

**Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency
Study of the Police Department**

CITY OF PACIFICA, CALIFORNIA

FINAL REPORT



201 San Antonio Circle, Suite 148
Mountain View, CA 94040
650.858.0507

May 31, 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
2 EVALUATION OF MANAGEMENT OF THE POLICE DEPARTMENT	7
3 EVALUATION OF FIELD SERVICES DIVISION	27
4 EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND INVESTIGATIVE DIVISION	78
APPENDIX A – POLICE DEPARTMENT BUDGET, STAFFING, RESPONSIBILITIES OF PERSONNEL	90
APPENDIX B – SUMMARY OF THE EMPLOYEE SURVEY	99
APPENDIX C – CURRENT 10 HOUR PATROL SCHEDULE WITH VARIOUS DEPLOYMENTS	112
APPENDIX D – SAMPLE 12 HOUR PATROL SCHEDULE	118

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In February 2013 the Matrix Consulting Group began the project to conduct an organizational effectiveness and efficiency study of the Pacifica Police Department. Introductory meetings, interviews, data collection, analysis, and review of interim deliverables occurred from February through April 2013.

The Pacifica Police Department provides a wide range of law enforcement services for approximately 37,000 residents and covering 12.6 square miles. The population of Pacifica has remained stable over the last 10 years. To provide law enforcement services in Pacifica, the Police Department is staffed with 33 sworn full time employees and six civilian employees (two are part time positions) for a total of 38 full time equivalent (FTE) positions. A Captain is assigned to manage one of the two Divisions: Field Services, and Administrative and Investigative Services.

After the initial meeting with the City Project Committee, the Matrix Consulting Group project team conducted interviews of 18 members of the Department and collected data relevant to this study to facilitate the analysis of all services provided by the Department, including patrol, investigations, records, training and technology.

Additionally, an anonymous employee survey was distributed to regular members of the Department and the project team received 27 responses, a 68% response rate which is significantly higher than typically seen in other police department studies conducted by the project team throughout the United States. The survey results served to provide a snapshot of employees' beliefs and perceptions, and also served to supplement the project teams' understanding of the Department (the summary of the survey is attached as Appendix B).

This report is divided into the following chapters:

- Executive Summary
- Evaluation of Management of the Police Department
- Evaluation of Field Services Division
- Evaluation of Administrative and Investigative Services Division

Each chapter includes information, evaluation, analysis and appropriate recommendations for the different work units of the Department. In this analysis the project team evaluated the strengths of the organization as well as the areas where improvement may be warranted. In any organization such as the Pacifica Police Department there are many opportunities for improvement and in a study such as this one, the focus is most commonly on the areas needing improvement. In this report recommendations are only made when the project team has identified an area where a change should be made to improve function, practice or efficiency – cost efficiency, process efficiency or an improvement to the current business practice. Each recommendation is listed in the appropriate section in the body of the report and also summarized in a table later in this section.

There are also areas that the project team believes Pacifica PD is performing well and deserving to be highlighted here, at the beginning of this report. One of the most important functions of any local police agency is the response to calls for service from the community. The Police Department has the largest amount of resources assigned to the Field Services Division and they are the most visible representation of the Police Department in the community, not only responding to calls for service but also conducting proactive patrol activities. The Field Services Division performed very

well in response to calls for service – the overall average response time (from time call was received by dispatch to arrival at the scene) was a very impressive 5.2 minutes to the highest priority calls for service, Priority 1; and for the “medium” priority calls (Priority 2), the PPD also performed very well with a call response time of 12.3 minutes. Additionally, Patrol personnel used available “proactive time” to initiate over 16,000 events during the year – such as traffic safety stops, foot patrols, school checks, bar checks and citizen assists. This level of Officer initiated activity is one of the highest levels (as a ratio of the number of community generated calls for service) seen by the project team in the several hundred police department studies across the United States.

Additional noteworthy efforts of the PPD include several specific community outreach efforts such as conducting various crime prevention presentations, providing public information at local events/festivals, National Night Out community events, Neighborhood Watch meetings, and partnering with the school districts to provide regular patrol and checks at the local schools.

Overall, PPD line level employees and managers alike expressed and exhibited a high level of commitment to the organization and service to the public, both in the individual interviews and in the employee survey. In any organization, the people working in the organization are the most valuable resources and their commitment and dedication to their job is the primary factor in providing high quality services to the community. The day to day dedication of all employees is a very positive factor in PPD’s overall organizational performance, and is most visible when interacting and dealing with members of the public.

The table below lists all of the recommendations and/or improvement opportunities that are made in the various chapters and sections of this report.

Recommendations
Chapter 2 – Evaluation of Department Management
The Chief of Police should continue the efforts of his officers to regularly engage the community as a partner of the Department. The only recommendation would be to document these efforts in a formal report that would be presented to the City Manager and Council as well as made public to demonstrate the positive efforts of their Police Department. Page 9
The Chief of Police should be tasked with developing a staff committee for the establishment of a formal strategic plan that includes a vision of what the PPD should be 3-5 years in the future, goals for improvement, and an action plan that defines each goal specifically, when it is to be accomplished, and who is responsible for completing the tasks. Page 9
The Chief and the command staff of the Department should be tasked with developing a crime analysis process that fits the needs of the Department, including the designation of a Department crime analyst (either as an additional duty to an existing position or new staff). Page 14
The Chief and command staff of the Department should be tasked with developing a problem-identification process that they may use to guide efforts to serve the community's needs. Page 14
The Chief should formally implement a Community Policing and Problem-Solving (COPPS) philosophy for the Department supported by policy as well as personnel training at all levels. Page 14
The Chief of Police should be tasked with developing a staff committee for reviewing all governing documents of the Police Department. The governing documents should be in the form of separate general orders, policy statements, and standard operating procedures. Page 15
The Chief and the command staff must develop a system of data collection so that the response to meeting goals and objectives can be measured. Page 16
The Chief and the command staff must develop an internal and external performance reporting system based on these goals and objectives. Page 16
The Chief should establish a working committee to assess the personnel performance evaluation system and design, develop, and implement a system that is specific to the needs of the Department. Page 17
The Chief should be tasked with improving the personnel evaluation system which should include a methodology to prepare supervisors and managers to perform their functions successfully as well as assume the responsibilities of their supervisor when needed. Page 19
Identify management training programs for executive level training of management personnel. Page 19
The Chief should implement a Discipline Decision Guide that is in accordance with the State laws and City policies. Page 20
The Chief should formalize the process that he uses to allow input from the management team so that it optimizes his foundation for making disciplinary decisions. Page 20
The Chief and his command staff should design and implement a plan that develops leadership capabilities within the Department. Page 24
The Chief and command staff should meet off site once per year for 2-day planning session that relates directly to meeting Department goals and objectives. This meeting may need to be facilitated by a third party for the first session. Page 24

Recommendations
The Chief and command staff should meet off site at least once per year with all supervisors to follow up the command staff off site meeting and develop action plans relating directly to the Department goals and objectives. Page 24
The Chief and command staff should meet at least once per month with the supervisors as a regularly scheduled meeting so that internal communications can be maintained. Page 24
Chapter 3 – Evaluation of the Field Services Division
Annually review the attrition rate and if it remains at the 8% – 10% level plan to replace approximately 3-4 Officers per year and include sufficient resources in the budget to accomplish this need. Page 37
Set a goal to maintain a five year average attrition rate of 8% or less for police employees. Page 37
Annually review the number of community generated calls for service from the CAD data to determine the trend in community generated workload. Page 43
Establish reasonable “call processing time” goals for Priority 1 and Priority 2 calls for service and meet with the South San Francisco Dispatch Center manager quarterly to review the results. Page 43
Establish a goal to respond to Priority 1 calls for service 90% of the time in under 7 minutes travel time. Page 43
Determine if the S. San Francisco Dispatch Center is able to obtain backup Officer data from the CAD system; use this information in an annual review of Officer workload. Page 44
Continue to encourage Patrol Officers and Corporals to maintain this high level of Officer initiated activity. Annually review existing Patrol plans and develop new ones as needed to address community, quality of life and crime issues in Pacifica when “proactive time” is available. Page 47
Establish a City goal, depending on the level of service desired, of targeting either a 50% or 40% average “proactive time” level for Patrol services. Use this target goal as part of the information evaluated when determining the appropriate Patrol staffing level. Page 64
Annually review patrol staff workload for each four hour time block to review workload distribution and determine if some patrol staff should be redeployed to busier hours of the day; or if resources from other work units should be redeployed to Patrol. Page 64
Adopt a process to enhance delivery of patrol services during the periods when “proactive time” is available. The Captains and Sergeants should coordinate the development of plans that identify specific tasks/projects that can be worked on or accomplished when “proactive time” is available during a shift. Page 64
Review the Patrol workload for 2013 and if the level of proactive time remains similar to 2012 (above 50%) then implement a planned reduction of two Patrol Officer positions, from 20 to 18 positions. Estimated annual salary/benefits savings of \$271,920. Page 70
Continue to staff Patrol with five Sergeants, or increase the staffing level to six Sergeants to reduce overtime and minimize the need to redeploy staff. Page 72

Chapter 4 – Evaluation of the Administrative and Investigative Services Division
The PPD should establish a performance measure for the Investigative Division of a specified percentage higher than the national clearance rate for violent crimes and for property crimes (e.g. if the national clearance rate is 20% then the goal would be a 24% clearance rate). Page 81
Reduce the staffing level in Investigations to three – a Sergeant, Corporal and Detective. Estimated annual salary/benefits savings of \$135,960. Page 85
Provide part time clerical support to the Detective Unit. Estimated annual salary/benefits cost of \$50,137. Page 85
Formalize quarterly and annual Property Room audits in policy and complete written documentation of each audit conducted. Page 88

A more detailed explanation for each recommendation can be found in the body of the report.

2. MANAGEMENT OF THE POLICE DEPARTMENT

The Police Department is organized into two Divisions, each managed by a Police Captain – Field Services Division and Investigations and Administrative Services Division. This chapter focuses on the issues associated with current management approaches in the Pacifica Police Department. In reviewing the management function of the Department, the project team focused on six aspects of current internal management:

- Department goals and definition of service to the community.
- Problem identification and determining community needs.
- Policies and Procedures.
- Internal and external reporting of performance.
- Personnel management – evaluations, training, career development and succession planning, and discipline.
- Leadership, teamwork, and organizational culture.

The management assessment begins with the goals of the Department to define the service to the community.

1. ANALYSIS OF DEPARTMENT GOALS AND DEFINITION OF SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY.

This section examines the PPD's approach to engaging the community in its planning process so that a partnership between the department and the community it serves is defined. With this process in mind, the Department should establish a strategic planning process that will be used to guide it through the completion of goals and actions that will formalize any change process in which the organization is involved.

(1) The Department's Process to Engage the Community is Appropriate.

The PPD's stated obligation to the community may be found on their webpage:

"It is the mission of the men and women of the Pacifica Police Department to protect and serve the members of our community with the highest level of commitment, ethics and professionalism." (Pacifica Police Department Mission Statement)

*"The Pacifica Police Department is committed to serving all citizens with the highest standards of ethics, professionalism, respect and fairness. We are committed to the safeguarding of constitutional guarantees; the preservation of peace, order and safety by fair and practical enforcement of laws and ordinances; and the prevention of crime through a proactive and collaborative effort with the community. Our goals are to solve problems in the community by encouraging a mutually beneficial relationship, to provide the highest level of professional service to all and to maintain our **tradition of community service**. We recognize our authority is derived from the people we serve." (Statement on Website)*

The project team interviewed the management team regarding the process by which the needs and desires of the community are assessed. The Department engages citizens through normal patrol activities, including additional foot patrols, bar checks, and neighborhood checks following specific crimes. Additionally, officers participate in fairs and other community events. The Department also conducts 'contact audits' by having sergeants contact citizens who have been involved in calls for service. The Sergeants on every shift audit at least two calls per month per Officer. This amounts to 350 to 400 audit calls per year. The satisfaction rate by citizens has been approximately 90%.

The Chief supports his officers' attempts to be approachable by citizens at any time. First-line supervisors oversee all of these activities. The Department also has a fairly comprehensive interactive website open to the public. The appearance is that the Department has a transparent approach to providing information to its citizens.

The above website statement relating to community service is a valid description of what the Department should be doing. It appears that the Department does embrace the community in a partnership without special interest or political influence.

Recommendation: The Chief of Police should continue the efforts of his officers to regularly engage the community as a partner of the Department. The only recommendation would be to document these efforts in a formal report that would be presented to the City Manager and Council as well as made public to demonstrate the positive efforts of their Police Department.

(2) The Department Has No Long Term Goals or Strategic Planning Process.

The project team found during its interviews with the management team that there are no formal departmental goals, nor is there a strategic planning process. The City Manager and City Council set goals and expectations from their perspectives each year, however, there are no goals set by the Chief or command staff of the Department. This process of external goal setting places the Department in a position of instability as it tries to satisfy these entities. While it is important for the Chief to work with the City Manager and Council regarding expectations, it is imperative that the Department determines how it best serves all stakeholders. This may be accomplished by establishing a strategic plan that incorporates input from the manager, council, community and employees of the Department.

Recommendation: The Chief of Police should be tasked with developing a staff committee for the establishment of a formal strategic plan that includes a vision of what the PPD should be 3-5 years in the future, goals for improvement, and an action plan that defines each goal specifically, when it is to be accomplished, and who is responsible for completing the tasks.

2. PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION AND DETERMINING COMMUNITY NEEDS.

This section examines the processes that the Department employs to identify problems that exist in the community, determine the priority of those problems, establish a plan of action to address the problems, and assess the outcome of that plan.

(1) The Department Does Not Have a Clear Method of Identifying Community Issues / Problems.

The confidential survey of employees indicates that there is a strong feeling that the Department meets the service needs of the community (100%). Interviews with managers indicate that community policing is an important aspect of the service level in Pacifica. Currently, the Department uses an informal approach to identifying community issues and problems rather than a structured approach – which includes documentation and performance evaluation of the issues identified. The project team interviewed the management team and found that the procedures of the PPD that relate to identifying community problems basically involved the following:

- Review of crime and incident reports.
- Special enforcement log that defines areas needing attention.
- Identification of individual issues as they occur.
- Information received from citizens at special events and meetings.

In the employee survey, Department members indicated they are split over the question of crime analysis – 44% think it is working and 41% do not agree. This is interesting as there is no formal crime analysis function within the Department. Information is shared at briefings attended by patrol officers, supervisors, and detectives. Officers choose the beat they will be assigned at briefing, which is based on seniority. Problem-solving efforts are unstructured but tend to follow the process of

identification of the problem, assignment of resources, and determination of the cause(s).

When asked about the philosophy of policing, the Chief focused on officers making themselves accessible to citizens through foot patrols and citizen contacts. Additionally, the employee survey indicates a belief that community policing is a high priority for the Department (89%). Some regular PPD tasks do relate to generic “community policing” by addressing quality of life issues (e.g. beat Officers spending time at schools, dog park issues, coordinating with Public Works on traffic issues, etc.) but they were not described as having been formally adopted through training processes in the Department.

The identification of community problems is a central responsibility for the Department. This should minimally include:

- A crime analysis function (part or full time).
- Community engagement with beat officers.
- A community policing and problem-solving philosophy.

An informal system, such as that described in interviews, which does not include a true crime analysis component, does not meet the requirements for conducting problem-solving methods in policing. Crime analysis relies on input from crime reports, case management, field interrogations, officer and detective intelligence, and community members as well as other sources that happen to be available. This information must be collected, analyzed, interpreted and distributed to be effective. The interaction between the analyst and the beat officer is of paramount importance to problem-solving efforts.

Crime analysis is a key component of problem identification. The optimal situation is to have a full-time crime analyst, but this means adding personnel to the department staff. It is possible to train officers or detectives in crime analysis and have them share the responsibility as collateral duties if it is unrealistic to fund a crime analyst position. The Department should designate an official crime analyst for the Department.

This position would focus on the following:

- Developing full knowledge of available computer systems to facilitate an understanding of the data that provide useful information.
- Creating a set of reports that are provided throughout the Department on a daily, weekly and monthly basis summarizing the occurrence of crime, accidents, reports, etc.
- Learning the skills necessary to identify trends and analyze linkages between people and events.
- Be able to respond to requests for information generated both inside and outside the Department.

Community engagement with patrol officers is the second component of the problem-solving method of policing. This can be accomplished by assigning officers to specific areas as permanent or long-term assignments. The officers get to know their beats and the members of the community through constant interaction. If this is coupled with a formal process whereby the officers profile their areas of responsibility through a beat analysis procedure, the result is a well-informed cadre of patrol personnel who collect data from the community regularly.

Once the data is collected by various means, officers may use a problem identification process to develop a plan of action. One of the more common methods of problem identification is known as the SARA method (scan, analyze, respond, assess). This method is easy to train and implement.

Community policing is a philosophy of policing that may easily be combined with a problem-solving approach. This is referred to as Community Oriented Policing and Problem-Solving (COPPS). Community policing reflects collaboration between the police and the community in which problems are identified and solved. The Chief has stated that the Department is committed to a community policing philosophy and that the focus placed on it by managers and supervisors has provided a good focus for the organization and very importantly, agreement with the community policing philosophy by line in their daily operations. The Department should begin to aggressively attempt to identify community issues or problems in a structured manner as this is one of the core principles of the COPPS program.

For any effective community policing approach, two components must be in place.

- Community partnership is one of two core components of community policing. This may be accomplished through officer-citizen interaction through neighborhood contact teams, town-hall meetings, and daily contacts by police officers with the public. It is also imperative that supervisors, managers, and the Chief engage in these contact activities. Community partnership allows members of the community to be engaged and have some influence over which problems are dealt with by the police and which resources are utilized.
- The second component is problem-solving. This process has been described in the preceding paragraphs.

PPD embraces this process and documenting it as Department policy will formalize it as an operational philosophy for the PD. These additional efforts will facilitate Department wide implementation and maintenance of crime analysis (resulting in “intelligence led” policing) and community policing in Pacifica.

Recommendations:

The Chief and the command staff of the Department should be tasked with developing a crime analysis process that fits the needs of the Department, including the designation of a Department crime analyst (either as an additional duty to an existing position or new staff).

The Chief and command staff of the Department should be tasked with developing a problem-identification process that they may use to guide efforts to serve the community's needs.

The Chief should formally implement a Community Policing and Problem-Solving (COPPS) policy for the Department supported by training of personnel at all levels.

3. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.

This section examines the processes that the Department employs to review, revise, develop, distribute and review policies and procedures that provide essential uniform guidelines for day-to-day Department operations.

(1) Current Policies and Procedures Have Been Updated.

The project team reviewed the current key policies and procedures of the PPD that establish department policy and provide uniform guidelines for day-to-day operations. The points that follow, describe the team's findings from that review:

- The Department Policy Manual has been continually updated since 1996, the latest of which was updated in 2012.
- The Department Manual in place at this time appears to be comprehensive; however the contents of the manual are not structured by category.
- High-risk topics that are covered in the Department Manual include Sexual Harassment, Officer-Involved Shootings, Vehicle Pursuits, Discipline and Internal Affairs.
- A High-risk topic that is not included in the Department Manual is Racial Profiling/Biased Policing; however it is covered in the Rules and Regulations, the Field Training Program, and in-service training given to officers as required by law.

- The Department is moving toward adopting Lexipol policy and procedures methods.

Because the present manual is being phased out in favor of a new process (Lexipol), the assessment in this report is necessarily restricted.

Recommendation: The Chief of Police should be tasked with developing a staff committee for reviewing all governing documents of the Police Department. The governing documents should be in the form of separate general orders, policy statements, and standard operating procedures.

4. INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL REPORTING OF PERFORMANCE.

Presently, internal reporting of performance is conducted through the use of the Uniformed Crime Reports (UCR), crime statistics, and monthly audits of calls handled by patrol officers. Employees do not believe that proper performance measures are being used as only 52% agree with the present methods.

The Chief meets with the City Manager and other Department heads once each week for the Executive Team meeting and also meets with the City Manager individually every two weeks to discuss departmental issues as well as on an as-needed basis.

(1) There Are No Formal Established Internal or External Performance Objectives Used to Provide Departmental Performance Reports.

No formal performance reports exist that are metric-based and relate directly to Department goals and objectives.

- Weekly staff meetings are held within the department (open to all in the organization) and meeting so these meetings are posted.
- The Department does not set specific internal or external service delivery goals or objectives.
- Again, the Department does not formally set long or short term objectives by Division, Unit, or individual. With no expressed work product outcome through the goal and objective setting process the Department has no accountability mechanisms in place.

- Key meetings need to be used to produce accountability and to optimize departmental performance.

Recommendations:

The Chief and the command staff must develop a system of data collection so that the response to meeting goals and objectives can be measured.

The Chief and the command staff must develop an internal and external performance reporting system based on these goals and objectives.

5. PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT – EVALUATIONS, TRAINING, CAREER DEVELOPMENT AND SUCCESSION PLANNING, AND DISCIPLINE.

The project team reviewed personnel management procedures used by the Department. In reviewing these systems the project team focused specifically on four aspects of personnel management.

- Performance evaluations of officers, supervisors, and managers.
- Training of management personnel, including the Chief of Police.
- Career development and succession planning for management personnel.
- Disciplinary measures.

The next several sections evaluate the personnel management systems in the Department.

(1) Performance Evaluations Should Be Redesigned to More Adequately Reflect the Roles of Those Employees Being Evaluated.

The primary performance evaluation form is used for patrol officers, corporals, and sergeants. As such, they do not adequately reflect the roles of officers and supervisors. The evaluation process is not simply a means of describing employee behavior and skills in performing the job, but also may be used to identify and highlight training needs, provide a platform for employee improvement, establish career development paths, and act as a barometer for potential problem behaviors. This

cannot occur, however, unless the evaluation instrument actually demonstrates the specific responsibilities and role of the employee being evaluated. The evaluation instruments used by the Department do not qualify as such.

- The performance evaluation for police officer, corporal, and sergeant cover the four categories of Quality of Work, Dependability, Personal Relations, and Attendance and Promptness. A fifth category relates to field training officers.
- Because the performance evaluation for supervisors is the same as for police officers, its effectiveness as a personnel tool is diminished.
- The officer, corporal, sergeant evaluation form includes rating levels that are undefined. They include Unacceptable, Below Standard, Standard, Above Standard, Outstanding, Not Applicable, and Not Observed. While some of these may seem self-explanatory, the difference between Unacceptable and Below Standard may be confusing for the rater and the recipient. A rubric for each should be established to avoid this potential confusion that might lead to an unfair evaluation.
- The performance evaluation for managers is completely different from the officer and supervisor evaluations. This form is a City of Pacifica general evaluation tool used for various positions within the City. Its use as a management and executive performance evaluation for the police department is questionable if the goals are not clearly articulated, particularly at the Captain's level. The form includes a full narrative format. While the form allows for any topic to be discussed, it may not focus on important aspects of the Department's goals and objectives.
 - There is the lack of any mention of leadership, community policing, or problem-solving.
 - The instrument has no reference to law enforcement management.

Evaluation forms are an important feedback mechanism for all employees and should provide the format for current assessment of performance and future needs which are one part of the career development for employees.

Recommendation: The Chief should establish a working committee to assess the personnel performance evaluation system and design, develop, and implement a system that is specific to the needs of the Department.

(2) Training of Management Personnel, including the Chief of Police, is Adequate.

The Chief and command staff are well educated. The Chief has a bachelor's degree and his captains have master's degrees. Beyond formal education, none of the command staff have attended the F.B.I. National Academy, however, the Chief is a graduate of the California POST Command College; both Captains, and some Sergeants, have attended the California POST Supervisory Leadership Institute, which focuses on leadership, decision making and supervision topics. Additional leadership training programs should be evaluated for attendance by Captains.

(3) Career Development and Succession Planning.

Career development and succession planning are generally informal processes in the Department. This is a continuation of the preceding sections on performance evaluations and training of management personnel. This section is separated for the express purpose of highlighting the importance of career development and succession planning. Supervisors and managers must be able to step into the next higher level of the organization in the event a vacuum occurs. This will maintain stability and consistency in times of chaos.

There is a mentoring program in the PD where mentors are identified and provided two days of a POST approved mentoring course. This is the "One Step Up" program in the PD that allows an Officer or Corporal to "shadow" a Sergeant for a week to experience the duties and responsibilities of higher positions on a temporary basis. This allows personnel to gain experience in a setting that promotes discussion of organizational roles and career development. This program should continue to be used in the Department.

The Department should take several other steps to support career development and succession planning:

- A proper evaluation system should be put in place.
- Appropriate manager and supervisor training programs must be maintained.
- An effective communications system that allows supervisors and managers to understand and be part of important decision-making process should exist.

Recommendations:

The Chief should be tasked with improving the personnel evaluation system which should include a methodology to prepare supervisors and managers to perform their functions successfully as well as assume the responsibilities of their supervisor when needed.

Identify management training programs for executive level training of management personnel.

(4) Discipline Guidelines and Decisions Are Unstructured.

The discipline system in the Department Manual defines wrong-doing and the possible outcomes (e.g., suspension, demotion, termination, etc.).

Discipline is handled at the Chief's level, but often with input from his command staff. The captains and the Chief may 'roundtable' the discussion, but the Chief will make the final decision. There are no specific guidelines that describe how discipline may be applied to incidents by category.

This open-ended approach to decisions regarding discipline can lead to unequal discipline being administered and the perception of bias in the process. The survey indicates that 64% of the employees agree that discipline is fair and consistent. This perception by employees is good but it can be improved. The most effective means of handling this issue is two-fold, a "Disciplinary Decision Guide" and proper communications between the Chief and his command staff.

A “Disciplinary Decision Guide” would assist by being a point of reference in determining discipline. This will avoid the problem of unequal levels of discipline for similar acts of misconduct, which adversely affects employee morale and fosters a sense of favoritism. The following table displays a very brief example of what a “Disciplinary Decision Guide” might look like.

Policy Number	Conduct	1st Offense	2nd Offense	3rd Offense	4th + Offense
#	Alcohol related incidents not related to DUI	Minor - Written Reprimand	Major	Major – Terminate	Terminate
#	Neighborhood Disputes / Personal	Minor	Major	Major – Terminate	Terminate
#	False Information in Reports	Terminate			
#	Truthfulness in an internal investigations	Terminate			

The development and adoption of this guide would help to mitigate future issues regarding the administration of discipline and reinforce a sense of fairness in the decision process.

Recommendations:

The Chief should implement a Discipline Decision Guide that is in accordance with the State laws and City policies.

The Chief should formalize the process that he uses to allow input from the management team so that it optimizes his foundation for making disciplinary decisions.

6. LEADERSHIP, TEAMWORK, AND ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE.

The Department is experiencing a feeling of uncertainty that is resulting from the possible outsourcing of law enforcement services to outside entities. This is having a negative effect on morale and willingness to plan for the future. This is the time for very strong and directed leadership and team-building.

(1) Leadership Practices In The Department Appear Random.

The employee survey demonstrates a problem with a clear vision and direction for the future. Less than half (48%) of the employees agree that the vision and direction are clear. However, all of the management interviewees believe that leadership exists within the department. From the interviews conducted by the project team and evaluation of policy, one cannot make a definitive evaluation of the quality and quantity of leadership practices in the organization, as a significant component of leadership is personal interaction with employees over a protracted period of time and how routine decisions are made in the Department. However an important factor that guides the leadership practices is that the leaders themselves have a clear definition of leadership, its principles and how it has been implemented in the Police Department. The Chief does not support micromanagement by his commanders and encourages the delegation of authority. He supports the mentoring of future leaders and a plan for succession that is represented in collateral duties and participation in the budget process.

The Chief has maintained his office in a widely visible office accessible to any member of the department. He has done this so that employees may stop by, unannounced, and visit with him. He believes this has increased communications with the other members of the Department. Both of the captains mentioned this in a positive manner during their interviews. The Chief described PPD as having a “family” feel in that the organization is small and everyone knows each other, this was also mentioned by one of the Captains. The project team understands what message the Chief is trying to convey and while a family atmosphere is positive aspect of small organizations, the primary role is that of a publically funded law enforcement organization. While a family

feel is positive for image and random communications, this can also present some challenges. The open office may lead to members of the Department bringing problems and issues directly to the Chief that should be handled by supervision or mid-management. If this happens the authority of those ranks is diminished and clear decision-making may be replaced with reactive or 'hallway' decisions. A second concern is that the open office may prevent some employees from talking to the Chief because they do not want to do so in such a public arena. This would prevent the Chief from helping some employees and from receiving necessary information about issues within the Department. It is important in small organizations to ensure that the positive aspects of a small organization are realized while ensuring that potential negatives do not occur; the Chief is aware of these issues and address them appropriately. Benchmark leadership practices for all law enforcement organizations include clear lines for employee accountability, as well as establishing goals/objectives, and developing metrics for measuring and determining the effectiveness of the organization in providing police services to the community.

Given the community policing philosophy that the Department is supposed to be operating under, a functional definition of leadership may be: "The ability to influence others to solve their own problems in a moral manner." This definition of leadership is consistent with community policing and problem-solving activities. This is only an example, but it is accepted that leadership does not equate with command. Anyone can be a leader. The Department needs leadership at all levels as the community looks to the police for leadership. While the Chief may be the visible face of the Department, leadership is something that should prevail at all levels of the organization.

(2) There Is No Formal Departmental Process For Team Building.

An organization that has leadership works as a team. Teamwork can occur when meetings are held regularly and have specific objectives to meet. In this way, the group can coalesce into a team as they work together to obtain desired results. Meetings do take place in the Department and people do work together. Regular meetings that the Chief has with Department members and the City include:

- Staff meeting with the managers every week that is open to Department members; with posted minutes.
- City department meeting every week.
- Meetings with the City Manager every two weeks.

As they are designed, none of these meetings have much of a chance of inspiring teamwork. These meetings may be needed to share information or to engage in problem-solving at a superficial level. What is needed is a planned effort for members of the Department to come together for the specific purpose of solving long-range problems and reaching Departmental goals and objectives, in addition to the meetings the Chief presently requires.

(3) Organizational Culture of the Police Department.

A healthy organization is one that fosters innovation, looks to the future, self-assesses, and solves problems among other things. The Pacifica Police Department may be moving away from these positive characteristics – the source of this change has been identified by most members of the Department as the impending decision on outsourcing. It is very important for the Department to ensure that these positive characteristics continue to be practiced during difficult times such as this issue. The idea of an outside agency taking over the duties of the Department is repugnant to most

employees. They see outsourcing as an insult to their abilities to serve the community with an outcome of less effective policing if adopted.

During interviews, it became immediately apparent that the Department was trying to provide adequate services to the community, but was moving into a holding pattern until a decision on outsourcing could be made. Interviewees mentioned that people were leaving and others were beginning to look for other employment. They noted that the department was much smaller than five years ago (33 officers compared to 42).

While the apprehension regarding outsourcing is a significant morale factor, it should not be an excuse for a lack of organizational progress. As mentioned above, this is the time for leadership. Outsourcing appears to be a de-motivator, but identifiable and direct leadership is needed to keep the Department moving forward during these difficult times.

Recommendations:

The Chief and his command staff should design and implement a plan that develops leadership capabilities within the Department.

The Chief and command staff should meet off site once per year for 2-day planning session that relates directly to meeting Department goals and objectives. This meeting may need to be facilitated by a third party for the first session.

The Chief and command staff should meet off site at least once per year with all supervisors to follow up the command staff off site meeting and develop action plans relating directly to the Department goals and objectives.

The Chief and command staff should meet at least once per month with the supervisors so that internal communications can be maintained.

The table on the following pages outlines the steps outlined in this section regarding the suggested steps to take in managing the Department.

MANAGEMENT RESOLUTION IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Management Issue	Action Items	Priority	Responsibility	Due Date
Analysis of Department Goals and Definition of Service to the Community				
A formal report to the City Manager, City Council and the public documenting the efforts of the Department to engage the community does not exist.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a formal report that is distributed to the City Manager, City Council and public. 	L	Chief and command staff	
The Department has no Long Term Goals or Strategic Planning Process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a staff committee to establish a formal strategic plan that includes a vision, goals, and objectives 	H	Chief	
Problem Identification and Determining Community Needs				
The Department has no Clear Method of Identifying Community Problems.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a crime analysis process Develop a community problem identification process Implement a COPPS philosophy for the Department 	M M M	Chief and command staff Chief and command staff Chief	
Policies and Procedures				
Current policies and procedures should be in the form of general orders, policy statements, and standard operating procedures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a staff committee for reviewing all governing documents and overseeing the adoption of Lexipol 	M	Chief	
Internal and External Reporting of Performance				
There are no formal established internal or external performance objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a system of data collection regarding meeting goals and objectives 	M	Chief and command staff	
There is no formal system to report internal and external performance reports.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop an internal and external performance reporting system 	M	Chief and command staff	
Personnel Management – Evaluations, Training, Career Development and Succession Planning, and Discipline				
Performance evaluations do not reflect roles of those employees being evaluated.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a working committee to assess the personnel performance evaluation system 	M	Chief	

CITY OF PACIFICA, CALIFORNIA
Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency Study of the Police Department

Management Issue	Action Items	Priority	Responsibility	Due Date
Career development and succession planning has not been formalized.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a system for career development and succession planning 	L	Chief and command staff	
Discipline decisions should be more structured and adhere to a standard process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement a Discipline Decision Guide Adhere to a formal discipline process that allows input from the management team as a standard procedure. 	H M	Chief and command staff Chief	
Leadership, Teamwork, and Organizational Culture				
The Department appears to approach leadership as a random process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement and develop a plan that develops leadership capabilities within the Department 	H		
The Department does not have a teambuilding process for planning the future, identification of issues, and overall assessment of the organization.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement yearly off site management planning sessions 	H	Chief	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement yearly off site supervisor/management planning sessions 	H	Chief	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain strict schedule of monthly meetings between supervisors and management team. 	H	Chief	

3. EVALUATION OF THE FIELD SERVICES DIVISION

This chapter provides information about the Division, including the current staffing levels, a detailed analysis of workload and the staffing needed to respond to calls for service and provide “proactive” patrol services to the community. The information was developed through interviews of PPD management and personnel, review of documents, call for service data and other data provided to the project team.

1. PATROL SHIFT OPERATIONS STAFFING AND WORKLOAD.

The following information was obtained through interviews with PPD personnel, electronic data from the CAD (Computer Aided Dispatch) and RMS (Records Management System) as well as any relevant documents associated with patrol (i.e., statistical reports, training records, leave time records, etc.).

The project team collected information regarding the PPD workload activities relating to field patrol personnel (i.e., regular Patrol Officers, field corporals and Sergeants). Specifically, this involved the raw data set that captured all dispatch communication activity for the Pacifica Police Department in calendar year (CY) 2012 and included the following types of information:

- Call or Event Number
- Date and Time Call was Received
- Location of Call
- Type of Call
- Priority of Call
- Time of Unit(s) Dispatch
- Time of Unit(s) In-route

- Time of Unit(s) On-Scene Arrival
- Time of Unit(s) Clearance
- Beat Unit Identifiers (e.g., unit numbers) for responding unit
- Incident Disposition (e.g., report taken, arrest, citation, etc.)

This information serves as the context for analyzing patrol's staffing needs and estimating workload activity, including the identification of community-generated calls for service, as well as Officer initiated activity. This summary description of PPD patrol services is organized as follows:

- Patrol unit scheduled deployment
- Patrol officer availability
- Total calls for service
- Calls for service by priority
- Calls for service response and handling time
- Calls for service dispositions
- Officer initiated activity and handling time

The first section provides the current patrol unit deployment, showing by time of day the number of patrol units scheduled.

(1) Pacifica Police Department Patrol Schedule and Officer Availability.

Patrol Sergeants, Corporals and Officers in the Pacifica Police Department typically work ten hour shifts, four work days followed by three days off. Currently, due to one Sergeant being off on long term disability leave, the remaining four Sergeants are working 12 hour shifts to provide supervisory coverage on each shift. As of February 2013 there are 20 authorized positions on Patrol: 5 Sergeants, 5 Corporals

and 15 Officers. Personnel are assigned to three shifts to provide 24/7 coverage. Patrol Corporals and Officers work the following schedule and probable staffing level, when fully staffed:

- Watch A hours are 0700-1700 – 2 Sergeants, 2 Corporals, 4 Officers
- Watch B hours are 1600-0200 – 2 Sergeants, 1 Corporal, 7 Officers
- Watch C hours are 2200-0800 – 1 Sergeants, 2 Corporals, 4 Officers

The shifts have a one hour overlap to allow for a 15-30 minute briefing for the on-coming shift.

The Department does not use a “team concept” (where Patrol personnel work with the same people on their shift every day) as there are six Patrol Teams required to provide 24/7 coverage and there are only five Sergeants authorized for Patrol. However, Sergeants, Corporals and Officers do work their same shifts each week so will work with the same people during some of their shifts each week.

The Sergeants are currently working 12 hour shifts to provide coverage without the use of significant overtime. Their current hours are 0700-1900 or 1900-0700 on a rotating shift schedule: 4 days on, 3 days off followed by 3 days on, 4 days off (this results in a required 4 hours of overtime every other week).

The table below lists the authorized number of sworn staff assigned to patrol services to show a graphical depiction of patrol officer staffing over an average 24 hour day using the current work schedule. A Sergeant is also deployed on every shift for supervision and overall management of patrol services; typically Sergeants are not included in Patrol staffing calculations due to their primary role as supervisors and also the significant amount of time required during the shift for administrative tasks.

Corporals act as shift supervisors in the absence of a Sergeant. Patrol Sergeants in Pacifica also respond to calls for service and often will handle calls for service as the primary unit, which is common in smaller police agencies. The table below shows the combined staffing level for 25 personnel - 15 Officers, 5 Corporals and 5 Sergeants assigned to Patrol.

25 Authorized Patrol Staffing

Hour	A Shift 0700-1700	B Shift 1600-0200	C Shift 2200-0800	Average Shift Staffing
0000		5.7	4.0	9.7
0100		5.7	4.0	9.7
0200			4.0	4.0
0300			4.0	4.0
0400			4.0	4.0
0500			4.0	4.0
0600			4.0	4.0
0700	4.6		4.0	8.6
0800	4.6			4.6
0900	4.6			4.6
1000	4.6			4.6
1100	4.6			4.6
1200	4.6			4.6
1300	4.6			4.6
1400	4.6			4.6
1500	4.6			4.6
1600	4.6	5.7		10.3
1700		5.7		5.7
1800		5.7		5.7
1900		5.7		5.7
2000		5.7		5.7
2100		5.7		5.7
2200		5.6	4.0	9.6
2300		5.6	4.0	9.6

The above table depicts the authorized number of all Patrol staff when all personnel assigned to the shift actually work their shift. This equals an average of 5.9 staff on duty per hour and a total of approximately 142 hours per day of patrol staffing.

The table below shows the staffing level for the 23 personnel - 13 Officers, 5 Corporals and 5 Sergeants assigned to Patrol. Both A and C Shifts are staffed with six Officers/Corporals and B Shift is staffed with 8.

