for volunteers (reduces costs for uniforms and background checks)	\$1,900
2.	Supplies for Neighborhood Amateur Radio Team (NART, Community Emergency Response Team (CERT), Neighborhood Watch, Disaster District Plan (DDP)	\$3,000
3.	PVE-CARES program reductions by 70%: rentals, printing, food, supplies, etc. (offset in part by vendor fees)	\$7,760
4.	Weekend service by Los Angeles County Animal Control for dead animal pickup and strays	\$5,000
5.	Reduced supplies and curriculum planning time to facilitate a “Student & the Law” class at PVHS	\$1,000
6.	Miscellaneous Reductions: police and finance operations	\$2,780
7.	Uniforms due to vacant Police positions and transferred uniform costs to volunteers	\$2,500
8.	Police General Equipment and Supplies: evidence supplies and hardware supplies	\$1,650
9.	Equipment and Rental costs: reduced contingency fund for emergency preparedness	\$13,730
10.	Police & Streets Auto Supplies and Maintenance: fuel, car wash, supplies, etc.	\$26,025
11.	Police (non-emergency) overtime for training, call back, etc.	\$11,700
12.	Two of four Police Aide positions helping with PV Drive West traffic control and school crossing assistance	\$21,350
13.	Background checks due to vacant Police positions	\$5,000
TOTAL		\$103,395

⁴ Source: May 25, 2017 [Menu of Budget Reductions](#) ([here](#)) presented for developing 2017-18 fiscal year budget.

Jail Operations

The internal assessment of Jail operations concludes that the minimum staffing deemed necessary to support Dispatch operations without jail-related duties and to accommodate personnel leaves and other operational factors is determined to be 8 Service Officers. The following is a breakdown of shift assignments:

Shift	Service Officer at Dispatch	Backup dispatcher
Dayshift (MTW)	1	The (1) Service Officer who is assigned to property / evidence
Dayshift (ThFSa)	1	The (1) Service Officer who is assigned to personnel and training
Graveyard (MTW)	2	No backfill necessary
Graveyard (ThFSa)	2	No backfill necessary

With 8 Service Officers, the Jail function can be sustained in the Police Department. By eliminating 2 of the 10 Service Officer positions as listed above, the incremental cost of maintaining the Jail is \$12,000 for supplies plus on-going training, much of which is reimbursable by the State. In other words, eliminating the Jail would save approximately \$12,000 while requiring Patrol Officers to conduct necessary booking, and ultimately transporting, of arrestees. It is estimated that since January 1, 2017, 214 people that were arrested were held longer than 6 hours and 143 were held less than 6 hours. For those held longer than 6 hours, it is estimated that it would be approximately 2 hours of an Patrol Officer's time to transport the person arrested, complete necessary paperwork, and return to the City. Therefore, the City would incur approximately 428 hours that a Patrol Officer would not be in the field or available for field work and / or overtime necessary.

Palos Verdes Estates Jail Activity

Year	2015	2016	2017 Thru May 31
Total Booked	407 (60 Felony)	420 (85 Felony)	192 (40 Felony)
<i>Male</i>	307	320	138
<i>Female</i>	100	100	54
Disposition			
Cite released	287 (115 DUI)	272 (100 DUI)	129 (45 DUI)
Release to other agency	25	26	10
Transported to Court	37	49	10
Transported to County Jail	13	5	5
Transported to Hospital	2	6	2
849	18	23	15
Bond	17	34	18
Bail	0	0	0
Released to parent	6	3	1
Los Padrinos	2	2	2

Average bookings/month	34	35	38
Average hours of stay	N/A	12.12	13.2

The incremental cost of approximately \$12,000 for sustaining Jail operations is relatively minor in comparison to the 428 hours that a Patrol Officer may be unavailable, on duty, in the community. Thus, it is recommended that the City maintain the Jail function.