23 Authorized Patrol Staffing

Hour	A Shift 0700-1700	B Shift 1600-0200	C Shift 2200-0800	Average Shift Staffing
0000		4.6	4.0	8.6
0100		4.6	4.0	8.6
0200			4.0	4.0
0300			4.0	4.0
0400			4.0	4.0
0500			4.0	4.0
0600			4.0	4.0
0700	4.6		4.0	8.6
0800	4.6			4.6
0900	4.6			4.6
1000	4.6			4.6
1100	4.6			4.6
1200	4.6			4.6
1300	4.6			4.6
1400	4.6			4.6
1500	4.6			4.6
1600	4.6	4.6		9.1
1700		4.6		4.6
1800		4.6		4.6
1900		4.6		4.6
2000		4.6		4.6
2100		4.6		4.6
2200		4.5	4.0	8.5
2300		4.5	4.0	8.5

The above table depicts the authorized number of the call for service handlers – Officers and Corporals, when all personnel assigned to the shift actually work their shift. This equals an average of 5.5 staff on duty per hour and a total of approximately 131 hours per day of patrol staffing. The above average staffing numbers were obtained from a sample 10 hour patrol shift deployment schedule for Officers and Corporals on each of the three shifts, refer to Appendix C for the schedule details.

There is not a specific minimum staffing level on patrol but a supervisor will call in someone to work overtime when the staffing level falls below two Officers and Corporals.

(2) Leave Hours for Patrol Division Staff and Patrol's Actual Staffing Level.

An employee is scheduled to work 2080 hours in a year (208 ten hour shifts). The total number of hours actually worked on their patrol shift is reduced by leave hours used, in-service training and other assigned tasks. The project team used personnel leave data obtained from the PD to determine the number of leave hours for patrol personnel for calendar year 2012. Officers who had not completed their first full year of service were excluded from the calculations due to the significant training that occurs during the first year of employment.

Officers also perform a variety of administrative tasks during their work shifts – such as shift briefing, meal breaks, meetings during the shift, etc. The project team used an average of 60 minutes per shift for the actual number of work shifts they worked after deducting leave hours and training hours. Officers also work “backfill overtime” to replace other officers to fill in for officers who are off sick, on vacation, etc. – in 2012 this amounted to an average of 238 hours per Patrol assigned employee.

The following table summarizes the estimated availability of police officer after deducting leave hours, training hours and also showing an estimate of the hours spent administrative tasks during their shift.

Officers/Corporals - Leave and Training Hours for 2012	Work Hours and Percentages
Total Paid Annual Work Hours	2,080
Average Leave Usage	306
Average Training Hours (on duty)	20
Total Unavailable Hours	326
Net Work Hours	1,754
% Annual Availability	84.3%
Add Average Hours of Backfill OT / Officer	238
Net Work Hours with OT	1,992
% Annual Availability	95.8%
Administrative Time (90 Min. x 175 Shifts)	299
Net Available Work Hours	1,693
% Annual Availability	81.4%

The following points summarize the data above:

- Patrol Officers and Corporals averaged 306 hours of leave usage annually for 2012. This includes time off for vacation, injury, sick, compensatory time off, FMLA leaves, bereavement, etc.

The leave hours for Pacifica staff are slightly above the 250 – 300 hour range the project team typically sees for police departments across the United States.

- An estimated average of 20 training hours “on duty” as part of their 2080 straight time hours – either as part of their regular work schedule or adjusted straight time schedule. The exact number of on duty training hours is not known as it is not specifically tracked.
- This equates to a total of 1,754 hours, or approximately 84% of the time that a patrol officer is present at work and working a patrol shift.
- “Backfill OT” on Patrol is necessary to replace Officers who are on leave or not working their shift. This OT in 2012 equaled an average of 238 hours per Patrol assigned employee; these hours were added as additional work hours as one component to determine the actual staffing level.
- During the work shift Officers attend briefing, take meal breaks, appear in court, re-fuel and check their vehicle, and perform a variety of other tasks. This is defined as “administrative time” and takes an estimated 90 minutes per shift. Note that a Patrol Officer is almost always available to respond to urgent or emergency calls when performing administrative tasks.

In summary, a Pacifica Patrol Officer is available at work for approximately 1,754 hours per year but after adding in backfill overtime hours it equals approximately 1,992 hours annually. The actual time spent providing patrol services, after deducting the time required for administrative tasks totals approximately 1,693 hours annually.

The table below shows the leave usage information for Sergeants.

Sergeants - Leave and Training Hours for 2012	Work Hours and Percentages
Total Paid Annual Work Hours	2,080
Average Leave Usage	270
Average Training Hours (on duty)	20
Total Unavailable Hours	290
Net Work Hours	1,790
% Annual Availability	86.1%
Add average 2012 Hours of Backfill OT / Sergeant	238
Net Work Hours with OT	2,028
% Annual Availability	97.5%
Administrative Time (6 hours x 175 Shifts)	1,217
Net Available Work Hours	811
% Annual Availability	39.0%

As a group, Sergeants used an average of 36 less hours of leave in 2012. Because of their routine administrative and supervisory tasks, an average of six hours per shift was used to show an approximate availability during a “normal” shift. It is important to note that in smaller police agencies like Pacifica a Patrol Sergeant’s time spent on administrative functions varies significantly and it often takes the majority of their time, unless the activity on the shift requires their presence in the field.

The following table shows the actual number of Officers, Corporals and Sergeants that worked a shift on patrol during 2012. The actual staffing level is always lower than the authorized level due to officers off on leave, on a training assignment or other reasons but is supplemented by officers working overtime. The overall net

availability (a filled position on Patrol) of Officers/Corporals in Pacifica is 95.8% and for Sergeants it is 97.5%.

25 Patrol Personnel (Actual Staffing) – Officers, Corporals, Sergeants

Hour	A Shift 0700-1700	B Shift 1600-0200	C Shift 2200-0800	Average Shift Staffing
0000		5.5	3.8	9.3
0100		5.5	3.8	9.3
0200			3.8	3.8
0300			3.8	3.8
0400			3.8	3.8
0500			3.8	3.8
0600			3.8	3.8
0700	4.4		3.8	8.2
0800	4.4			4.4
0900	4.4			4.4
1000	4.4			4.4
1100	4.4			4.4
1200	4.4			4.4
1300	4.4			4.4
1400	4.4			4.4
1500	4.4			4.4
1600	4.4	5.5		9.9
1700		5.5		5.5
1800		5.5		5.5
1900		5.5		5.5
2000		5.5		5.5
2100		5.5		5.5
2200		5.1	3.8	9.0
2300		5.1	3.8	9.0

The above table depicts the total number of all Patrol personnel that actually worked an assigned shift in 2012 – this level equals an average of 5.7 personnel on duty each hour and a total of approximately 136 hours per day of patrol staffing.

The following table shows the actual number of Officers and Corporals that worked a shift on patrol during 2012.

20 Patrol Personnel (Actual Staffing) – Only Officers and Corporals

Hour	A Shift 0700-1700	B Shift 1600-0200	C Shift 2200-0800	Average Shift Staffing
0000		4.4	3.3	7.7
0100		4.4	3.3	7.7
0200			3.3	3.3
0300			3.3	3.3
0400			3.3	3.3
0500			3.3	3.3
0600			3.3	3.3
0700	3.3		3.3	6.6
0800	3.3			3.3
0900	3.3			3.3
1000	3.3			3.3
1100	3.3			3.3
1200	3.3			3.3
1300	3.3			3.3
1400	3.3			3.3
1500	3.3			3.3
1600	3.3	4.4		7.7
1700		4.4		4.4
1800		4.4		4.4
1900		4.4		4.4
2000		4.4		4.4
2100		4.4		4.4
2200		4.3	3.3	7.6
2300		4.3	3.3	7.6

The above table depicts the actual number of the call for service handlers – Officers and Corporals that actually worked an assigned shift on the streets in 2012 – this level equals an average of 4.6 personnel on duty each hour and a total of approximately 109 hours per day of patrol staffing.

These actual staffing levels reflect the “net” hours on duty compared to the “authorized” staffing level. The actual staffing level deducts the hours for employees who were off on various types of leave or at a training course that is part of their normal work hours (or adjusted work hours). The project team added back in the number of backfill overtime hours that increases the actual staffing level.

(3) Employee Attrition Rate.

The following table shows the number of employees who have separated from the PD for any reason (retirement, resignation, termination).

Calendar Year	Sworn Separations	No. of Sworn Employees	Attrition Rate
2008	4	40	10.0%
2009	4	40	10.0%
2010	1	40	2.5%
2011	4	38	10.5%
2012	4	35	11.4%
Total	17		
Average	3.4	38.6	8.8%

A total of 17 sworn employees separated from the PD over the last five years. Attrition rates above 8% annually represent a challenge for organizations to replace employees and at this rate it is often difficult to maintain the Patrol staffing level without the significant use of overtime or the re-assignment of personnel from other work units (which Pacifica PD has done). It also requires a higher training budget and puts a strain on existing training resources such as Field Training Officers.

Recommendations:

Annually review the attrition rate and if it remains at the 8% – 10% level plan to replace approximately 3-4 Officers per year and include sufficient resources in the budget to accomplish this need.

Set a goal to maintain a five year average attrition rate of 8% or less for police employees.

(4) Calls for Service Workloads

The table on the following page shows the total number of community generated calls for service (CFS) by time of day and day of week for CY 2012. The project team defined a community generated call for service as a call where at least one PPD sworn officer provided the primary response to an incident. The CAD system data was used to

determine the number of CFS. It does not include the incidents of Officer initiated activity.

Community Generated Calls for Service by Day & Hour – Calendar Year 2012

Hour	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Total
0000	94	56	35	41	48	57	69	400
0100	63	39	24	34	34	31	57	282
0200	68	24	18	32	32	24	52	250
0300	42	31	16	26	23	28	36	202
0400	63	63	156	166	160	131	140	879 ¹
0500	23	26	11	19	16	22	18	135
0600	21	27	26	27	37	20	25	183
0700	27	48	55	49	48	43	26	296
0800	44	73	49	73	73	73	44	429
0900	65	76	72	91	69	76	71	520
1000	60	84	68	80	65	74	76	507
1100	92	78	72	71	68	85	97	563
1200	81	74	55	86	94	100	93	583
1300	72	72	71	71	83	75	64	508
1400	70	72	83	80	90	111	78	584
1500	81	103	85	85	95	109	70	628
1600	57	84	82	101	105	92	103	624
1700	78	99	100	83	114	116	100	690
1800	75	90	102	114	90	92	88	651
1900	86	89	79	96	86	109	67	612
2000	82	72	81	96	73	84	72	560
2100	67	77	66	100	78	79	79	546
2200	60	67	61	84	69	105	88	534
2300	54	54	58	65	81	86	100	498
Total	1,525	1,578	1,525	1,770	1,731	1,822	1,713	11,664
Ave/day	29	30	29	34	33	35	33	

PPD responded to 11,664 community generated calls for service, approximately 32 per day, where a Patrol unit provided the primary response. The busiest days of the week were Friday and Saturday with an average of 35 and 33 CFS respectively. Of the total number of calls, 4,322 calls (37%) occurred during the day (0800-1600), 4,715

¹ 705 of these calls were to “mark & tab” Abandoned Vehicles

calls (40%) occurred during the afternoon/evening hours (1600-midnight) and 2,627 calls (23%) occurred during the nighttime hours (midnight – 0800).

The table on the following page shows the most common types of calls for service during 2012:

Type of Call	# of Calls	% of Total
Disturbance	1264	10.8%
Welfare Check	1046	9.0%
Abandoned Vehicle	861	7.4%
Suspicious Circumstances	721	6.2%
Suspicious Person/Vehicle	702	6.0%
Building Alarm	661	5.7%
Animal Call	513	4.4%
Domestic Disturbance	438	3.8%
Bad Checks	423	3.6%
Property Damage Accident	309	2.6%
Property Incident	287	2.5%
Petty Theft	283	2.4%
Civil Incident	262	2.2%
Vandalism	238	2.0%
Fireworks	235	2.0%
Burglary	233	2.0%
Muni Code Violation	222	1.9%
Assist Fire Department	216	1.9%
All Other Calls for Service	2,750	23.6%
Total	11,664	100.0%

The “other” types of calls include vehicle storage, assisting another police agency, traffic hazards, juvenile mischief, attempt to contact, etc. As shown above, the 10 most frequent calls for service account for 6,938 calls, almost 60% of the total number of calls during the year.

The following table shows the breakdown by priority of the type of call for service.

- **Priority 1** – An “immediate” response; in progress calls involving an imminent threat to life or bodily injury (e.g. shooting, major injury accident, assaults, rape, robbery, etc.)
- **Priority 2** – An “as soon as possible” response; in progress calls only involving a threat to property (e.g. burglary in progress or vandalism in progress, non-injury

traffic accidents).

- **Priority 3** – “Handle as quickly as convenient” response; calls involving crimes with no suspects present (e.g. barking dog, ticket sign off, advice calls)

CFS Priority	Number	% of Total
1	456	3.9%
2	5885	50.5%
3	5323	45.6%
Total	11,664	100.0%

As shown above, 4% of the calls for service in CY 2012 were Priority 1 calls, about 51% were Priority 2 and 46% were Priority 3 calls.

(5) Average Times for Response and Handling of Calls for Service in 2012.

The response to and handling of community generated calls for service is one of the primary tasks of any municipal police agency and one that frequently is the subject of inquiry from city leaders and members of the community. The project team calculated the average times using all of the calls for service reported to the Pacifica Police Department in 2012.

The following table shows three individual time components and two overall time components for a community generated call for service:

- Call processing and call “queue” time – from the time the call was received in Dispatch (contract services provided by South San Francisco PD) until the officer is dispatched.
- Travel time – from the time the call was dispatched to an officer until the arrival of the first police unit (the difference between the “dispatch time” and the “on scene time” for the first arriving unit).
- Call “response” time – the call process time + travel time. This is the time citizens are most often interested in – from the time they call 9-1-1 until an officer arrives at the scene of the reported incident (shaded box).
- On scene time – from the time of arrival to the time the officer cleared the call.

- Call handling time – the total of the travel time and on scene time.

The times are shown for the different types of priority calls for service and the overall total for all calls for service.

Final Priority	CFS by Priority	Call Processing	Travel	Response Time	On Scene	Call Handling (Travel + On Scene)	Call Handling Hours
1	456	1.7	3.5	5.2	40.7	44.2	336
2	5,885	6.1	6.2	12.3	24.5	30.7	3,013
3	5,323	26.1	7.4	33.5	21.5	28.9	2,561
All	11,664	13.5	6.5	20.0	23.8	30.3	
Total Officer Hours Required to Handle All Calls for Service							5,910

As shown above, the average “Call Processing” time for Priority 1 calls is 1.7 minutes and the average “Travel” time is 3.5 minutes. This equals an average “Response” time for the first PPD unit to arrive at the scene of a Priority 1 call for service of 5.2 minutes, 12.3 minutes for Priority 2 calls and 33.5 minutes for Priority 3 calls.

An average processing time of 1.7 minutes (which includes Dispatcher time and also “queue” time) for Priority 1 calls is too high for actual “emergency” calls and should be reviewed with SSF PD to determine the reasons. There are several possible reasons for this, including that the types of Priority 1 calls listed in the CAD data may not meet the definition of a “Priority 1” call and should have been classified as Priority 2; the calls are automatically given a Priority number by the information listed in the “type of call” CAD field, and the Dispatchers are not processing the call information fast enough or Officer(s) are not responding to acknowledge the call and go “in-route” fast enough. It is likely a combination of several factors but the data should be reviewed

with SSF PD Dispatch manager and determine the actual reasons and if steps can be taken to reduce the call processing time.

The average “On Scene” time for the different types of priority calls ranged from 40.7 minutes for Priority 1 calls to 21.5 minutes for Priority 3 calls. The overall average “Call Handling” time of 30.3 minutes is in the middle of the range of handling times for calls for service commonly seen by the project team in other police department studies throughout the United States. The total Officer time required to handle community generated calls for service in 2012 was 5,910 hours.

The table on the following page shows the percentage of calls for service that were responded to within various time ranges.

CFS by Priority Type	Travel Time in Minutes					Total #	Total %
	0:00–4:59	5:00–6:59	7:00–9:59	Above 10:00	No Time Stamps		
1	341	60	24	9	22	456	3.9%
2	2786	1012	826	806	455	5,885	50.5%
3	1461	427	453	674	2308	5,323	45.6%
Total	4,588	1,499	1,303	1,489	2,785	11,664	100%
% of CFS	39.3%	12.9%	11.2%	12.8%	23.9%	100%	

The times listed above were separated by the Priority type for each call for service. The calls listed as “no time stamps” are the calls that either a dispatch time or arrival time was listed in the CAD record. The most common reason for this is for Officers who are dispatched to a call but cancelled while “in route” to the call – an “arrival” time stamp is appropriately not entered for his/her response. There are also additional reasons for missing CAD data that include Officer, Dispatcher or equipment error in not recording it.

As the above table shows, from the time an Officer receives the call, PPD units responded to all community generated calls for service within 5 minutes approximately 39% of the time, and within 7 minutes for 52% of all calls for service.

Recommendations:

Annually review the number of community generated calls for service from the CAD data to determine the trend in community generated workload.

Establish reasonable “call processing time” goals for Priority 1 and Priority 2 calls for service and meet with the South San Francisco Dispatch Center manager quarterly to review the results.

Establish a goal of responding to Priority 1 calls for service 90% of the time in under 7 minutes of travel time.

(6) Officer “Back-Up” Time, Reports Written and Bookings.

Officers also respond as backup units to assist the primary officer on many calls for service. The CAD system used by Pacifica PD does not capture the number of calls where Officers respond as a back-up officer and the amount of time officers spend as a back-up officer. In other police department studies conducted by the project team an average rate for a backup Officer(s) to assist the primary Officer is commonly 40% - 60% of all calls for service. The project team used a 50% factor to calculate the back-up rate, which equals 5,832 calls where more than one unit responded and factored a call handling time of 75% of the primary unit time (30.3 minutes x 75% = 22.7 minutes). This equals 2,207 hours for backup Officers assisting at calls for service.

Pacifica Officers wrote a total of 3,709 incident reports (405 traffic related and 3,304 crime/other types of reports). There is not a completely reliable way to calculate the number of hours spend on report writing as it is not sufficiently tracked by the CAD system, reports are of varying complexity, and time logs are not kept by Officers. The

project team uses an average of 45 minutes for each report; this equals 2,782 hours of report writing time in 2012.

Officers made a total of 803 arrests in 2012 – the project team will use an average of 1.5 hours per arrest as the total booking time required of Officers.

These time elements will be used when calculating total committed time later in this report.

Recommendation:

Determine if the S. San Francisco Dispatch Center is able to obtain backup Officer data from the CAD system, use this information in an annual review of Officer workload.

(7) Officer Initiated Activity.

In addition to responding to community generated calls for service, Patrol Officers engage in a number of officer initiated activities during their work hours, such as traffic stops, pedestrian stops, security checks, etc. The number of officer initiated activities was determined by identifying the number of self-initiated events from the CAD record. The table on the following page shows the number of officer initiated incidents.

Officer Initiated Activity – Calendar Year 2012

Hour	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Total
0000	185	129	99	102	118	100	233	966
0100	120	66	64	48	64	52	129	543
0200	55	53	51	32	45	61	76	373
0300	30	35	43	31	35	28	39	241
0400	22	21	21	22	9	14	16	125
0500	21	33	32	27	28	36	28	205
0600	31	42	50	43	53	47	45	311
0700	18	41	60	49	48	45	25	286
0800	46	77	124	114	116	93	40	610
0900	71	94	118	149	124	107	93	756
1000	104	111	121	112	122	131	83	784
1100	90	85	104	134	135	109	104	761
1200	60	79	105	105	99	91	80	619
1300	72	80	80	105	106	86	88	617
1400	73	81	104	96	122	103	80	659
1500	78	79	91	102	83	89	89	611
1600	58	68	61	62	78	89	87	503
1700	147	149	113	160	144	197	140	1,050
1800	147	145	125	154	146	179	182	1,078
1900	137	156	114	137	162	172	161	1,039
2000	131	163	129	121	126	131	140	941
2100	134	132	94	119	106	152	170	907
2200	146	118	88	131	127	192	184	986
2300	163	168	129	128	150	264	212	1,214
Total	2,139	2,205	2,120	2,283	2,346	2,568	2,524	16,185
Ave/day	41	42	41	44	45	49	49	44

As shown above, Patrol Officers initiated 16,185 on-view incidents, an average of 160 events per day. Most frequently these events were vehicle stops but also included pedestrian stops, assisting outside agencies and warrant service. As shown in the following table the most frequent Officer initiated activities were traffic stops and foot patrol.

Officer Initiated Incidents

Type of Incident	Number	Percent	Avg. Minutes
Traffic Stops	9,475	58.5%	7.5
Foot Patrol	1,222	7.6%	11.8
Follow-up	835	5.2%	18.2
School Check	795	4.9%	11.7
Citizen Assist	771	4.8%	18.3
Bar Check	734	4.5%	6.8
Foot Patrol – Shopping Center	734	4.5%	11.6
Subject Stop	685	4.2%	8.9
Suspicious Activity	516	3.2%	5.1
All Other Incidents	418	2.6%	59.0
Total Incidents & Average Time	16,185	100%	10.6

Traffic stops accounted for 9,475 events initiated by Officers during 2012, over 58% the total number of Officer initiated incidents. A significant number of foot patrols were also initiated by Officers during the year. The average time spent on all Officer initiated incidents was 10.6 minutes, totaling 2,859 hours during the year for these activities – for the 1st Officer.

This is a significant number of officer initiated incidents as it is almost 40% more than the number of community generated calls for service which is higher than the number of Officer initiated incidents commonly seen by the project team in other police departments. It indicates that the organization has developed and implemented a workforce that has been given specific tasks and guidance of what should be accomplished when time is available during the shift. One example of this is that Officers are given school contact tasks and are accountable to their Supervisor to make a sufficient number of contacts at the schools. This is an example of a planned patrol activity during “proactive time” and is a very good use of Patrol resources. The existence of these plans indicates that Supervisors are managing field activities and that Officers are very active in performing proactive tasks when time is available during their

shift. These types of planned activities should be reviewed every year to evaluate effectiveness and determine the most important planned activities to continue or implement. Additionally, this high level of Officer initiated activity should continue to be encouraged by management and supervisors.

Officers also respond as backup units to assist the primary Officer on these self-initiated incidents. As with the call for service calculation for back-up Officers' time responding to and handling calls for service, a 50% factor was used to calculate the back-up rate. This equals 8,093 events where one or more backup Officers assisted the primary unit. An estimated travel time must also be included for back-up Officers – the project team used a 4.0 minute average. Using the same estimated incident handling time of 75% of the primary unit time (10.6 minutes x 75% = 8.0 minutes), plus the 4 minute travel time, equals 1,612 hours for backup Officers assisting at these events. As with the calls for service, these hours of backup officers' time will be used when calculating total committed time later in this report.

Recommendation:

Continue to encourage Patrol Officers and Corporals to maintain this high level of Officer initiated activity. Annually review existing Patrol plans and develop new ones as needed to address community, quality of life and crime issues in Pacifica when “proactive time” is available.

2. PATROL FIELD SERVICES PRINCIPLES AND BEST PRACTICES.

The orientation toward the provision of field patrol services in municipal law enforcement agencies has come full circle in the United States over the last 60 years. The historic law enforcement approach to field services involved a Police Officer who walked a particular beat or neighborhood. A traditional beat officer knew people in the area and was in a position to know potential problems before they occurred, or likely

suspects for crimes committed on the Officers beat. As cities grew and metropolitan areas spread the motorized officer became the normal transportation mode to respond to calls for service. The police department's focus changed to one of responding quickly (i.e. in a patrol car) to all types of calls in a wider geographic area and overall, fewer officers assigned to foot or vehicle patrol duties. At the same time, society at large and city residents developed rising expectations of the services that would be provided by police officers (e.g. the passage of domestic violence laws in the late 1970s and 1980s). Over time these factors resulted in a beat officer that had less local neighborhood knowledge and less frequent contact with the residents in his/her service area but with a higher expectations among the general public that they would improve the neighborhoods.

Initiatives over the last four decades have attempted to once again provide policing services more tangible to the community. This law enforcement focus throughout the country has been under the general umbrella of "community policing" – a return to providing a wide range of services identified by citizens and more frequent contact with a police officer and more proactive law enforcement in neighborhoods and schools. Community policing has taken the form of countless initiatives and iterations throughout the country in recent years. The project team supports local community policing efforts, especially ones that involve Patrol personnel when they have uncommitted time during their shift. These efforts should also involve the active participation of supervisors, managers and other specialty units (e.g. School Resource Officers). Pacifica does not staff School Resource Officers but does assign dayshift

patrol units to make regular school contacts as part of their routine patrol duties when they have time during their shift.

Over the course of several hundred police department studies the Matrix Consulting Group has developed a list of key elements in the effective provision of field patrol services in a community, including the responsibility of Officers to be proactive during their shifts (to identify and resolve problems) and not just reactive in handling calls for service. These general policing elements are summarized on the next several pages.

Management Task	Comments
Reactive Patrol Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The primary mission of any law enforcement field patrol force. Responding to citizen requests (or calls) for service is the most critical element of successful patrol services.• As staffing allows, the Department should have clearly defined areas of responsibility (beats).• The Department should have clearly defined response policies in place; including prioritization of calls, response time targets for each priority and supervisor on scene policies.• This reactive workload should make up between 50% and 60% of each Officer's net available time per shift (on average). This includes time to write reports, transport and book prisoners.

Management Task	Comments
Proactive Patrol Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Proactive time” is defined as all other activity not in response to a citizen generated call; it occurs during the shift when Officers are not handling calls and have completed other necessary tasks; it includes items such as traffic enforcement, directed patrol, bike and foot patrol. It is also sometimes referred to as “uncommitted” time but that is somewhat of a misnomer as it only means “not committed to handling community generated calls for service”. • The Department should have clearly defined uses for “proactive time” – i.e. officers should know what they are expected to do with their time when not responding to calls for service. This may include targeted preventive patrol for general visibility, traffic enforcement, developing relationships with members of the community, visiting schools or parks. • The proactive element of field patrol should make up between 40% and 50% of an officer’s day (on average). • Research and experience has shown the 40% – 50% range to be an appropriate level of “proactive time” for several reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Less than 35% “proactive time” available to officers typically does not allow for sufficient “bundling” of available time – time comes in intervals too short to be effectively utilized by law enforcement personnel for meaningful activity. - “Proactive time” of more than 50% results in less efficient use of officer resources as it is difficult to have sufficient meaningful work tasks and manage personnel whose time is so heavily weighted toward proactive activities. - Some exceptions to this latter concern are units which are dedicated to handle certain types of activity, e.g., traffic enforcement units, School Resource Officers, etc. However, it should be noted that the Officers assigned to these units should respond to any call for service when needed/required. - A level of 50% “proactive time” or higher is typically seen in smaller suburban or rural communities; a level of 30-40% is more common in medium size and larger cities.
Problem Identification and Resolution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective proactive patrol for municipal law enforcement requires the rapid identification of problems and issues, the development of an action plan to address issues as they arise, implementation of the potential solution and regular evaluations to determine if the approach successfully addressed the issue. • This approach should be used on criminal, traffic and other quality of life problems reported to the Department or discovered by officers during the course of their patrol duties. • Officers have the primary role in accomplishing proactive tasks, field projects (e.g. Problem Oriented Policing), etc. • Formal and informal mechanisms for capturing and evaluating information should be used. This should be primarily handled by officers and supervisors, but managers must also have involvement and oversight.

Management Task	Comments
Management of Patrol Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patrol supervisors and managers must take an active role in management of patrol. This includes developing and utilizing management reports that accurately depict the activity, response times to calls for service and the variety of current issues and problems being handled by patrol units. • Resources must be geared to address actual workload and issues. This includes ensuring that patrol staffing is matched to workload, that patrol beats or sectors are designed to provide an even distribution of workload. • This also includes matching resources to address issues in a proactive manner. This may include shifting beats to free staff to handle special assignments, assigning officers to targeted patrols, assigning traffic enforcement issues, etc. • Staffing should be related to providing effective field response to calls for service, provision of proactive activity and ensuring officer and the safety of members of the public. • Supervisors should be both an immediate resource to field officers (for advice, training, back-up, inter-personal skills) and field managers (handling basic administrative functions).
Measurement of Success and Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data should be used to plan and manage work in Patrol and other field work units. • Effective field patrol should be measured in multiple ways to ensure that the Department is successful in handling multiple tasks or functions. • Examples of effective performance measurement include: response time, time on scene, number of calls handled by an officer, back-up rate and the traffic enforcement index (citations/warnings + DUI arrests divided by injury + fatality accidents), overall level of crime and clearance rate. • Managers and supervisors should track and review performance measures on a regular basis to know what level of service is being provided to the community and for use as one tool to ensure that services are effective and efficient.

The matrix above summarizes the basic elements of an effective and modern patrol service in a community, providing both reactive field services (response to community generated calls for service) and proactive work by Officers assigned to field work units (i.e. Patrol Division). During these times of limited or decreasing budgetary resources it becomes critically important for managers of the patrol function to make the best use of Officer's time to provide effective policing and meeting expectations of the community.

The key elements identified above in the effective provision of field patrol services in a community are summarized below:

- Effective municipal law enforcement requires a field patrol force, which is designed and managed to be flexible in providing both reactive and proactive response to law enforcement issues in the community.
- This requires that the Department balance personnel, resources and time to handle both of these types of law enforcement. Between 50% and 60% of the time in a community should be spent handling all of the elements of reactive patrol. The remaining 40% to 50% should be spent specific proactive patrol activities, other self initiated tasks or community policing activities.
- When an Officer has a block time available (e.g. during a slow day) the activities planned/conducted during this time should be part of a Patrol plan and not left unstructured and random. Effectively addressing issues in the community requires tasks be accomplished as part of a plan – addressing specific problems in pre-determined ways. The plans should be overseen by management but planned and accomplished at the Officer/Sergeant or “squad” level.
- Any effective proactive approach to patrol requires that information be managed formally and that a formal effort be put into evaluating that information. This evaluation should lead to specific actions to address issues/problems in a community. In addition, attempts to address problems should be evaluated formally to determine if the efforts made have been effective.

These basic elements represent the essential ingredients of effective and efficient municipal field law enforcement in the United States in the 21st century. Establishing a patrol pro-activity target is important for effective management and planning of a patrol operations force.

An additional facet of proactive Patrol activity is accountability of Officers and Sergeants in making good use of “proactive time”. Sergeants and Officers on a shift should be involved in determining individual productivity goals, receive regular feedback from their supervisor, and measure accomplishment of those goals throughout the year is a reasonable element in the Department’s accountability system. As part of this system supervisors should be provided regular (i.e. monthly) statistical reports showing

individual Officer's productivity, such as reports written, investigations conducted, arrests made, field contacts (e.g. vehicle and pedestrian stops), citations or warnings issued, and number of calls for service handled. This information can and should be part of the information used by the supervisor to evaluate an Officer's overall performance for the month and year.

(1) Factors to Consider in Establishing Patrol Staffing Levels.

The project team uses an analytical approach to determine the staffing level required in a community such as Pacifica. The approach is characterized by several key factors that provide the basis for objective evaluation of a police department's patrol force:

- Staffing should be examined based on the ability of current staff to handle the calls for service generated by the community (and the related work such as report writing and processing arrestees); as well as providing sufficient time for proactive activities such as directed patrol, traffic enforcement and addressing on-going issues/problems in a neighborhood.
- Staffing is dependent on the time officers are actually available to perform the work required of the patrol function. In this evaluation, leave hours usage and time dedicated to administrative functions are examined.
- Policy is made by selecting a level of "proactive time", or uncommitted, time that is deemed to be appropriate for the community – this can be established by the Chief, City Manager and/or elected officials. In the case of Pacifica, the project team recommends a target of an overall average of 50% "proactive time" that will enable Patrol Officers to handle the community generated calls for service effectively and efficiently, engage in a variety of targeted patrol activities (ability varies depending on time of day), and provide for safety of officers.
- The project team's analysis does not include the utilization of ratios such as "officers per thousand" because they do not account for the unique characteristics of communities (e.g. demographics, workload, unique community needs, deployment, etc.). Although these ratios are interesting, they do not provide a comprehensive measure of staffing needs for a specific community, nor should policy makers use them as a basis to make decisions regarding patrol staffing. The Project team's approach is supported by the International

Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) that view 'officer per thousand' ratios as "totally inappropriate as a basis for staffing decisions".

There are other significant factors for policy makers to consider when determining staffing levels. These factors include, but are not limited to, the following:

- The type, severity and volume of crime in a community.
- The ability of the police department to meet response time goals to calls for service and solve crime (taken as a performance measure and not as a crime prevention/reduction measure).
- The level of police department involvement in providing non-traditional police services such as neighborhood problem solving, graffiti removal, community meetings and events and teaching/role modeling in the schools.
- The level of proactive efforts such as traffic safety and parking enforcement, narcotics enforcement, enforcement of vice crimes such as prostitution and liquor laws.
- Providing for basic officer safety and risk management of a patrol force. In some police agencies, the "proactive time" level may not be the primary measure to determine the minimum number of Patrol Officer positions needed – it may be driven by officer safety concerns. For example, a staffing level needed to meet basic officer safety concerns, may result in a "proactive time" level that is above 50% for a portion of the day.

The above factors should be used by policy makers in determining appropriate staffing levels for all functions within the police department. The goal of a patrol staffing analysis is to ensure sufficient patrol resources on duty 24 hours a day providing a high level of service to the community. The ability of the Police Department to do this depends on knowing and evaluating the community demand workload – the number of community generated calls for service, reports and bookings of arrested persons. These are the factors used by the project team to evaluate the number of patrol officers needed in a community to achieve a Patrol Officer staffing level that will provide the level of pro-activity that is desired by a community.

(2) Data Used to Conduct Staffing Calculations.

The Project team calculates “proactive time” in law enforcement agencies using a mixture of known data combined with several assumptions. The table below provides a brief description of the basis for this calculation for the City of Pacifica.

Reactive Factor in Calculation of “Proactive Time”	Summary Discussion
Calls for Service	Actual call data obtained from the South SF Dispatch Center’s CAD system allowed the project team to determine the number of community generated calls for service (reactive time of Patrol Officers).
Call Handling Time	Generally, an average call handling time of approximately 30 minutes is needed to efficiently and effectively handle a community generated call for service. The handling time includes an Officer’s travel time and on-scene time. A handling time that is higher than 40 minutes may indicate Patrol Officers may not be timely in processing calls for service (not including report writing time); a handling time lower than 30 minutes indicates Patrol Officers may not be providing an appropriate amount of attention to all calls for service.
Back-Up Frequency / Number of Units per Call	An average of 1.4 – 1.6 patrol units responding to handle a community generated call for service.
Duration of Time On-Scene by Back-Up	An average of 75% (or less) of the primary/initial unit’s handling time is not excessive (Department policy/practice may impact this time factor).
Number of Reports	This number is based on the number of community-generated calls for service. For most incidents requiring a report the Officer will gather preliminary information while on-scene handling the call and spend additional time later in the shift, at the end of the shift or the next day. The project team’s experience with other municipal law enforcement has found that some type of report is written to document the incident on approximately 1/3 of the community generated calls for service.
Time to Complete a Report	An average of 45 minutes is used to determine the time required for completing incident reports resulting from a call for service or self-initiated activity; this time is included as part of reactive workload time. The actual report writing time is currently not being captured by the CAD system.

Reactive Factor in Calculation of “Proactive Time”	Summary Discussion
Number of Arrests	The actual number of arrests for 2012 was used.
Time to Complete an Arrest	An average of the actual time it takes for an Officer to book an arrestee at the PD or a nearby jail facility. This time is included as part of reactive workload time. The project team used an average of 1.5 hours per arrest, to account for the additional travel and processing time required to book a prisoner into the County Jail.
Available Time of Officers / Officers on Duty	This number used in the calculations is the average number of all leave hours (e.g. vacation, sick, long term disability, military) used by Patrol Officers deducted from the total paid hours in a year (2,080) to obtain the actual hours that an Officer is working.
Availability of Supervisors to Handle Field Workloads	The staffing needs analysis determines the appropriate number of Officers needed to handle the community generated calls for service. Sergeants are not included as primary responders to calls for service. This is appropriate as Sergeants should primarily be responsible for supervision, oversight and other tasks; not primarily used for response to calls for service.

Using this data and targets, the project team can then perform the calculation of the current “proactive time” and also a range of “proactive times” that policy makers may want to have as a desired goal. The simple formula illustration of the calculation that is performed to determine “proactive time” is:

Proactive Time Percentage =

$$\frac{\text{All Available Time} - (\text{Reactive Workload Time} + \text{Admin. Time})}{\text{Total Available Time}}$$

Two definitions used in this formula are important to note:

- “Total Available Time” is defined as the number of Officer Hours actually available in a year.
- “Reactive Workload Time” is defined as the average total committed time per call for service, multiplied by the number of calls for service for the year analyzed.

The approach used by the project team provides managers and policy makers with an easily understood measure of the capability of the patrol workforce to provide proactive law enforcement (the time left over once calls for service and related workload, and administrative tasks have been handled). Although the basic formula is simple, the project team provides detailed information and analysis of the various data elements that are used to determine the annual “proactive time” percentage. The detailed calculations of overall Patrol Officer committed time for various hours of the day is provided later in this report.

Using this method avoids the significant problems in other comparative staffing models (e.g., “officers per thousand” ratio mentioned above) that do not take into consideration the workload for Patrol Officers that is generated by a community being served by the law enforcement agency. This approach also provides a methodology that can easily keep pace with future growth that takes place in the city (by factoring in a percentage growth in call for service demand). Finally, this approach allows managers/policy makers to select a “proactive time” target that is desired (e.g., 40% “proactive time” level), and then basing total patrol staffing on a combination of the work that *must* be done (i.e., community generated calls for service) with the “proactive time” level that is desired. Here is a recap of the model’s use and key analytical points:

- The model makes specific provision for “proactive time” targets.
- The model can be used at any level of detail, i.e. staffing levels can be calculated for specific times of day or for specific geographical areas.
- The model uses commonly available data:
 - Gross and net officer availability hours (“proactive time”).
 - Calls for service counts and the time committed to these calls.

- Related additional workload, including report writing and time spent booking arrestees.
- “Administrative” tasks, such as time spent in “briefing” at the beginning of a shift, breaks, vehicle maintenance, and other tasks during a shift.

The project team used this approach in conducting the staffing calculations from calendar year 2012 call for service data.

(3) Important Factors Regarding CAD Data and the Calculation of Committed and “Proactive Time” Levels.