Alternatively, the Police Operations Study states that the Jail function comprises the time of 4 Service Officers, leaving 6 to support the Dispatch function (in comparison to the City’s assessment that 8 Service Officers are necessary for Dispatch). Reducing the number of Service Officers to 6 would automatically necessitate closure of the Jail and potentially comprise Dispatch operations. It would require overtime for Dispatch operations to fill-in for vacancies (if a Service Officer is available to work overtime, would add costs, and tax staff), or require a Police Officer to operate Dispatch, removing the position from field work. *Note: City Police Officers will need training to operate Dispatch.* With numerous 911 calls for an incident (e.g., fire, helicopter flying overhead, etc.), call response would be delayed.

In fiscal year 2016-17, the 10 Service Officers logged 3,432 hours (\$115,317 in leave earnings) in leave time that was accommodated by 3,401 in overtime hours (with a cost of \$176,747). If combined with the estimated 428 hours for booking and transporting arrestees, eliminating 4 Service Officer positions could reduce the availability of a Patrol Officer for Jail and Dispatch responsibilities potentially up to 3,860 hours a year.

FISCAL IMPACT

The Police Operations Study specifies that its recommendations would take 2- to 3-years to implement. This results from relying on attrition to achieve vacancies, negotiating with the Police Officers Association (POA) relative to changes in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), developing necessary contracts, and implementing the cultural changes in operations that would be required. With two positions within the menu above currently vacant and the POA members taking responsibility for a portion of pension costs, savings are already being achieved. While 1 Captain is acting as Police Chief, the City is also temporarily saving cost that will be continued until the Captain (or civilian Manager) position is filled.

Also, of note, the reductions identified herein do not reflect the recommendations of the Police Operations Study to enhance funding for emergency preparedness, afternoon traffic control at Via Corta and PV Drive West, developing a Technology Strategic Plan and securing the Police entrance driveway. The figures herein include the funding for two Motor Officers for traffic –related enforcement.

Revenue Opportunities

The City’s Finance Department is currently facilitating a “user fee analysis” that will determine if appropriate fees are charged to cover the cost of the related activity e.g., if building permit fees recover the cost of providing plan review and inspection services, or false alarm fees represent full cost recovery. The findings with associated recommendations for adjustments

in fees will be presented to the City Council for consideration in November or December 2017. In correlation with the user fee analysis, there are several opportunities to enhance revenues and offset costs related to police services that are prevalent in other cities that the City Council may want to consider. They are as follows:

- Yearly alarm permit. This is a yearly fee to register alarms with the City. The permit is not to install.
- Institute collection procedures for delinquent false alarm bills.
- House watch fee (vacation checks are currently provided as a courtesy by Police Department volunteers)
- Parking meters
- If the City retains a Type 1 facility jail, “pay-to-stay” jail for people who have time that must be served. (The City of Seal Beach program resulted in \$365,000 in 2016.)
- Collect parking fines for parking on street sweeping days.

Additionally, the City could commission a study to evaluate the cost and revenue opportunity for expanding police services (patrol, parking enforcement and potentially other services) for adjacent cities.

NOTIFICATION

Notice of this meeting was initially broadcast on October 30, 2017 when the Police Operations Study and City Management Review recommendations were discussed. The meeting and this staff report have subsequently been noticed and posted according to requirements and routine practice.

ALTERNATIVES

The City Council is requested to provide policy direction to staff. The alternatives include, but are not limited to:

1. Continue the discussion of the policy alternatives to another date.
2. Provide direction on some or all the policy matters identified in the Police Operations Study, the Management Review of the study and / or the budget reductions herein.
3. Provide alternative direction(s) for addressing police services.
4. Request additional information.
5. Take no action.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the City Council discuss the alternatives for addressing Police Department costs and provide direction to staff. Accordingly, staff will proceed with their implementation in a timely and expeditious manner.