The use of CAD data to calculate patrol officers work tasks will not capture all of the duties and tasks done by Officers during their shifts due to human error and incomplete data in the CAD call for service records (e.g. missing time stamps, the fact that sometimes Officers do not report a task they are doing to Dispatch so it is not logged, sometimes Dispatchers do not track all patrol tasks). This is especially true in the first year of a thorough CAD call for service data analysis, and will be true for subsequent years unless the agency makes concerted and consistent efforts to improve accuracy. This is not unique to Pacifica; it is common in other law enforcement agencies’ data evaluated by the project team in other studies. The project team estimates that approximately 10 – 20% of an Officer’s time that he/she is doing job related tasks is not tracked in the CAD record (this is a general number for all police departments that is applicable to Pacifica but it was not specifically derived from the Pacifica CAD data). This number is important to remember as it means that 10 – 20% of the “proactive” or “uncommitted” time in the CAD data analysis must be deducted from the calculated result to obtain a more accurate percentage of Officers’ “proactive”

or “uncommitted” time. The following summary is provided illustrating the implications of various “proactive time” levels:

- A 10 – 20% “proactive time” level reflects a patrol staff that is essentially fully committed (except during the low CFS hours of the day); this is due to CAD data not capturing all committed time or tasks required/completed by Officers. Average travel times to high priority community generated calls for service may be above 8 minutes and “on scene” times may be below 30 minutes due to calls “stacking” and the need to respond to other incidents; this may not be enough time to conduct a thorough investigation of the incident or provide a high quality level of service.
- At this level, during most hours, Officers will be responding to CFS and will not have time for any consistent proactive or project oriented activity – the blocks of time are generally too short (less than 30 minutes) to allow for meaningful targeted patrol or working on beat projects or neighborhood issues.
- A 40% “proactive time” level is generally sufficient to provide blocks of time where Officers can conduct targeted patrol, beat projects to address community issues. Average travel times to high priority community generated calls for service should commonly be less than 6 minutes and “on scene” times should commonly be above 30 minutes, sufficient to allow thorough investigations and sufficient time to provide a high quality level of service.
- A 50% “proactive time” level will afford a patrol force on most workdays to have a several hours during their shift to conduct targeted patrol, specific projects to address community issues, and other officer initiated activities. Average travel times to high priority community generated calls for service should commonly be less than 5 minutes and “on scene” times should commonly be above 30 minutes, sufficient to allow thorough investigations and sufficient time to provide a high quality level of service.
- “Proactive time” levels above 50% may provide a challenge to supervisors to keep Officers busy with meaningful work and engaged in the job. For communities that do have this high level of “proactive time” it is important to plan for productive work and measure the results.

Each community can choose an appropriate target of “proactive time” desired for its patrol staff, based on unique needs, available funding and policing model desired. A 40 – 50% overall average “proactive time” level is a reasonable target/goal for a community that desires a patrol force that can provide a consistent level of proactive

services to the community. Policymakers should determine the policing level for their community and understand the impacts of higher and lower “proactive time” levels. Higher targeted “proactive time” levels will require more staff but also ensure that the police force is able to provide a higher level of service to the community in the form of proactive policing and will allow the Patrol Officer to be more involved in issues/problems in the neighborhoods where they serve.

3. PATROL OPERATIONS COMMITTED AND “PROACTIVE TIME” IN 2012.

The workload required during various hours of the day (committed time) and the resulting “proactive time” level of a patrol staff is the most significant factor in determining the staffing needed to achieve the level of service desired by a City. However, fielding a minimum number of Officers to provide for basic safety of Officers while on patrol, and the ability of the Department to handle more than one critical incident simultaneously are also significant factors to consider in deployment of police resources.

It is important to have a clear understanding of what is included in the “proactive time” calculations. “Proactive time” is the amount of an Officer’s work hours remaining (expressed as a percentage of work hours) after handling the community generated workload demand, this includes the time required to handle calls for service, make arrests, book arrestees, write reports, etc.

(1) Assumptions Utilized in Calculating “Proactive Time”.

In the calculation and analysis of “proactive time” there are several analytical assumptions that were utilized:

- Actual community generated calls for service obtained from CAD data totaled 11,664. This number excludes all Officer initiated activities (such as traffic

stops); multiple unit entries, administrative activities and calls cancelled prior to an Officer being dispatched.

- Meals and other breaks are taken evenly across all hours of a shift.
- The volume of calls for service throughout the day (expressed as a percentage for each 4 hour time period) was used to allocate the number of reports written and arrests made.
- Personnel are available on an average hourly basis (i.e., in the model there are no heavy or light shift days).
- Officers are available for an average of 1,754 shift hours per year to provide all field services. This takes into account the various leave usages (e.g. vacation, sick) and training hours.

The resulting calculation shows the average level of an Officer's "proactive", or discretionary, time during a shift, when they are available to handle general proactive policing efforts in the field, targeted patrol to address a specific problem, visiting schools, traffic enforcement, walking patrol in the downtown area, and other tasks initiated by the Officer or directed by the Officer's supervisor.

(2) The Percentage of Uncommitted Time Varies Throughout the Day and Should be Evaluated for Each Shift.

An overall percentage for committed and "proactive time" in 2012 was calculated but because the percentages vary significantly throughout the day calculations are also shown in four-hour time blocks. This gives a clearer picture of the availability or unavailability of Patrol staff during various times of the day.

The average number of Officers actually on duty during a 24 hour period was taken from the "Actual Patrol Staffing" table presented earlier in this report. The average call handling time of 30.3 minutes for the primary (1st Officer) and 22.7 minutes for the "back-up" Officer(s) were used in this calculation. Report writing time was

estimated at 45 minutes per report and the initial booking of a prisoner at 1 hour, 30 minutes each (this does not include other prisoner transportation time).

The following table shows the actual available staff time for Officers, Corporals and Sergeants in 2012 and the community generated calls for service workload (other discretionary, or Officer initiated activity is not included in this table). Administrative time for Officers and Corporals was estimated at 1.5 hours per shift and for Sergeants at 6 hours per shift.

Calls for Service Workload in 2012

	0000 - 0400	0400 - 0800	0800 - 1200	1200 - 1600	1600 - 2000	2000 - 2400	Total
Patrol Staff Allocation	19.4%	14.5%	12.7%	12.7%	19.4%	21.3%	100.0%
Hours Staffed (ST + OT)	9,596	7,173	6,282	6,282	9,596	10,536	49,466
Administrative Time	2,104	1,572	1,377	1,377	2,104	2,310	10,844
Available Work Hours	7,493	5,600	4,905	4,905	7,493	8,226	38,622
Calls for Service (CFS)	1,134	1,493	2,019	2,303	2,557	2,138	11,644
% of Total CFS	9.7%	12.8%	17.3%	19.8%	22.0%	18.4%	100%
1st Officer Minutes / CFS	30.3	30.3	30.3	30.3	30.3	30.3	30.3
1st Unit Hours	573	754	1,020	1,163	1,291	1,080	5,880
Back-Up Unit Responses	568	748	1,011	1,153	1,281	1,071	5,832
Back Up Minutes / CFS	22.7	22.7	22.7	22.7	22.7	22.7	22.7
Back Up Officer(s) Hours	215	283	383	436	485	405	2,206
Reports Written	361	476	643	734	814	681	3,709
Report Writing Hours	271	357	482	550	611	511	2,782
Bookings	78	103	139	159	176	147	803
Booking Hours	117	154	209	238	265	221	1,205
Total Committed Hours	1,176	1,548	2,093	2,388	2,651	2,217	12,073
Total "Proactive" Hours	6,317	4,052	2,812	2,517	4,841	6,010	26,549
Committed Time Percent	15.7%	27.6%	42.7%	48.7%	35.4%	26.9%	31.3%
"Proactive Time" Percent	84.3%	72.4%	57.3%	51.3%	64.6%	73.1%	68.7%

In 2012 Patrol staff spent a minimum of 31.3% of their on duty hours handling community generated calls for service and the related workload; leaving an overall

average of 68.7% of “proactive time”. It is important to subtract the estimated 10 – 20% of work not captured by CAD (discussed in an earlier section) into these totals – equaling an overall daily average of 41 – 51% committed time, and an average “proactive time” level of 59 – 49%.

The typical busiest hours of the day are from 8:00 AM to 8:00 PM, and in Pacifica 59% of the calls occur during these hours but the “proactive time” level is still averages 59%. The calls for service pattern is typical of most police departments – more calls for service during the “daytime” hours, resulting in more hours of committed time, and fewer calls during the “nighttime” hours which results in a higher level of “proactive time”. The high levels of “proactive time” from midnight to 8:00 AM are common in most police agencies. Agencies may be able to redeploy some staff to busier hours of the day but other factors may limit management’s ability to make changes. These factors include: 1) maintain sufficient staff to provide for safety of Officers working during the night, and, as part of a reasonable risk management plan, having the ability to handle one critical incident with on duty staff (as during the early morning hours no other police resources such as Detectives are on duty to provide additional assistance quickly).

It is important to note that this is the first year that an evaluation of this type has been done for patrol workload and, as already mentioned, the CAD data does not capture all of the work done by Patrol Officers. Improvement in tracking Officers time in CAD over the next year will provide more accurate data to conduct this same workload analysis for 2013 and 2014 and have an increasing degree of confidence that the results closely reflect the actual patrol workload time commitment. The workload

analysis in the second and subsequent years will also show workload trends that will assist managers in making staffing allocation decisions.

Recommendations:

Establish a City goal, depending on the level of service desired, of targeting either a 50% or 40% average “proactive time” level for Patrol services. Use this target goal as part of the information evaluated when determining the appropriate Patrol staffing level.

Annually review patrol staff workload for each four hour time block to review workload distribution and determine if some patrol staff should be redeployed to busier hours of the day; or if resources from other work units should be redeployed to Patrol.

Adopt a process to enhance delivery of patrol services during the periods when “proactive time” is available. The Captains and Sergeants should coordinate the development of plans that identify specific tasks/projects that can be worked on or accomplished when “proactive time” is available during a shift.

4. PERSONNEL STAFFING REQUIREMENTS FOR PATROL.

The table in the previous section described the 2012 Patrol hours worked (by Officers, Corporals and Sergeants) and the level of community work (calls for service, reports, bookings) to determine the level of committed time required for these tasks. This section utilizes this data to evaluate the staffing level needs and the project team’s evaluation of the results for a targeted 50% “proactive time” level and a 40% level. The project team also discusses the results in the overall context of Patrol workload and service level desired in Pacifica.

(1) Patrol Staffing Requirements.

The table on the following page uses the employee and workload data to calculate the number of Officers and Corporals required to handle the community generated workload and perform necessary administrative tasks.

Staffing Projections	Workload 2012
1. COMMUNITY GENERATED WORKLOADS	
Calls for service (one year)	11,664
Handling Time – 1 st Unit from Dispatch until Officer clears call (30.3 minutes)	5,880
Handling Time – Backup Officers (22.7 minutes)	2,206
Number of Reports Written	3,709
Total Time for Report Writing @ 45 minutes each	2,782
Number of Bookings	803
Time to Process Bookings @ 1.5 hours each	1,205
Total Time Needed to Handle Workload	12,072
2. Additional Hours for Preventive Patrol & Officer Initiated Activity	
To Provide 50% “Proactive Time” Level	12,072
To Provide 40% “Proactive Time” Level	8,048
3. Total Time Required for Reactive & Proactive Work	
To Provide 50% “Proactive Time” Level	24,145
To Provide 40% “Proactive Time” Level	20,120
4. Availability of Staff	
Annual Paid Work Hours	2,080
Leave Hours (vacation, sick, WC, etc.) and On-Duty Training	326
Administrative Tasks – 90 min per shift (briefing, breaks, etc.)	299
Net Available Hours	1,455
5. Officers Required to Handle Workload – 8 or 12 Hour Shifts	
To Provide 50% “Proactive Time” Level	16.6
To Provide 40% “Proactive Time” Level	13.8
6. Officers Required to Handle Workload – 10 hour Shifts (+15%)	
To Provide 50% “Proactive Time” Level	19.1
To Provide 40% “Proactive Time” Level	15.9
7. Additional Officers (To Handle Attrition Rate of 8%)	
50% of Available Time	20.6
40% of Available Time	17.2

The table above shows the minimum number of Officers required to handle the call for service workload and administrative tasks. Two “proactive time” levels are

presented to show the number of personnel required – if an overall average of 40% “proactive time” is desired then Pacifica needs only 16 Officers/Corporals assigned to Patrol, based solely on the 2012 community generated call for service data; and a 50% “proactive time” target requires 19 Officers/Corporals. To address known attrition (averaging 8.8% annually from 2008-2012) an additional “overhead” of 1.5 or 1.3 officers are needed.

Additional factors need to be included when determining an appropriate staffing level – these factors (and the reasonableness of a reduction to 16 Officers/Corporals) will be discussed in the next section. The current Patrol staffing authorized level is 20 (15 Officers and 5 Corporals) which is a difference of 1 position from an average 50% “proactive time” level. This current staffing level is a reduction from several years of budget cuts to the Police Department budget but, as shown in the analysis completed for this project, the reductions have still allowed the PD to respond to calls for service within acceptable response times and Patrol staff still has a significant amount of time for proactive activities.

(2) Analysis of Patrol Workload and the Current Staffing Level.

In April 2013 Field Services Division had 20 Officers/Corporals and 5 Sergeants assigned to Patrol (this number includes any personnel that may be on light duty). This staffing level is more than adequate to handle the current workload, provide for officer safety and to have a significant amount of time for proactive activities (an average of 68% in 2012). This viewpoint is supported by the employee survey where 81% of the staff (which included employees assigned to Patrol but also other areas of the

Department) reported that they had the right balance of work, or had busy periods but most of the time they were able to keep up with the workload.

This patrol workload analysis from the CAD data provides police managers with valuable information regarding workload demand when making staffing decisions but these calculations are only one of the items of information needed when determining the total number of staff needed to effectively and safely provide patrol services in Pacifica and allocating staff to the different shifts. It is also wise to keep in mind what was mentioned earlier in this report that the 2012 CAD documented workload is likely does not capture 10% - 20% of the workload performed by patrol personnel. When making projections regarding Patrol staffing needs – the second and third year of CAD data analysis will provide valuable information that supplements 1st year data and begin to reveal a historical trend and more reliable analytical workload data results.

Other factors that should be considered when determining a staffing level include the desired and planned proactive tasks to be accomplished by Officers when on duty (e.g. traffic safety enforcement, foot patrol, addressing identified community concerns, school visits, etc.), size and geography of patrol areas (beats), frequency of critical incidents, availability of mutual aid, the level of crime activity, the number of new Officers in FTO training, general “community safety” perceptions/concerns, prudent risk management considerations, recommendations from PD management based on their experience, additional tasks that may be required of Patrol in the near future, and to meet Officer safety requirements. Officer safety concerns in this context are addressed by establishing a minimum staffing level for a shift that is adhered to notwithstanding the call for service workload demands.

An example of this is determining a minimum staffing level for nighttime hours; although the workload level is generally low and the “proactive time” level from midnight through 8:00 AM is very high (87% from 0000-0400 and 78% from 0400-0800), a minimum number of Patrol Officers are reasonably required to be assigned to the night shift (2200-0800 hours) to provide adequate coverage for the City, meet Officer safety needs and have the ability to handle one critical incident (typically 3-4 Officers and a Sergeant).

The current staffing level of 25 (15 Officers, 5 Corporals and 5 Sergeants) meets all of the criteria listed above and also results in a generally good response times to calls for service and a high “proactive time” level during the day, as this staffing level exceeds the number actually needed to handle the community generated workload volume. However, Pacifica Officers have made good use of their “proactive time”, initiating 16,185 incidents, 40% more than the number of community generated calls for service in 2012 and, as mentioned earlier, is one of the highest Officer activity levels seen by the project team in the hundreds of studies completed throughout the United States. These activities accounted for 4,471 staff hours out of the 26,549 proactive hours in 2012.

The project team recommends retaining the current staffing level of 25 Officers/Corporals/Sergeants on Patrol until a 2nd year of call for service data can be analyzed. If the workload volume remains near the 2012 level, the staffing level should be reduced to 23 (reduction of 2 Officer positions) levels². Whether or not the staffing

² A sample 23 Officer/Corporal/Sergeant Patrol deployment schedule is provided in Appendix C.

level is reduced, the Department should continue to evaluate and conduct data analysis to determine if the workload, performance and productivity are at acceptable levels.

A target service level of 40% “proactive time” based on the 2012 data would result in a reduction of 4 Officer positions – to a total of 21 Patrol staff (16 Officers/Corporals and 5 Sergeants). This would likely result in day shift and night shift being staffed with 5 Officers/Corporals and afternoon shift staffed with 6 Officers/Corporals³. A reduction to this level is not realistic as a shift staffing of 6 personnel (likely for night shift) will only be able to field 3 personnel four days a week and 4 personnel the other three days of the week with the current 10 hour work schedule. Additionally, a reduction below 18 may result in unintended negative consequences such as: an increase in the time to respond to urgent calls for service, a reduction in Officer initiated activity, a decrease in the perception of safety by Pacifica residents, and an increase in the number of crimes and/or a reduction in the number of crimes cleared.

The table below shows the average authorized Patrol staffing level for the current 10 hour shift if the number of Officer positions were reduced by two – to 13 Officers, 5 Corporals and 5 Sergeants⁴. A reduction of two Officer positions would result in an annual salary and benefits savings of \$271,920⁵.

³ A sample 21 Officer/Corporal/Sergeant Patrol deployment schedule is provided in Appendix C.

⁴ At this staffing level Night shift will still only field 3 personnel for two days of the week (for the shifts beginning Monday and Tuesday nights in the sample schedule listed in Appendix C) but 4-5 personnel the other five days.

⁵ Refer to the budget section in Appendix A for details of cost savings estimate.

23 Authorized Patrol Staffing – Officers, Corporals, Sergeants

Hour	A Shift 0700-1700	B Shift 1600-0200	C Shift 2200-0800	Average Shift Staffing with 23 Personnel	2012 Average Shift Staffing – 25 Personnel
0000		4.6	4.0	8.6	9.7
0100		4.6	4.0	8.6	9.7
0200			4.0	4.0	4.0
0300			4.0	4.0	4.0
0400			4.0	4.0	4.0
0500			4.0	4.0	4.0
0600			4.0	4.0	4.0
0700	4.6		4.0	8.6	8.6
0800	4.6			4.6	4.6
0900	4.6			4.6	4.6
1000	4.6			4.6	4.6
1100	4.6			4.6	4.6
1200	4.6			4.6	4.6
1300	4.6			4.6	4.6
1400	4.6			4.6	4.6
1500	4.6			4.6	4.6
1600	4.6	4.6		9.1	10.3
1700		4.6		4.6	5.7
1800		4.6		4.6	5.7
1900		4.6		4.6	5.7
2000		4.6		4.6	5.7
2100		4.6		4.6	5.7
2200		4.5	4.0	8.5	9.6
2300		4.5	4.0	8.5	9.6

Recommendation:

Review the Patrol workload for 2013 and if the level of proactive time remains similar to 2012 (above 50%) then implement a planned reduction of two Patrol Officer positions. Estimated annual salary/benefits savings of \$271,920.

- (3) Sergeants Are a Critical Component of Effective Service Delivery and Supervision of Personnel and the Staffing Level Should be Evaluated Separately.**

While Officers and Corporals handle the great majority of calls for service, Sergeants are a critical component of providing effective patrol services. Sergeants spend a significant portion of their day on administrative duties such as reviewing reports, roster scheduling, approving personnel paperwork, providing direction &

guidance, responding to telephone calls from members of the public, etc. They also have the primary responsibility for supervision of officers in the field and ensuring calls are handled according to Department policy and procedures. When the shift is busy they will spend time in the field assisting officers in handling calls for service or assisting officers as a backup unit.

There are five Sergeant positions assigned to Patrol – two on day shift, two on evening shift and one on night shift. Currently, with one Sergeant off on long term disability the other four Sergeants were re-deployed to 12 hour shifts to provide more supervisory coverage without the use of significant overtime. Supervision is a critical component of risk management and proper functioning of a police department. At least one Sergeant should be on duty 24/7 to provide the necessary shift management, accountability and supervision. The project team used the Sergeant leave data to calculate the number of positions required to field one Sergeant 24/7, shown in the following table.

Patrol Sergeant	Hours
Hours Required to Fill One 24 Hour Position	8,760
Average Annual Hours Worked / Employee (2,080 – 290 leave and training hours)	1,790
Staff Required to Fill One 24 Hour Position	4.9
10 Hour Shift Factor (+15%)	.7
Patrol Sergeants Required	5.6

A total of 5.6 Sergeant positions are needed on Patrol to staff one Sergeant position 24/7 for the year. It is reasonable to round up to staff a total of six Sergeant positions – this will reduce the amount of overtime required and reduce the need to re-deploy Sergeants to 12 hour shifts, as is currently occurring due to one of the Sergeants being on long term disability leave.

Recommendation:

Continue to staff Patrol with five Sergeants, or increase the staffing level to six Sergeants to reduce overtime and minimize the need to redeploy staff.

(4) Comparison of the 10 Hour Schedule with the 12 Hour Patrol Schedule.

Over the last 25 years most law enforcement agencies in California have experimented with different work schedules other than the traditional 8 hour shift. These schedules include a 9 hour, 10 hour, 11 hour and 12 hour work shifts. Most commonly, the 10 hour patrol work schedule has been the primary schedule that law enforcement agencies have adopted, however, in the last 10 years the 12 hour shift has held some attraction for agencies as it only requires two shift deployments rather than the three shift deployments required for a 10 hour schedule.

Currently the PPD works a 10 hour work schedule with rotating work days and days off. Pacifica does not have a “team concept” where Officers/Corporals work with the same personnel each day and are supervised by the same Sergeant. In smaller agencies such as Pacifica the “team concept” often is not employed as it typically requires a higher number of patrol staff. Pacifica has discussed but has never worked a 12 hour patrol schedule, however, other agencies in San Mateo County have worked a 12 hour schedule for several years or longer (e.g. San Mateo County Sheriff’s Office).

Alternate work schedules, also referred to as “compressed work schedules” have existed for decades and various research studies have been conducted that evaluates the effects of the different schedules on workers. A recent study published in December 2011 reported findings from an experiment using different work schedules in the Detroit,

Michigan and Arlington, Texas Police Departments⁶. This study primarily addresses the impacts on personnel that are working the different schedules rather than an evaluation of the cost efficiency of the various schedules, and also uses an 8 hour schedule as the baseline for comparisons to longer work shifts but the principles are instructive for comparison of the 10 hour and 12 hours schedules. The study made the following findings:

- **Sleep and Quality of Life Benefits:** Officers working 10 hour shifts got significantly more sleep than those on 8 hour shifts, the same was not true for those on 12 hour shifts; the same correlation held true for a higher reported quality of work life.
- **Overtime Comparison:** Officers in this study worked the least amount of overtime on the 10 hour shift (0.97 hours); followed by the 12 hour shift (1.89 hours) and those assigned to an 8 hour shift worked significantly more (5.75 hours) in a two week period.
- **Twelve Hour Shifts Resulted in Lower Levels of Alertness:** Shift length did not impact safety (e.g., driving and reaction time) but those assigned to 12 hour shifts had significantly lower average levels of alertness at work than those on 8 hour shifts, and somewhat lower than the 10 hour shift; however, this factor did not translate into reduced performance.
- **Shift Length Did Not Have A Significant Impact on Performance, Safety, Work-Family Conflict, or Health.** Performance and safety measures such as interpersonal interactions, shooting skills, risky driving behaviors, reaction time, and self-initiated departmental activity were not impacted by shift length.

The issues identified in this study are reflective of most of the concerns related to a 12 hour work schedule. Other issues commonly associated with 12 hour shifts include the following: 1) officers working the schedule are only at work on average 14 days out of 28 days which often delays coordination with Detectives on cases and increases the time to complete necessary follow-up; 2) an increased concern related to fatigue if officers are required to work beyond their 12 hour shift; 3) the commute

⁶ "Which Shift is Best?", Karen Amendola, Police Chief Magazine, March 2013

distance travelled before and after their shift; 4) the long days/lack of sleep when officers attend court; and 5) in some agencies it is more difficult to fill office positions (e.g. Detective) if Patrol Officers have more days off due to the 12 hour shift schedule.

Many agencies have used both the 10 hour schedule and the 12 hour schedule for years without any significant and known impacts to the organization or personnel working the schedules. Often it is the circumstances of the city and agency, and the preferences of the officers that determine changing to a different work schedule and the success of a particular schedule. The positive and negative aspects of these two schedules do not lead to a clear recommendation to select one schedule over the other – any decision should be based on local needs and preferences.

The project team has prepared deployment tables for a 12 hour schedule that show the average authorized and actual staffing levels (the detailed deployment schedules are in Appendix D). With this schedule the team concept was able to be implemented, with one exception. However, this schedule does not provide for overlap of shifts (0600 and 1800 hours) unless one or two personnel would be scheduled to provide a minimal overlap (e.g. start at 0700 and 1700).

The tables on the following pages show the authorized staffing levels for a 12 hour work schedule for: 1) the current staffing level of 25 staff – 5 Sergeants, 5 Corporals, 15 Officers, and 2) a reduced staffing level of 23 staff – 5 Sergeants, 5 Corporals and 13 Officers.

25 Authorized Patrol Staffing – Sergeants, Corporals, Officers

Hour	Day Shift 0600-1800	Night Shift 1800-0600	Average Staffing with 12 Hour Shifts	2012 Average Staffing – 10 Hour Shifts ⁷
0000		6.0	6.0	9.7
0100		6.0	6.0	9.7
0200		6.0	6.0	4.0
0300		6.0	6.0	4.0
0400		6.0	6.0	4.0
0500		6.0	6.0	4.0
0600	6.5		6.5	4.0
0700	6.5		6.5	8.6
0800	6.5		6.5	4.6
0900	6.5		6.5	4.6
1000	6.5		6.5	4.6
1100	6.5		6.5	4.6
1200	6.5		6.5	4.6
1300	6.5		6.5	4.6
1400	6.5		6.5	4.6
1500	6.5		6.5	4.6
1600	6.5		6.5	10.3
1700	6.5		6.5	5.7
1800		6.0	6.0	5.7
1900		6.0	6.0	5.7
2000		6.0	6.0	5.7
2100		6.0	6.0	5.7
2200		6.0	6.0	9.6
2300		6.0	6.0	9.6

The above table depicts the average hourly staffing level for 25 Patrol staff working the 12 hour schedule – this level equals an average of 6.3 personnel on duty each hour and a total of approximately 150 hours per day of patrol staffing. The staffing provided by the 10 hour schedule is shown for comparison – it equals an average of 5.9 staff on duty per hour and a total of approximately 142 hours per day of patrol staffing. This staffing level difference is primarily due to the fact that personnel would work an average of 42 hours a week in the 12 hour schedule.

⁷ The average staffing in this column is taken from the table in Section 1 (1) of this chapter, page 31.

23 Authorized Patrol Staffing – Sergeants, Corporals, Officers

Hour	Day Shift 0600-1800	Night Shift 1800-0600	Average Staffing with 12 Hour Shifts	Average Staffing – 10 Hour Shifts ⁸
0000		5.5	5.5	8.6
0100		5.5	5.5	8.6
0200		5.5	5.5	4.0
0300		5.5	5.5	4.0
0400		5.5	5.5	4.0
0500		5.5	5.5	4.0
0600	6.0		6.0	4.0
0700	6.0		6.0	8.6
0800	6.0		6.0	4.6
0900	6.0		6.0	4.6
1000	6.0		6.0	4.6
1100	6.0		6.0	4.6
1200	6.0		6.0	4.6
1300	6.0		6.0	4.6
1400	6.0		6.0	4.6
1500	6.0		6.0	4.6
1600	6.0		6.0	9.1
1700	6.0		6.0	4.6
1800		5.5	5.5	4.6
1900		5.5	5.5	4.6
2000		5.5	5.5	4.6
2100		5.5	5.5	4.6
2200		5.5	5.5	8.5
2300		5.5	5.5	8.5

The above table depicts the hourly staffing level for 23 Patrol staff working the 12 hour schedule – this level equals an average of 5.8 personnel on duty each hour and a total of approximately 138 hours per day of patrol staffing. The staffing provided by the 10 hour schedule is shown for comparison – it equals an average of 5.5 staff on duty per hour and a total of approximately 131 hours per day of patrol staffing.

This 12 hour schedule results in each staff member working 84 hours in a two week cycle; in most agencies using this schedule the 4 extra hours earned are accrued and banked as “comp time” to be taken off with approval. Other 12 hour schedules (e.g.

⁸ The average staffing in this column is taken from the table in Section 1 (1) of this chapter, page 32.

3 on, 4 off; 4 on, 3 off) equals 72 hours worked in two weeks and the employee “owes” the city 8 hours, which can be applied to complete necessary training or for court attendance.

4. EVALUATION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND INVESTIGATIVE DIVISION

This section provides summary workload activities for the Administrative and Investigative Services work units. This Division is staffed with one Captain, two Sergeants, 1 Detective Corporal, 2 Detectives, 2 Records Personnel, 1 Systems Specialist, 1 Evidence Technician and a ½ time Property Clerk.

1. INVESTIGATIONS.

The primary task of the Detectives is to follow-up on crimes or serious incidents that have occurred in Pacifica. Cases are screened and assigned by the Captain and assignments given to the investigators. Any cases that have a lead that would reasonably lead to a suspect responsible for the crime are assigned to a Detective for follow-up. The Sergeant is also assigned cases to investigate in addition to his supervisory responsibilities.

The evaluation of this work unit begins with a review of the number of crimes reported in Pacifica (FBI Part I Crimes) and the clearances of those crimes. Although the overall crime rate and crime clearances is a shared responsibility for the entire organization, and the City, the Investigations Unit has the responsibility to track and evaluate this area of the Department's performance. The clearance of reported crimes is one significant measure of a Department's effectiveness.

(1) Crime Data in Pacifica.

Since 1929 law enforcement agencies have reported crime occurring in their City to the FBI, who collects the data nationally in a format known as the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) system. It is published and used for many purposes, including as a

benchmark for Cities of similar population or location for comparison. Several years ago the FBI developed an expanded crime reporting system known as the National Incident Based Reporting System (NIBRS). The FBI and law enforcement agencies are in a multi-year transition from the UCR system to the NIBRS. Approximately 25% of law enforcement agencies have made the transition to the NIBRS but it is unknown if a mandatory conversion date will be established. Currently Pacifica reports on UCR crimes and information.

The FBI publishes crime and clearance data in the UCR format and it is commonly used for comparison purposes – for historical averages within a City and also in comparison with other Cities. For this report the project team obtained the UCR crime data for calendar years 2010 - 2012. They are listed in the following table.

UCR Part I Crimes⁹

Crime	2010	2011	2012	% Change 2010 to 2012	2010-2012 Average
Homicide	0	0	1	100%	0.3
Forcible Rape	7	4	5	-28.6%	5.3
Robbery	17	7	9	-47.1%	11.0
Aggravated Assault	45	33	27	-40.0%	35.0
Burglary	114	89	148	29.8%	117.0
Larceny – All	580	350	382	-34.1%	437.3
Motor Vehicle Theft	66	45	48	-27.3%	53.0
Arson	6	3	3	-50.0%	4.0
Total	835	531	623	-25.4%	663
Violent Crime	69	44	42	-39.1%	52
Property Crime	766	487	581	-24.2%	611

From 2010 to 2012 the City of Pacifica experienced a 39% decrease in the number of violent crimes and a 24% decrease in the number of property crimes. The

⁹ All crime data was obtained from Pacifica PD statistics that are reported to the State of California Department of Justice.

most significant decreases were in the number of Robberies, down 47%, the number of Aggravated Assaults, down 40%, and the number of Larcenies (which includes auto burglaries), down 34%. The one exception to the general decreases from 2010-2012 is the significant increase in the number of burglaries.

It is very important to monitor and evaluate crime statistics over many years to determine if significant changes are just a one year decrease, or spike in crime, or a multi-year trend. Additionally, crime numbers should be reviewed monthly to determine if a crime trend is developing and, if so, evaluate strategies to address the increase and attempt to reduce the crimes from occurring. Currently, this evaluation should be focused on burglary crime reduction strategies. The “alert” to a crime trend is typically provided by the Department’s crime analyst. The availability and use of a crime analyst for police departments cannot be understated. Analysis of crime information and trends for all agencies is an important part of providing effective service level to the community. Smaller size agencies may not need a full time crime analyst but, as discussed earlier in this report, resources should be provided for this important function.

(2) Crime Clearance Statistics.

Another significant statistic is the clearance rate of crimes that were “solved” or cleared by the Police Department. The number of crimes cleared is a significant measure of the effectiveness of the Investigative Division as it is their primary task to follow-up criminal cases and “clear” the case by identifying the perpetrator of the crime, making an arrest, or clearing the case by other means allowed under UCR standards. Clearance statistics are kept by the Department and monthly reported to the State of California, who reports them to the FBI. The FBI also publishes national average

clearance rate data for varying size cities. The table below shows PPD’s clearances for calendar years 2010 – 2012 and compares the 2011 clearances with the 2011 FBI clearance rate percentage¹⁰ for cities with a population between 25,000 and 49,999.

UCR Part I Crime Clearances

Crime	2010	2010 PPD Clear Rate	2011	2011 PPD Clear Rate	2011 Nat'l Clear Rate	2012	2012 PPD Clear Rate
Homicide	0	NA	0	NA	66.1%	1	NA
Forcible Rape	0	0%	3	60%	37.5%	2	38%
Robbery	8	47%	3	33%	30.3%	3	27%
Aggravated Assault	40	89%	22	81%	58.4%	20	57%
Burglary	13	11%	10	7%	12.5%	21	18%
Larceny – All	109	19%	41	11%	23.5%	40	9%
Motor Vehicle Theft	9	14%	7	15%	11.2%	3	6%
Arson	3	50%	0	0%	19.9%	0	0%
Total	182	-	86	-	-	90	-
Violent Crime	48	70%	28	67%	48.4%	26	50%
Property Crime	134	17%	58	10%	20.1%	64	10%

The City of Pacifica experienced a reduction in the clearance rates for violent crimes from 70% in 2010 to 50% in 2012; while the 50% rate is still slightly above the national average the previous two years is a significantly better performance. Likewise, the property crimes clearance rate decreased from 17% in 2010 to 10% in 2012. it should be a focus of the Investigative Division to evaluate the reasons for the decrease in clearances (performance) and make it a focus to increase the crime clearance rates going forward.

Recommendation:

The PPD should establish a performance measure for the Investigative Division of a specified percentage higher than the national clearance rate for violent crimes and for property crimes (e.g. if the national clearance rate is 20% then the goal would be a 24% clearance rate).

¹⁰ Calendar year 2011 is the most recent published FBI statistics.

(3) Detective Workload.

The table below shows the number of “active” cases for the three investigators – one of the Detective positions is vacant. All investigators are “generalists”, meaning they are assigned both persons crimes and property crimes to investigate. One of the three Detectives is assigned as the Juvenile Detective and is typically assigned cases relating to juvenile victims such as physical or sexual abuse crimes.

An “active” case is where on-going follow-up investigation is being conducted (some investigative activity has been conducted in the past 30 days). Each Detective also has a varying number of “pending cases” where they are waiting for Crime Lab analysis, fingerprint comparison or it has been sent to the prosecutor to review for criminal charges. When information on a pending case is received it will require some additional work, become an active case again or the case will be closed.

Detective Caseload

Detective	Active Cases	Comments
1	9	
2	14	
3	8	Receives all child abuse cases

Each investigator is typically able to begin working their cases within a few days of it being assigned and if the case is a high priority one they will begin working on it immediately.

The number of cases per investigator is at the lower end of the “generalist” Detective average caseload range of 15-25 active cases. Additionally, the total number of Part I crimes that a Detective is typically assigned to conduct a follow-up investigation (homicide, rape, robbery, burglary, aggravated assault, arson) averages 43 cases

annually over the last 3 years, or 4 per month for each of the four Investigators. Currently one Detective position is vacant, which increases the average caseload to 5 Part I crimes monthly. Investigators are also assigned other types of follow-up investigations (e.g. Coroner's cases, vice, special investigations) and have responsibility for supervising the approximately 50 persons who are required to register with the police because of convictions for sex/drug/arson crimes. The level of supervision of these registered offenders varies widely from police agency to police agency. Smaller agencies with fewer investigative staff often only review the case files when the registrant comes to the PD to provide the legally required notifications (e.g. residence location change) and do not proactively review registrant information and conduct follow-up regarding the validity of the information or contact the registrant to ensure current compliance with the laws and in an attempt to reduce re-offending.

Detectives also have some ancillary duties (e.g. the Sergeant manages the Reserve Officer Program, training instructor) and become involved in a variety of other "one time" requests, administrative functions and other issues, as they are the largest office based work unit in the Department.

Detectives do not have any assigned clerical support so perform all of their own photocopying, answering phones, maintaining logs, etc. Detectives also perform "court officer" duties – the taking of cases to the District Attorney's Office for review, discussion with the DA regarding the filing of cases, providing additional information on a case or suspect, requested follow-up, and obtaining of search or arrest warrants. Currently most of this is done at the court in South San Francisco. In the near future this court location will be closing and Pacifica Detectives will need to drive to Redwood

City to do these tasks. It is reasonable and advantageous to provide part time clerical support¹¹ for Detectives to relieve them of administrative work that could be done by a civilian and also some of the District Attorney and Court paperwork filing. If part time assistance is provided it is important to attempt to use a person that is likely to be with the PD for 4-5 years, as it will take several years for a civilian to develop a reasonable level of knowledge and skill in handling some of the “court officer” functions.

However, the primary function of conducting follow-up investigations on assigned cases in Pacifica does not warrant four Investigators. Three Investigators (Sergeant, Corporal, and Detective) are sufficient staffing for the current workload; a reduction of one Detective would result in an annual salary and benefits cost savings of \$135,960¹². One Detective currently is, and would continue to be assigned as the “Juvenile” Detective that handles all juvenile related cases such as child abuse and neglect. This position also is tasked with reviewing of all Juvenile Contact Reports, diversion of cases in coordination with the Youth Services Bureau in San Mateo County; and typically is also assigned all of the sexual assault and elder abuse investigations. The other two Detective positions (Sergeant, Corporal) would handle all of the other follow-up investigations. This staffing level is sufficient to handle the “reactive” workload – incoming cases to conduct follow-up investigations but it is important to note that a staffing level of three Detectives would not typically allow for proactive field work (e.g. narcotics complaint investigation, tasks such as “sting” cars to combat auto theft) by this unit without the use of overtime.

¹¹ Refer to the budget section in Appendix A for details of estimated cost.

¹² Refer to the budget section in Appendix A for details of cost savings estimate.

If this reduction is made it will also be important to closely review and evaluate any negative impact to the crime clearance rate, especially since the violent crime clearance rate was about the national average and the property crime clearance percentage for 2011 and 2012 was about half of the national average.

Recommendations:

Reduce the staffing level in Investigations to three – a Sergeant, Corporal and Detective. Estimated annual salary/benefits savings of \$135,960.

Provide part time clerical support to the Detective Unit. Estimated annual salary/benefits cost of \$50,137.