ATTACHMENTS:

A – Cost Comparison

B – Public Correspondence

Cost Comparison

POSITION	Police Operations Study			10% Budget Reduction		FY 2017-18 Budget	
	# FTE	ORIGINAL TOTAL COST W/ BENEFITS	CORRECTED TOTAL COST W/ BENEFITS	# FTE	TOTAL COST W/ BENEFITS	# FTE	TOTAL COST W/ BENEFITS
Captain	1	\$226,981	\$228,482	1	\$228,482	2	\$436,854
Support Services Manager	1	\$116,100	\$128,835	1	\$128,835	0	\$0
Service Officers (Dispatchers)	5	\$509,144	\$592,192	8	\$789,588	10	\$986,984
Property and Evidence / CSI Officer	1	\$104,988	\$106,487	0	\$0	0	\$0
Training Sergeant	0	0	0	0	\$3,553 ¹	1	\$193,174
Patrol Officers	8	\$1,082,144	\$1,060,968	9	\$1,211,963	10	\$1,296,009
K-9 Officer	0	0	0	0	\$0	1	\$158,694
Motor Officer	1	\$144,719	\$4,284 ²	--	\$8,569 ³	0	\$0
Patrol Corporals	4	\$683,006	\$663,524	4	\$663,524	3	\$497,643
Traffic Control Officer	1	\$54,753	\$54,753	0	\$0	1	\$60,937
Community Relations Assistant (PT)	.5	\$17,100	\$16,200	0	\$0	.25	\$10,125
Police Service Aide (P-T)	1.5	\$33,000	\$25,150	0	\$0	1	\$14,150
Executive Assistant / Records Manager	1	\$115,563	\$116,850	1	\$116,850	1	\$116,850
Patrol Sergeants	4	\$743,165	\$744,645	4	\$744,645	4	\$744,645
Detective / Training Sergeant	1	\$189,535	\$189,343	1	\$189,343	1	\$189,343
Detectives	2	\$285,443	\$299,393	2	\$299,393	2	\$299,393
Community Relations Officer	1	\$99,293	\$99,285	1	\$99,285	1	\$99,285
Chief of Police	1	\$245,117	\$245,109	1	\$245,109	1	\$245,109
TOTALS	34 FTE (22 sworn)	\$4,650,051	\$4,575,500	33 FTE (22 sworn)	\$4,729,139	39.25 FTE (25 sworn)	\$5,349,195
4% employee contribution to PERS					(\$100,000)		
Savings from FY 2017-18 Salary Budget	(5.25)	(\$699,144)	(\$773,695)	(6.25)	(\$720,056)		
5% Budget Saving Goal = \$370,36510% Budget Saving Goal - \$740,730							

¹ 5% assignment bonus for 1 Service Officer² 5% assignment bonus for 1 Patrol Officer³ 5% assignment bonus for 2 Patrol Officers

From: Dez Mys <dezmys@[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, November 1, 2017 3:56 PM
To: Betty Lin Peterson; Sanford Davidson; Jennifer King; James Vandever; Kenny Kao
Cc: Victoria Lozzi
Subject: PVEPD

Dear City Council,

It was disappointed to hear the Staff claim that McCrary's costs savings as a reduction in service level; while the author was absent.

However we heard 2 things that were very encouraging:

- Council understood this misrepresentation; which was substantially different from when McCrary was here
- At least one Council member was committed to doing what it takes to ensure an affordable and sustainable local police force

The Staff report was 2 hours of ambiguous information - absent means upon which to base a decision.

This is why you are working so hard, you are doing Staff's job
You need:

- a recommendation to reduce waste; or any affirmation that an attempt was made
- a recommendation to implement efficiencies
- any identification of a single service level or anything that can be measured, reported or provide any accountability

Leadership

Safety services can and should be substantiated by measured and accountable service levels.... so where are the service levels?

You can not balance a budget based on feelings - you have limited funds to direct to priorities for which you need to hold Staff accountable using measurements.

There is no accountability ANYWHERE at city hall. This is not PVEPD's fault.

You asked your "CEO" to show you where 10% savings can be found.

He agreed and told you to expect this will result an unacceptable service level reduction.

So, by the end of Nov you will be no closer to convincing anyone the Leadership is capable of managing a police dept, a budget or \$5 million in new tax dollars.