2. RECORDS UNIT.

The Records Unit is open to the public during normal business hours, and until 7:30 PM on Wednesday evenings. This Unit is staffed with one Records Supervisor and one Records Clerk. The Records Units answers the business phone line for the Department and serves people at the front counter. The primary work tasks include:

- Processing traffic accident reports, traffic citations, tow reports
- Processing arrest reports and sends them to the Court
- Conducting quality control of the reports written before entry into the Records Management System
- Sending copies of reports to Detectives (e.g. felony arrest reports)
- Processing subpoenas for Officers and witnesses
- Processing field interview cards submitted by Officers
- Maintaining and submitting UCR (Uniform Crime Reports) data

The Records Unit does not keep any specific workload statistics. The Records Unit provides a valuable service to the Department and the public and appears to be well organized with the current staff of one Supervisor and one Clerk.

3. EVIDENCE PROCESSING AND PROPERTY ROOM.

This work unit has two civilian personnel assigned – a full time Evidence Technician who supervises a ½ time Property Clerk. The Evidence Technician also performs all of the property room functions as needed.

Following are the primary tasks assigned to the Evidence Technician:

- Receives and processes evidence submitted by Officers – this includes examination of latent print cards and comparisons with known suspects, “swabbing” of evidence for DNA, other processing requested by Officers, obtains and processes all digital media/evidence, prepares reports for the case file to document her work. This takes approximately 60% of her time on average.
- Field work – processing crime scenes and collecting evidence, taking photographs. This takes approximately 10-20% of her time on average.
- Supervision of the Property Room and performing general tasks. This takes approximately 15-20% of her time on average.
- Assists management staff in audits (primarily for guns, drugs, cash; a general “spot check” audit is conducted annually)
- The Evidence Technician performs other administrative work and tasks as assigned (e.g. RIMS maintenance and QC, maintenance of mug shot and gang databases, revision of policy, Livescan fees processing, issuing city ID cards, etc.)

These are important functions for the Department and the Evidence Technician performs a fairly wide ranging set of tasks. This is a critical position within the Department that requires a person with a wide range of skills that are developed over many years. In these important functions it is important to develop and train another employee to provide back-up support functions.

Following are the primary tasks assigned to the Property Clerk:

- Receive evidence and property booked into the Property Room by officers; ensure all items are properly labeled and packaged.
- Bar code, label and enter all items into RIMS

- Purges and properly disposes of items no longer needed (return to owner, dispose, and send to auction company, or destroy)
- Assists management staff in audits (primarily for guns, drugs, cash; a general “spot check” audit is conducted annually)
- Receives and disposes of prescription medication dropped off at the PD
- Takes evidence items to the Crime Lab for processing

The Property Room is a large modern facility that has sufficient storage space and is kept orderly. Access to the Property Room is through the PD card key system and personal PIN number (no hard keys) and only the assigned Captain, Evidence Technician and Property Clerk have access to the main room. Access to the interior room is further restricted to only the Evidence Technician and Property Clerk.

PPD policy requires Officers to complete a property report for all items of evidence/property seized or kept by the Department. Officers complete an electronic Property Report, place the items in a bag and then into the temporary storage lockers for processing by the Property Clerk. The Property Clerk reviews the electronic Property Report for correct entry into the RIMS (Records and Information Management System); it is then bar-coded, labeled and stored. The Property Room is in process of bar-coding all of the older property items in the 126 storage bins in the Property Room, approximately 85,000 items; they have been assisted by volunteers and are approximately 50% completed with this project.

Appropriate storage is provided for firearms, narcotics, cash (only that needed as evidence is kept), drying wet/bloody evidence and items requiring freezing.

Annual audits are conducted by the Department of all the firearms, narcotics and cash items in the Property Room. Additionally, the Captain conducts an impromptu

audit during the year of a storage bin and/or items of his choosing. When a new Captain is assigned to oversee the Property Room a complete audit of the firearms, narcotics and cash is conducted within a few weeks. Currently, written documentation is not completed for these audits.

Regular and consistent auditing of the Property Room is critical to ensuring the integrity of the Department's property and evidence. Quarterly and annual (more comprehensive) audits of the Property Room should be conducted by one of the Captains and documented. These procedures should be included in the Department's Policy and Procedures.

Recommendation:

Formalize quarterly and annual Property Room audits in policy and complete written documentation of each audit conducted.

4. ADMINISTRATION AND TRAINING.

This unit is staffed with one Sergeant who performs a wide variety of functions. The various training functions take approximately 50% of his time on average, approximately 30% of his time on hiring process (primarily for new Officers) and the rest of his time is spent on other administrative functions. This position also supervises the Information Systems Specialist and the functions related to this job (see the matrix earlier in this report for the specific job duties).

Following are the primary tasks assigned to the Admin and Training Sergeant:

- Identify training needs and develop a plan to provide the needed training to employees.
- Tracks and maintains training records of employees.

- Coordinate all in-house and “away” training of PD employees to maintain certification as a peace officer, including scheduling, assigning, processing paperwork.
 - Participates in County and regional professional associations such as the San Mateo County Training Managers Association.
 - Conducts hiring process for the PD, including processing of paperwork, scheduling and conducting interviews and background investigations.
 - Manages field training program and supervises new Officers in training.
 - Administrative tasks such as responding to inquiries from the public, internal affairs investigations as assigned, revision of policy and training manuals.
 - General research and development functions.
- In a small agency such as Pacifica the person assigned to this type of position is

frequently the person that is tasked with all of the “other” administrative tasks that the Chief and Captains want to accomplish. It is a critical position in the organization and important to keep consistently staffed.

The Department’s “Systems Specialist” is responsible for most of the technology systems and equipment for the Department, including computers, their support system and hardware, the telephone system, mobile & portable radios, cell phones, CAD connectivity, Officers audio/video recording system, cable TV, building cameras, card keys. He is responsible to maintain and improve these systems and also planning for future changes to systems. This is another critical position within the Department that requires a person with a wide range of skills to know the technology used and its application to law enforcement use. In PPD this is primarily the Systems Specialist – and in these important functions it is important to develop and train another employee to provide back-up support.

APPENDIX A – POLICE DEPARTMENT BUDGET, STAFFING, RESPONSIBILITIES OF PERSONNEL

The Pacifica Police Department provides a wide range of law enforcement services for approximately 37,000 residents and covering 12.6 square miles. The population of Pacifica has remained stable over the last 10 years. To provide law enforcement services in Pacifica, the two Police Captains share responsibilities for field patrol services, investigations and administrative services. The information contained here was developed through interviews of PPD management and personnel, review of documents, call for service data, investigator “desk audits” and other data provided to the project team.

This Appendix summarizes Department budget, current (2013) staffing level, job responsibilities and functions for each position within the Pacifica Police Department.

1. POLICE DEPARTMENT 2009 – 2013 BUDGET AND PERSONNEL COSTS.

Over the last four fiscal years (July 1 – June 30) the overall Department funding has decreased by \$589,345 (6.4%). The table below shows the line items for Patrol Services but just the total expense for the other eight service areas.

CITY OF PACIFICA, CALIFORNIA
Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency Study of the Police Department

Patrol Services Budget Item	FY 09/10 Actual	FY 10/11 Actual	FY 11/12 Actual	FY 12/13 Budget	% Change 2010 to 2013
Salaries – Regular	3,010,654	3,136,284	2,911,859	2,747,800	(262,855)
Salaries- Part-Time	13,379	29,833	5,012	-	(13,380)
Salaries – Overtime	513,683	498,861	462,767	475,000	(38,684)
Retirement	1,078,580	1,088,543	1,171,501	1,306,494	227,913
Benefits	559,400	568,044	337,161	526,902	(32,499)
Uniform Allowance	22,858	9,203	7,720	4,000	(18,859)
Conferences And Training	23,027	13,581	12,585	25,000	1,972
In-Service Training	27,666	36,534	33,883	35,000	7,333
Utilities- Gas And Electric	70,629	71,416	70,410	75,000	4,370
Departmental Expense	40,043	46,054	34,391	44,000	3,956
Operating Software	-	15,000	-	-	
Annual Motor Pool Expense	140,418	146,035	151,876	157,951	17,532
Annual Depreciation/Replacement	43,200	44,928	46,725	48,594	5,393
Contractual Services	78,699	114,088	88,717	103,050	24,350
County Charges	56,853	54,710	48,774	43,700	(13,154)
Trans For Capital-Vehicle	12,936	-	-	-	(12,937)
Capital Outlay	24,060	2,622	-	-	(24,061)
Patrol Services Total	5,716,085	5,875,736	5,383,381	5,592,491	(123,595)
Totals for:					
Traffic Safety Services	179,899	158,805	148,190	159,512	(20,388)
Crime Prevention	55,841	69,524	45,845	36,518	(19,324)
Investigative & Technical Services	1,147,466	1,223,654	1,118,887	1,041,826	(105,641)
Juvenile Services	243,182	261,360	225,884	240,174	(3,009)
Narcotics Task Force	71,541	73,766	70,294	70,989	(553)
Records	615,441	693,891	562,730	552,158	(63,284)
Communications Services	1,007,890	1,185,181	921,584	825,972	(181,919)
Disaster Preparedness	155,249	127,213	117,735	128,242	(27,008)
Department Total	9,250,746	9,696,113	8,689,981	8,661,402	(589,345)
Various Grants (Traffic Safety, etc.)	116,304	139,293	179,153	13,520	

Due to budgetary needs the Police Department has been required to realize efficiencies wherever possible – significant changes have included a reduction in staff and the outsourcing of Communications services to South San Francisco Police Department. The Department has also sought and received grant funding that has totaled over \$434,000 in the last three fiscal years (additional grant funds will be received for FY 2012/13).

Current indications are that the financial circumstances for the City will not support increases in funding for the Police Department in the next few years and, depending on the level of revenue received and expenses, may require further funding reduction. In this budget environment it is important for managers and employees to continue to operate prudently and, as PPD has done, pursue grant funding as it is available to supplement law enforcement functions.

In this report there are several recommendations made regarding a decrease or increase in the staffing level – they involve the Officer, Corporal, Sergeant and Administrative Assistant positions. The table below shows the average current cost for each of these positions (based on the data provided by the Finance Department).

Position	Salary	PERS Cost	Other Benefits Cost	Total
Officer	92,614	23,348	19,998	135,960
Corporal	115,535	29,041	20,650	165,225
Sergeant	126,989	32,011	21,459	180,459
Admin. Assistant (.5 FTE)	30,624	3,575	15,938	50,137
Admin. Assistant (1.0 FTE)	59,892	6,991	16,658	83,541

The Administrative Assistant position is currently a ½ time position; the cost estimate for a full time Administrative Assistant was based on the cost of a Records Clerk position.

The following section describes the staffing level and responsibilities of various members of the Police Department.

2. OVERVIEW AND STAFFING LEVELS.

The police department has a total of 38 sworn and civilian positions authorized and budgeted positions (full-time equivalents or FTEs). The authorized positions are deployed in the following work units:

	Chief	Captain	Sergeant	Corporal	Officer	Civilian
Office of the Chief	1					.5
Patrol		1	5	5	15	
Admin. & Investigations		1	1	1	2	1.5
Records						2
Admin / Training			1			1
Total	1	2	7	6	17	5

The following section lists the job responsibilities and tasks for each position in the organization.

3. PERSONNEL ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.

The table below provides a summary of the primary roles and responsibilities of the personnel within the PPD:

Division / Function	Classification and Authorized Staffing		Key Roles and Responsibilities
Office of the Chief	Chief	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides the overall leadership, guidance, management and administration of the Department personnel and police services. Manages and coordinates all police services in the City to meet objectives set by the Mayor and City Council. Develops Department policies and procedures. Responsible for overall management of risk in the Department. Supervises the Captains. Develops and maintains good working relationships with other managers in the City and peers in the regional and state law enforcement community. Develops and maintains good working relationships with local business leaders, community leaders and school officials. Performs routine administrative functions in the day to day management of the Department.

CITY OF PACIFICA, CALIFORNIA
Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency Study of the Police Department

Division / Function	Classification and Authorized Staffing		Key Roles and Responsibilities
Office of the Chief	Administrative Assistant	.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides secretarial and office administrative assistance to the Chief of Police and Captains. • Performs a variety of office administrative tasks, including the maintenance of records and files, scheduling appointments, answering phones, ordering supplies. • Coordinates submission of timecards to payroll. • Processes/logs vacation and other time off requests. • Coordinates maintenance and pays bills associated with operations. • Processes massage permit renewals, bingo permits, block parties, etc. • Special projects as assigned. • Typically works mornings M-F.
Field Services Administrative and Investigative Services	Captain (one in each Division)	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leads and manages the department to deliver police services. • Develops and implements Department policies, procedures, goals and objectives. • Works closely with the Chief to accomplish the goals of the Department. • Responsible for management of risk in the Department. • Directly supervise Sergeants and other personnel in their Division. • Overall responsibility for the proper functioning and work output of their Division. • Reviews reports of incidents. • Responds to requests from the media for information and interviews. • Directly oversee activities and provide assistance as appropriate, responds to major incidents and emergencies. • Oversees and participates in the development of the annual budget; monitors expenditures. • Performs routine administrative functions, approves bill payment, equipment purchases, etc. • Conducts special projects as appropriate. • Assumes command of the Department in the absence of the Chief.

CITY OF PACIFICA, CALIFORNIA
Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency Study of the Police Department

Division / Function	Classification and Authorized Staffing		Key Roles and Responsibilities
Patrol	Sergeant	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serves as the Watch Commander during the work shift; ensures there is adequate staffing to handle calls in the field and dispatch center. • Responsible for and supervises Corporals and Officers during their shift, ensure field resources are being utilized properly to address problems in the City. • Responds to major incidents and coordinates field responses as appropriate. • Keeps Captains and Chief informed of significant or newsworthy incidents. • Reviews written work and reports of Corporals and Officers. • Conducts monthly supervisory reviews of employees. • Trains, counsels, mentors and audits employees' performance; takes corrective or disciplinary action as necessary. • Receives and handles complaints from members of the public.
Patrol	Corporal Officer	5 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respond to all calls for service in the city, including crimes against persons, property crimes, domestic disputes, traffic collisions, disturbances. • Provide direct field enforcement of all applicable laws and ordinances. • Write reports; conduct preliminary investigations of crime, conducts follow-up investigations as appropriate, book prisoners, transport prisoners. • Engage in neighborhood patrols, directed patrol, traffic enforcement and other proactive activities to reduce crime. • Respond to questions, concerns and requests from the general public and provides information and problem resolution as necessary. • Identify and address both criminal and quality of life issues on their beat. • Assigned to pro-actively contact school personnel and students at the high schools to provide a positive police presence at the schools. • Corporals serve as the Watch Commander during the work shift in the absence of a Sergeant. • Corporals conduct monthly supervisory reviews of employees.

CITY OF PACIFICA, CALIFORNIA
Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency Study of the Police Department

Division / Function	Classification and Authorized Staffing		Key Roles and Responsibilities
Administration & Training	Sergeant	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinates all new officer (academy liaison), in-service continual professional training conducted by the PD and all special skills training (away courses). • Conducts recruiting and new Officer testing process; conducts all background investigations. • Supervises new Officers when at the Academy. • Coordinates travel arrangements for officers training courses. • Identifies training needs and schedules courses to provide mandated in-service and discretionary training to Department members. • Coordinates training with other training managers in the County. • Manages the FTO Program and monitors the training of new Officers. • Ensures paperwork for training classes is submitted to the state. • Enters Officers' training class records in the database. • Investigates Internal Affairs cases as assigned by the Chief. • Works on special projects such as revision of the FTO Manual.
Records	Records Supervisor	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Supervisor is responsible for managing and directing all work in the Records Unit. • Manages and supervises the file maintenance system for all police records and related documents. • Processes all crime reports, arrest reports, citations and field interview cards written by Officers; does quality control of all reports for entry into the RIMS (Records Information Management System). • Processes requests for reports and background checks. • Distributes citations and other paperwork to the appropriate Courts. • Responsible for handling all in-person and requests received in the mail, processing the requests and making copies of reports for members of the public. • Answers main Department phone number, distributes mail coming in to the Department. • Ensures completion of crime report processing, data entry and distribution of reports. • Processes subpoenas for Officers and witnesses. • Supervision of the volunteer scanning old case reports into a digital system. • Processes building alarm bills (for false alarms). • Tracks and reports Uniform Crime Data each month; sends traffic reports to CHP.
	Records Clerk	1	

CITY OF PACIFICA, CALIFORNIA
Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency Study of the Police Department

Division / Function	Classification and Authorized Staffing		Key Roles and Responsibilities
Evidence & Property	Evidence Technician	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducts latent print examinations of evidence to determine if it is suitable for submission to the crime lab (for AFIS comparison). • Processes evidence for examination as requested (e.g. swabbing for DNA analysis). • Provides field evidence services at crimes scenes as requested. • Supervises the Property Clerk and property room.
	Property Clerk	.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsible for receiving, logging, classifying, storing, and maintaining the custody and control of evidence so that it can be presented in court; returned to its rightful owner; auctioned, or properly destroyed. • Computer data entry, filing of hard copy evidence forms and processing the evidence for storage or transfer to the Crime lab. • Receives unwanted drug prescriptions from the public for proper disposal. • Takes evidence for processing to the crime lab. • Assists in conducting audits of the property room. • Orders and replenishes supplies for property and evidence packaging.
Administrative Services	Systems Specialist	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsible for most technology systems and equipment for the Department: computer systems and hardware, telephone system, mobile & portable radios, cell phones, CAD connectivity, Officers audio/video recording system, cable TV, building cameras, card keys. • Conducts maintenance and improvements of all of these systems. • Plans for future changes to systems.

CITY OF PACIFICA, CALIFORNIA
Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency Study of the Police Department

Division / Function	Classification and Authorized Staffing		Key Roles and Responsibilities
Investigations	Sergeant Corporal Detective	1 1 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct follow-up investigations for all assigned cases, both person crimes and property crimes, including: homicides, robbery, burglary, rape, sexual assaults, registering/follow-up on 290 P.C. sex registrants and related violations; missing persons, significant frauds, narcotic crimes and other cases needing follow-up. • Case assignments made by the Captain and Sergeant; Sergeant also carries an investigative caseload. • Coordinate with Patrol Officers as necessary to complete crime reports and investigations. • Detectives are subject to call-out as needed. <p>Additional duties for Sergeant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Sergeant investigates Internal Affairs cases as assigned by the Chief. • Liaison with Corporation Yard regarding fleet. <p>NOTE: One Detective position is vacant.</p>
Total Positions		38	

In total, the Pacifica Police Department has a total of 38 budgeted “Full Time Equivalent” (FTE) positions – 33 sworn and 5 civilian FTE positions (there are six civilian employees as two of the six are half time positions). In addition to the duties listed above for each position, most members of the Department have ancillary duties such as the Reserve Officer program, revision of specific policies, sitting on hiring boards, liaison with social service agencies, etc.

APPENDIX B – SUMMARY OF THE EMPLOYEE SURVEY

As part of the Pacifica Police Department’s study, the project team developed and distributed a survey to the employees of the police department. This survey was distributed in February 2013. The following summary provides information regarding this survey instrument.

1. AN ANONYMOUS SURVEY WAS CIRCULATED TO ALL EMPLOYEES.

An anonymous survey was circulated to all Pacifica Police Department employees to enable employees to provide their opinions about the strengths of the Department and any improvement opportunities that may exist. The employees were asked to rate statements (using a scale of 1 to 10), ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree, from Poor to Excellent, and to leave a question blank for No Opinion, in the following categories:

- Service to the Community
- Management / Administration
- Organization, Staffing, and Operations
- Equipment and Facilities

There were a total of 40 surveys distributed, of which 27 individuals responded, resulting in an overall response rate of 68%. The following table shows the breakdown of employee responses.