Many of us strongly prefer local control - but without leadership - it is a model doomed to fail. Then, we will enter into a badly written, badly understood, badly managed and likely overpriced agreement with the Sheriff's dept because:

- PVE is unable to clearly identify their needs
- PVE has not service levels they can articulate (or put in a contract)

Therefore the Sheriff's contract will have no accountability. And, another disappointment.

Don't believe me...? Take a look at your other service contracts.

Here is just some of the types of information that your Staff should be providing you:

1. How do PVEPD officer salaries compare to other police orgs (Sheriffs, RB, Torr, etc.).
2. What is the ratio of mgmt to staff?
3. What is the ratio of dept size compared to other comparable cities in size and safety?
4. How does the overtime cost compare to other similar cities ?
5. Efforts they made to reduce waste and their progress
6. Recommendations they have of efficiencies they recommend (I provided many useful suggestions; but your CEO does not have any commitment to fixing the issues

Here is some info:

1) RE: Salaries: As you recall, you were told Monday our officers make ~\$125k salary + benefits All of us want our officers to be treated fairly AND we want our PD to treat us fairly as well - this check and balance should be fairly and objectively managed by the City Mgr.

According to TransparentCalifornia (who gets this info from PVE Staff) - the first 4 are the only full time employees (which was the context of your question)

Total=\$141K-\$187K Humm, does that sound anything remotely similar to what your city mgr told you Monday?

And, that was 2 years ago, so it is more now

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
1	Employee Name	Job Title	PD	Base Pay	Overtime	Other Pay	Benefits	Total Pay	Total Pay & Benefits	Year	Notes	Agency	Status
15	Kyle Shea	POLICE OFFICER	p	89,961	48,104	14,495	35,240	152,560	187,800	2016		Palos Verd	FT
16	Cecilia Williford	POLICE OFFICER	p	83,963	5,795	19,606	41,965	109,364	151,329	2016		Palos Verd	FT
17	Alex Gonzales	POLICE OFFICER	p	83,578	23,009	10,008	28,739	116,595	145,334	2016		Palos Verd	FT
18	Russell Venegas	POLICE OFFICER	p	85,994	5,604	10,307	40,070	101,905	141,975	2016		Palos Verd	FT
19	Sean Tomlins	POLICE OFFICER	p	79,159	24,740	8,458	37,197	112,357	149,554	2016		Palos Verd	PT
20	Charles Reed	POLICE OFFICER	p	79,787	11,786	15,677	40,078	107,250	147,328	2016		Palos Verd	PT
21	Jesse Aguayo	POLICE OFFICER	p	73,949	18,342	3,334	25,667	95,625	121,292	2016		Palos Verd	PT
22	Sean Crisfield	POLICE OFFICER	p	75,371	20,277	5,423	20,087	101,071	121,158	2016		Palos Verd	PT
23	James O Connor	POLICE OFFICER	p	68,952	1,985	15,040	34,175	85,977	120,152	2016		Palos Verd	PT
24	Aaron Belda	POLICE OFFICER	p	70,383	14,553	1,545	33,291	86,481	119,772	2016		Palos Verd	PT
25	Rebecca Joan Garcia	POLICE OFFICER	p	59,884	611	17,876	40,856	78,371	119,227	2016		Palos Verd	PT
26	Bradley Lemmon	POLICE OFFICER	p	69,265	11,283	2,554	34,211	83,102	117,313	2016		Palos Verd	PT

2) What is the ratio of mgmt to staff.

According to Chief Kepley's power point presentation to you in March, it is 50%; inclusive of Chief, Captains, Corporals, Sargent and Leads. (the ppt is online)

The City Mgr recommends reducing a lead to be regular staff, but retaining his mgmt pay (i.e. less responsibility and accountability for less pay). BRILLIANT !

And the City Mgr recommends promoting another staff member to Corporal.

So, where is the comparison to other cities that 50% mgmt is the norm?

3) What is the ratio of dept size compared to other comparable cities in size and safety

4) How does the overtime cost compare to other similar cities

The FBI has a site with stats that can be used to compare. I can answer this for you.

But, I expect my information will be ignored, and this will not help the underlying problem.

5) Efforts they made to reduce waste and their progress

6) Recommendations they have of efficiencies they recommend

I provided you/CEO many useful suggestions; completely ignored.

I am not looking for credit - I want the City to fix the issues, this is becoming ridiculous.

I urge you to insist your "CEO" provide you meaningful and accurate information upon which to base a decision.

Then if he is unable and/or unwilling - you may choose to finally notice where the problem lies.

Or, continue working very hard with bad results.

- Desiree

--

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are the property of Dez Mys and/or its affiliates, are confidential, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom this e-mail is addressed. If you are not one of the named recipient(s) or otherwise have reason to believe that you have received this message in error, please notify the sender at Dezmys@ and delete this message immediately from your computer. **Any other use, retention, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited.**

Lauren Pettit

To: Anton Dahlerbruch
Subject: RE: PVE Budget Deliberations

From: Dwight Abbott [[mailto:dwrightabb2@\[REDACTED\]](mailto:dwrightabb2@[REDACTED])]

Sent: Sunday, November 12, 2017 3:08 PM

To: Sanford Davidson <sdavidson@pvestates.org>; Betty Lin Peterson <bpeterson@pvestates.org>; Jennifer King <jking@pvestates.org>; Kenny Kao <kkao@pvestates.org>; James Vandever <jvandever@pvestates.org>

Cc: Anton Dahlerbruch <adahlerbruch@pvestates.org>

Subject: PVE Budget Deliberations

City Council:

As I observe the City Council's work addressing the budget deficit issues I occasionally have a relevant thought regarding those issues that I believe might be helpful to your considerations. Being apart from the details of your deliberations may provide me some advantage of perceiving the bigger picture and thinking outside the box. In any case, I provide these thoughts for your consideration with the hope and intent that they may provide you some benefit. My latest thoughts are attached.

- Dwight Abbott

Palos Verdes Police Department (PVEPD) Considerations

The City Council's (CC) budget deliberations have focused largely on PVEPD costs with an apparent defacto decision to retain the local PVEPD in preference to the County Sheriff. Such a decision appears to be in line with the super majority (67% +) of residents that have provided many indications of their desire to maintain a local police department.

The parcel tax consultant, Mr. Tramutola, recommended a new parcel tax supporting the PVEPD. While this is consistent with the apparent CC path, I find it to be a path likely to fail.

If the CC now finds a majority of residents desire to retain the PVEPD, why would it want to conduct a voter parcel tax referendum on the PVEPD that risks failure? Recall that the electorate failed to pass the Measure D parcel tax not because it objected to fire services, but it objected to the contract terms that were proposed. Likewise, the electorate may favor retaining the PVEPD, but will it accept the contract (budget) terms offered – whatever they are? I think it's unlikely. It's the contract terms, not the police or fire services, that become the issue – and the PVEPD costs are very controversial.

You should be aware that there exists a continuing undercurrent of PVEPD antagonists on NextDoor that are very active. These posters use false, exaggerated, imagined and misleading arguments favoring County Sheriff services. The subject of PVEPD costs is like a dry-brush wild fire whenever it is posted on NextDoor. Just tonight I am following a rant against PVEPD costs that has reached 90! replies (not a misprint). Most all of the replies are in agreement with what are stated as PVEPD deficiencies. Most posters are not factually informed, but simply are following the demagoguery that is being preached.

With dedicated obstruction to PVEPD costs on social media and the current general societal distrust of government, I think a new parcel tax based on funding a local PVEPD – at any viable level – cannot succeed with a super-majority vote.

I believe the CC should follow the community desire to retain the local PVEPD, but need not risk a voter referendum. A CC resolution declaring intention to maintain the local PVEPD, but with reduced costs and streamlined operations should be made soon. The front page of the Peninsula News needs to state "PVE to retain its Police Force, but at reduced costs". That dust needs to settle long before a new parcel tax is proposed.

PVEPD costs need to be significantly reduced. What is a significant level? If the CC cannot show at least a 10% cut – preferably more - I don't think the cost-cutting effort will be regarded as credible. The CC should expect that the police union will maintain a no-cut posture. The CC should also expect that City staff will say some minimal cuts are possible, but ask that any staff reductions be made through attrition. That anticipated staff position will say that more substantial cuts will diminish "service levels". If that is true, then so be it. Substantial cuts must be made. However, I suspect that the actual service delivered is significantly a function of employee attitude – not just number of employees.

The CC has a legal fiduciary responsibility to manage the City budget. I suggest that the CC, after study and analysis, determine what the proper substantial PVEPD budget cut should be and then direct the City to work to it. (Easier to say than do – but a must do if necessary cuts are to be made.)

Parcel Tax Considerations

If a new parcel tax should not involve the PVEPD, then how might it be configured? I believe that the least controversial approach would be to return to the Fire Parcel Tax to fully fund County contracted fire services. Success this time would depend (again) on the contract terms.

Proposed fire contract terms offered should be the same or better than past experience. Contract term should not be 12 years as previously proposed, but be less than the 10 years of prior contracts – perhaps 8 years to align with an election year. The annual cost escalator should not be (up to) 6.2% as previously proposed, but in line with prior experience. Calculate the average escalation for the past 5 years – I believe about 3.3% - and propose that exact escalator. Using a higher value is too risky. I recognize that future escalation may be higher than the 3.3% (or whatever) in some years, but if so the City budget will have to accommodate. The intent is to propose that the new fire tax be the same as - nothing more than - the past years' taxes.

A second new ballot measure to restore only the reserve funds consumed in FY17/18 due to the failure of Measure D should be considered. I suggest that measure would have a short 4-year term. Restoring \$2M over 4 years means the average taxpayer pays a \$100 annual tax; \$3M means a \$150 tax. The argument for passage is that the fiscal safety provided by restoring reserves is needed and that, due to the failure of Measure D, tax payers on average avoided about \$1000 in parcel tax in FY17/18 and for a payback over 4 years of much less than \$1000, the safety provided by the reserve fund is restored.

A second ballot measure may not be considered as likely to succeed, but it won't succeed without trying. Also, does a ballot measure for a general reserve fund require only a simple majority to pass or a super majority as does a specific fire or police fund? Passage would not only restore reserves, but it would establish a higher overall total parcel tax rate providing headroom for future tax revenues that might follow in future ballots.

What might follow would be a parcel tax to fund certain defined City improvements. Recent City revenues, even with a fire parcel tax, have not been sufficient to adequately fund City improvements. If future improvements were to be defined, costs estimated and proposed, the community could be given the opportunity to fund a specific improvement project(s). I believe that if a 5 – 10 year City improvement plan were developed it would likely include a feature project(s) that the community would recognize as desirable and provide the funding to support it.

PVEPD Costs

If there exists any CC interest in a future path that would fund the PVEPD via a parcel tax I believe success would depend on bringing PVEPD costs way down to near the Fire parcel tax costs that the electorate is familiar with. The current police budget is substantially too high.

Current City budgeting practice is to cost all PVEPD activities as “police services”, but they are not. The PVEPD conducts “community services” such as PVE Cares, Disaster Preparedness, and Neighborhood Amateur Radio Team. It includes the Community Relations Office (Marcelle Herrera) that puts out weekly, if not more frequent, messages covering all City activities. It sponsors community activities like the Health Fair and supports 4th of July events. These are not

“police services” that the County Sheriff or any other non-local policing agency would expect to perform. However, the PVE community wants and supports these community services.

PVE budgeting and Police Department accounting could be changed so that community services and any non-police activity performed by the police department such as parkland or fire service assistance would be accounted to the appropriate non-police cost center. Why should Community Relations Office costs be charged to police? Why, if the Police Chief attends a monthly Disaster Preparedness meeting (it happens) should his time be “policing time”?

If a PVEPD time card system was established for daily accounting of work activities, a record would be available to separate police services from community and other services performed by the PVEPD. If such records were kept for a year then the true annual costs of PVEPD “policing services” only would be known and documented. Thereafter, it would be apparent what true PVE policing costs were and those costs should be nearer to fire service costs. (Incidentally, why do fire service costs not include brush clearance costs that are legally required for fire abatement?)

Lauren Pettit

To: Anton Dahlerbruch; Reggie Jue
Subject: RE: Comments on 10/30/2017 City Council Meeting

From: Reggie Jue [[mailto:reggie_jue@\[REDACTED\]](mailto:reggie_jue@[REDACTED])]
Sent: Monday, November 13, 2017 11:39 AM
To: Anton Dahlerbruch <adahlerbruch@pvestates.org>
Subject: Comments on 10/30/2017 City Council Meeting

At the October 30, 2017 PVE City Council meeting, staff reviewed their recommendations regarding the McCrary Report on the PVE Police Operations Study.

I wish to voice my support to an appropriate incorporation of these recommendations, specifically with the goal of preserving our PVE police force and proceeding on a revenue initiative to at least partially restore funding to help eliminate the structural deficit created by the defeat of Measure D in March of this year.

Along those lines, I'd like to make these additional comments:

- My wife and I moved to PVE, in part, because the dependence on a municipal police force differentiated this city from others on the hill, and implied a sense of community and exceptionalism that we were looking for in a new home.
- Page 64 of the McCrary Report lists police budgets for 3 comparable cities, and indicates that the spending in PVE is the largest of the 4 cities. While true, I believe that PVE residents should demand that city services in PVE, and police service in particular, be better than "just as good as" other cities. When the PVE police budget is normalized to a percentage of median household incomes, the per household PVE police budget compared to the other 3 cities in the McCrary Report is actually 30% lower than La Palma and San Marino, and less than half that of Los Alamitos.
- The McCrary Report estimates the annual cost of replacing the PVE police with Los Angeles County Sheriff (LASD) to be approximately \$5M plus start-up costs. Depending on which recommendations are accepted, the PVE police budget for 2017/18 is likely to be in the range of \$6.5M, or roughly \$300 more than the LACS would cost per household in PVE. That cost would pay for the enhanced security resulting from better familiarity and sense of community that the PVE police provides.

I urge the City Council to aggressively pursue a revenue replacement plan that would restore our city to the unique community that we all voted for by moving here.

Reggie Jue
Retired Engineer
[reggie_jue@\[REDACTED\]](mailto:reggie_jue@[REDACTED])

November 16, 2017

To Palos Verdes Estates City Council Members,

I have lived in Palos Verdes Estates for 46 years and enjoy living in a city that I consider safe as well as beautiful. Having our own police department has definitely contributed to that sense of safety. I know police response to an emergency call is approximately 2 to 3 minutes compared to the Los Angeles Sherriff's response of 7 – 9 minutes. In a disaster such as a major earthquake I know our police chief and officers will respond immediately and appropriately. Palos Verdes Estates would be far down the list of priorities for the Los Angeles Sherriff's Department in such a situation.

When the parcel tax was first approved in 1980 a citizen's committee worked diligently to educate the residents on its importance. It has been approved 4 times since then. It seems the City Council in 2017 took for granted the passage and did little to educate the residents or promote its passage.

It troubles me to hear people say the failure of the 2017 parcel tax to pass indicates a lack of support for our police department when 60% of the residents voted for it. The 2017 ballot results did not indicate failure of the residents to support our own police department. It is the 66% requirement for passage that created the problem.

I strongly urge you to place a parcel tax measure on the April 2018 ballot that specifically funds the Palos Verdes Police Department.

Following the consultant's recommendation, it is important to make the measure clear and simple and to educate the residents on the difference between it and the 2017 measure.

Barbara Hart
■ Paseo La Cresta
Palos Verdes Estates