Status	
Sworn	21
Civilian	6
Total	27

The following sections summarize the results of the employee survey.

2. AN OVERWHELMING MAJORITY OF RESPONDENTS AGREED THAT THE DEPARTMENT MEETS THE SERVICE EXPECTATIONS OF THE COMMUNITY.

Respondents were provided with a series of statements concerning the level of service to the community. The survey questions in this category and their responses are summarized in the table below:

Statement	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	No Opinion
1. The Pacifica Police Department meets the service expectations of the community.	0%	0%	100%	0%
2. The Pacifica Police Department meets the unique needs of this community.	0%	0%	100%	0%
3. City residents view our Department as a high priority.	15%	37%	48%	0%
4. Our approach to policing improves the quality of life in Pacifica.	0%	4%	96%	0%
5. "Community Policing" is a high priority for the Department.	0%	11%	89%	0%
6. City residents and businesses support their police department.	11%	15%	74%	0%

The following points summarize the statistical information provided in the table, above:

- 100% of the respondents agreed with question #1, "The Pacifica Police Department meets the service expectations of the community."
- All of the respondents (100%), agreed with question #2, "The Pacifica Police Department meets the unique needs of this community." This response pattern mirrors the response to the previous question and it follows that employees also believe the PD meets the unique needs of the community.
- Respondents had a mixed reaction to question #3, "City residents view our Department as a high priority." Almost a majority of respondents, 48%, agreed with the statement, while 15% disagreed, and 37% were neutral.
- An overwhelming majority of respondents, 96%, agreed with question #4, "Our approach to policing improves the quality of life in Pacifica." None of the respondents disagreed with this statement, but 4% did choose to remain neutral. Since improving the quality of life in Pacific could be considered meeting the

service expectations of the community, including any unique needs, it shows a consistency in responses.

- A majority of the respondents, 89%, agreed with question #5, “Community Policing’ is a high priority for the Department.” None of the respondents disagreed and 11% were neutral.
- A majority of the respondents, 74%, agreed with question #6, “City residents and business support their police Department.” Approximately 11% of the respondents disagreed, and 15% remained neutral. As this question relates closely to question #3, it is interesting to note that while the majority of the respondents agreed that residents and businesses support their department, there was no majority in terms of those same residents viewing the Police Department as a high priority.

In summary, an overwhelming majority of respondents agreed that the Department was able to meet the service expectations and needs of the community, including improving the quality of its life. However, while respondents believed that city residents and businesses support their department, there was mixed reaction regarding whether that support extended to viewing their police department as a high priority.

3. THE MAJORITY OF RESPONDENTS AGREED WITH THE MANAGEMENT STYLE OF THE DEPARTMENT EXCEPT FOR MIXED RESPONSES REGARDING THE DEPARTMENT’S VISION AND TIMELY DECISION MAKING.

Respondents were asked to respond to a series of statements relating to the administrative procedures and the management style of the Pacifica Police department.

The responses to the statements in this category are summarized in the following table:

Statement	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	No Opinion
7. Our department has a clear vision / direction for the future.	22%	30%	48%	0%
8. I am kept informed of important Departmental information.	22%	26%	52%	0%
9. My opinions are listened to and considered in this Department.	22%	11%	63%	4%
10. My work performance expectations are made clear.	7%	0%	93%	0%

CITY OF PACIFICA, CALIFORNIA
Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency Study of the Police Department

Statement	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	No Opinion
11. When problems and issues arise, they are resolved quickly.	19%	18%	63%	0%
12. Staff at all levels of the organization are held accountable for their actions.	19%	22%	59%	0%
13. Our Department seems to be innovative and progressive.	15%	15%	70%	0%
14. Our Department does a good job planning and scheduling our work assignments.	15%	22%	59%	4%
15. Our Department does a good job making decisions in a timely manner.	26%	33%	41%	0%
16. Our policies and procedures are up to date and consistently followed by staff.	7%	15%	78%	0%
17. When employee discipline is needed it is fair and consistent.	7%	22%	64%	7%

The following points summarize the statistical information provided in the table above:

- Respondents had a mixed reaction to question #7, “Our Department has a clear vision / direction for the future.” Almost a majority of respondents, 48%, agreed with the statement, while 22% disagreed, and 30% remained neutral.
- A slight majority of respondents, 52%, agreed with question #8, “I am kept informed of important Departmental information.” Approximately 22% of the respondents disagreed, and 26% remained neutral.
- A majority of the respondents, 63%, agreed with question #9, “My opinions are listened to and considered in this Department.” Approximately 22% disagreed, 11% were neutral, and 4% had no opinion. This consistency in disagreement of respondents, suggests that the same set of individuals disagree with the department management communication style.
- An overwhelming majority of respondents, 93%, agreed with question #10, “My work performance expectations are made clear” and only 7% disagreed.
- A majority of the respondents, 63%, agreed with question #11, “When problems and issues arise, they are resolved quickly.” About 19% disagreed, with 18% remaining neutral.
- A majority of the respondents, 59%, agreed with question #12, “Staff at all levels of the organization are held accountable for their actions.” About 19% of respondents disagreed and 22% were neutral.

- A majority of the respondents, 70%, agreed with question #13, “Our Department seems to be innovative and progressive.” The same proportion of respondents, 15%, disagreed and remained neutral regarding the issue.
- A majority of the respondents, 59%, agreed with question #14, “Our Department does a good job planning and scheduling our work assignments.” Approximately 15% disagreed, 22% were neutral, and 4% had no opinion.
- Similar to question #7, respondents also had a mixed reaction to question #15, “Our Department does a good job making decisions in a timely manner.” While 41% agreed with the statement, 26% of the respondents disagreed, and 33% remained neutral. Considering that making decisions in a timely manner can relate to the department having a clear vision / direction for the future, this mixed response reinforces that employees have been consistent in their responses.
- Approximately 78% of the respondents agreed with question #16, “Our policies and procedures are up to date and consistently followed by staff.” Only 7% disagreed and 15% were neutral.
- A majority of respondents, 64%, agreed with question #17, “When employee discipline is needed it is fair and consistent.” Only 7% disagreed, 22% remained neutral, and 7% had no opinion.

In summary, for the statements relating to administrative procedure and management oversight, the majority of respondents generally agreed with the current management style, leadership, communication, and problem resolution. However, respondents did have mixed reactions regarding the department’s vision for the future and its ability to make decisions in a timely manner.

4. MAJORITY OF RESPONDENTS DISAGREED WITH STAFFING LEVELS BUT AGREED WITH PERFORMANCE MEASURES, DEPARTMENT OPERATIONS, AND THAT THEY COULD MAKE A CAREER AT THE POLICE DEPARTMENT.

Respondents were asked to respond to several statements regarding staffing levels, organizational structure, department operations, and career aspirations at the Pacifica Police Department. The survey questions in this category and their responses are summarized in the table below:

Statement	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	No Opinion
18. We have the staff we need to perform safely and effectively during incidents.	67%	18%	11%	4%
19. We do a good job anticipating problems.	15%	30%	55%	0%
20. Our Department effectively uses performance measures to improve services.	4%	41%	52%	4%
21. Our organizational structure is appropriate for a department our size.	26%	26%	48%	0%
22. My general morale about my job is good.	15%	33%	52%	0%
23. I can make a career at the Pacifica Police Department.	4%	15%	81%	0%

The following points summarize the statistical information provided in the table, above:

- A majority of respondents, 67%, disagreed with question #18, “We have the staff we need to perform safely and effectively during incidents.” Approximately 11% agreed, 18% were neutral, and 4% had no opinion. Overall, respondents feel that staffing levels are inadequate.
- A majority of respondents, 55%, agreed with question #19, “We do a good job anticipating problems.” Approximately 15% disagreed and 30% were neutral.
- A slim majority of the respondents, 52%, agreed with question #20, “Our Department effectively uses performance measures to improve services.” Only 4% disagreed and 4% also had no opinion, but 41% remained neutral regarding this issue. It is interesting to note the high percentage of neutral responses, which suggests that while respondents may not have disagreed with the statement, they did not necessarily agree with the Department’s effective use of performance measures. These performance measures could even relate to inadequate staffing level touched upon in question #18.
- Respondents had mixed reactions to question #21, “Our organizational structure is appropriate for a department our size” Approximately 26% of respondents disagreed, 26% remained neutral, and 48% agreed. The mixed responses in this statement are consistent with the other opinions expressed in this section.
- A slight majority of the respondents, 52%, agreed with question #22, “My general morale about my job is good.” About 15% disagreed and 33% remained neutral.
- A strong majority of the respondents, 81%, agreed with question #23, “I can make a career at the Pacifica Police Department.” Only 4% of the respondents disagreed, and the remaining 15% were neutral.

In summary, respondents generally believe the department’s staffing level is inadequate. While there was a positive majority, the majority was slim regarding the Department’s anticipation of problems and their general morale. In terms of effective use of performance measures, only a slight majority agreed with the statement, while the remainder of the respondents provided a neutral response. Additionally, respondents had a mixed reaction to the organizational structure being appropriate relative to the size of the department. However, a majority of respondents did agree that they could make a career at the Police Department.

5. RESPONDENTS BELIEVED THEIR WORKLOAD TO BE HEAVY, BUT THEY WERE STILL ABLE TO KEEP UP WITH IT.

Respondents were asked to respond to a question regarding their typical day-to-day workload. The survey question in this category and its response is summarized in the table below:

Statement	% of Responses
About the right balance between time available and the amount of work.	22%
I am always overloaded. I can never catch up.	19%
I could handle more work without being overloaded.	0%
Sometimes my workload is heavy, but most of the time I can keep up.	59%

In summary, none of the respondents felt that they could handle more work without being overloaded, 19% felt that they were always overloaded and could never catch up, 22% felt that they had the right balance between time and the amount of work, and 59%, felt that their workload was heavy, but they were able to keep up most of the time. This response pattern proves consistent with the discussion of inadequate staffing level expressed in the previous section of the survey; because if the respondents

believe that there is inadequate staffing then that means that there is potential for a heavy workload and also for them being overloaded.

6. EMPLOYEES GENERALLY HAD MIXED RATINGS REGARDING MOST OF THE PROGRAMS AND SERVICES, BUT THE MAJORITY OF EMPLOYEES RATED INTERACTION WITH CITIZENS AND POLICE FACILITY SECURITY AS EXCELLENT.

Respondents were asked to respond to a series of statements evaluating the quality and / or effectiveness of the programs and services of the Police Department.

The following table summarizes the programs and services and their ratings:

Programs / Services	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	No Opinion
25a. Response times to calls for service.	4%	0%	37%	44%	15%
25b. Availability of backup for officer safety.	11%	40%	30%	4%	15%
25c. Department capabilities for selective enforcement of targeted problems.	11%	30%	33%	15%	11%
25d. Amount of proactive time in the field.	0%	30%	44%	11%	15%
25e. The way officers deal with citizens.	0%	0%	22%	70%	8%
25f. The depth and quality of investigations.	0%	15%	33%	37%	15%
25g. Police facility security for staff and evidence.	4%	4%	18%	63%	11%
25h. Quality of dispatch services.	7%	30%	41%	11%	11%
25i. Availability and content of training.	4%	11%	33%	41%	11%
25j. Crime Analysis.	15%	26%	33%	11%	15%
25k. Coordination with regional agencies (i.e., for narcotic enforcement, etc.).	4%	26%	22%	33%	15%

The following points summarize the statistical information provided in the table above:

- Approximately 44% of respondents rated #25a, “Response times to calls for service” as excellent, only 4% as poor, none of the respondents chose fair, 37% rated it as good, and 15% had no opinion.
- Respondents had a mixed response to #25b, “Availability of backup for officer safety.” 11% rated it as poor, 40% as fair, 30% as good, only 4% rated it as excellent, and 15% had no opinion. It can be seen that even though there is no

clear majority, the majority of responses fell either in the fair or good category. This response remains consistent with the inadequate staffing levels and workload levels discussed in previous sections of the survey analysis.

- Respondents had varied responses to #25c, “Department capabilities for selective enforcement of targeted problems.” About 11% rated it as poor, 30% as fair, 33% as good, 15% as excellent, and 11% had no opinion. Once again, the majority of responses fell into either the fair or good categories.
- None of the respondents rated #25d, “Amount of proactive time in the field” as poor, 30% rated it as fair, 44% as good, 11% as excellent, and 15% had no opinion. Considering that the majority of the respondents of the survey are field officers, it makes sense that they would not rate “proactive time” in the field as poor, but it is interesting to note that there was no clear majority in any category and that the responses were either fair or good, rather than being centered between good and excellent.
- A majority of respondents, 70%, felt that #25e, “The way officers deal with citizens” was excellent. None of the respondents rated interaction with citizens as either poor or fair, 22% chose good, and 8% were neutral.
- Approximately a third of the respondents (33%) ranked #25f, “The depth and quality of investigations” as good, none of the respondents chose poor, 15% as fair, 37% as excellent, and 15% were neutral. This is one of the few services in which the majority of employees responded either in the good or excellent category.
- A majority of respondents, 63%, ranked #25g, “Police facility security for staff and evidence” as excellent, 4% as poor, 4% as fair, 18% as good, and 11% were neutral. Other than interaction with citizens, this is the only program / service, which has a clear majority in any single category.
- Only 7% of respondents qualified question #25i, “Quality of dispatch services” as poor, 30% as fair, 41% as good, 11% as excellent, and only 11% remained neutral. Once again the responses fall into either the fair or good categories.
- Approximately 41% of respondents ranked #25j, “Availability and content of training” as excellent, 33% as good, 11% as fair, only 4% as poor, and 11% were neutral.
- A third of the respondents (33%) rated #25k, “Crime analysis” to be good, 15% stated it to be poor, 26% as fair, 11% as excellent, and 15% remained neutral on its quality of crime analysis. Even though there was no clear majority, the plurality of responses fell into either the fair or good category.

- There was a large variation in responses in regards to rating #25I, “Coordination with regional agencies (i.e., for narcotic enforcement, etc.)” Only 4% rated this cooperation as poor, 26% as fair, 22% as good, 33% as excellent, and 15% had no opinion regarding the program.

In summary, for most of the programs and services there was no category in which there was a clear majority, most of the responses hovered between the fair and good categories. There were only two areas in which respondents rated the police programs and services as excellent: interaction with citizens and police facility security for staff and evidence. The responses in this section were consistent with many of the opinions expressed in previous sections of the survey.

7. NONE OF THE RESPONDENTS RATED ANY OF THE EQUIPMENT AS POOR AND THE MAJORITY OF RESPONDENTS RATED POLICE FACILITY AS EXCELLENT.

Respondents were asked to rate the quality of equipment and facilities available to the Police Department. The items in this category and their ratings are summarized in the table below:

Item	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	No Opinion
26a. Vehicles	0%	11%	41%	37%	11%
26b. Radios	0%	22%	48%	19%	11%
26c. Officer personal equipment (e.g., vests)	0%	4%	48%	33%	15%
26d. Mobile Data Computers	0%	15%	40%	30%	15%
26e. Police Facility	0%	4%	22%	74%	0%

The following points summarize the statistical information provided in the table above and on the previous page:

- Approximately 41% of the respondents rated vehicles (#26a) as good, 0% as poor, 11% as fair, 37% as excellent, and 11% had no opinion. The majority of responses felt into the good or excellent categories.
- Almost a majority of respondents ranked the radios (#26b) as good, none of the respondents chose poor, 22% rated it as fair, 19% as excellent, and 11% were

neutral. In this instance the majority of responses were fair or good, rather than good and excellent.

- Similar to radios, almost a majority of respondents at 48% also rated Officer personal equipment (#26c) as good, while 0% rated it as poor, only 4% rated it as fair, 33% rated it as excellent, and 15% had no opinion. However, different from radios the majority of responses for officer personal equipment were either good or excellent.
- None of the respondents qualified Mobile Data Computers (#26d) as poor, 15% as fair, 40% as good, 30% as excellent and 15% were neutral.
- A majority of respondents, 74%, stated Police Facility (#26e) to be excellent, none of the respondents rated it as poor or had no opinion, only 4% chose fair, and the remaining 22% rated it as good. This was the only facility in question, and it was also the only statement to receive a clear majority in one category.

In summary, this is the only section of the survey in which respondents are asked to present their opinions regarding police equipment and facilities. A majority of respondents rated their equipment as either excellent or good and a significant majority of 74% rated the police facility as excellent.

8. NARRATIVE SURVEY RESPONSES.

In addition to the survey's forced choice questions, respondents were asked to provide narrative responses to three open-ended questions (#8 to #10). The responses to the questions were grouped by common themes and summarized by the project team.

(1) Please indicate what you believe are the most important strengths of the Department:

Those who chose to answer the open-ended questions stated that the greatest strength lay in the high level of dedication of these officers to their job and the community and also the quality of the personnel working within the department. The greatest strengths of the Department were viewed to be:

- Dedication of officers
- Quality of personnel
- Teamwork
- Fast response times
- Focused on community policing
- Training

In summary, it can be seen that many of the strengths of the department are inter-connected; the dedication of the officers to their job and the community is a direct result of the quality of the personnel hired by the department. This dedication to the community would be incomplete without proper teamwork, fast response times, and a focus on community policing. Lastly, a training focus helps the development of the other items listed. The responses in this category were consistent with the opinions expressed in the rest of the survey.

(2) Please indicate what you believe are the most important improvement opportunities facing the Pacifica Police Department:

Many different responses were generated for this question but the majority of respondents stated that there needed to be an increase in the current staffing. The most important opportunities for improvement:

- Increasing staffing level
- Communication between line staff / personnel and management
- Automating many of the paper processes
- Employee retention
- Updating shift scheduling to better accommodate the needs of the officers

In summary, the respondents stated that there was a need for increasing the staffing levels at the department, which has been a constant theme expressed throughout many of the different sections of the survey analysis.

(3) Please indicate any functions, services, resources, etc. you believe can be shared or consolidated with other agencies to enhance service levels and / or manage costs:

The general consensus of respondents for this question was that there were no further opportunities for either shared or consolidated functions, services, or even resources, as many of the traditional functions and services such as dispatch and SWAT have already been consolidated. The responses are summarized below.

- None
- Traffic enforcement with other local city departments
- Regional investigation unit

In summary, the respondents' general opinions were that no further opportunities exist to share or consolidate functions.

In addition to the narrative survey questions, respondents were asked if they wanted to share any other comments related to the questions in the survey or additional feedback. The majority of the respondents commented on the low morale of the department as a result of instability due to the uncertainty associated with the possible outsourcing of police services. In an earlier question a slight majority indicated that their own general morale was good. However, the issue of outsourcing remains a significant factor for employees.

APPENDIX C – 10 HOUR PATROL DEPLOYMENT SCHEDULES

1. CURRENT 25 PERSON STAFFING LEVEL.

The three shift deployments below depicts the current staffing level of 5 Sergeants, 5 Corporals and 15 Officers, using the current 10 hour shift schedule of 4 days on, followed by 3 days off.

Dayshift (0700-1700) Schedule – 2 Sergeants, 2 Corporals, 4 Officers

	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Sergeant 1	1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1			
Sergeant 2				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1
Corporal 1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1
Corporal 2				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1
Officer 1	1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1			
Officer 2	1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1			
Officer 3			1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1	
Officer 4	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1
Authorized	5	4	4	6	4	5	4	5	4	4	6	4	5	4	5	4	4	6	4	5	4	5	4	4	6	4	5	4
Actual	4.8	3.8	3.8	5.7	3.8	4.8	3.8	4.8	3.8	3.8	5.7	3.8	4.8	3.8	4.8	3.8	3.8	5.7	3.8	4.8	3.8	4.8	3.8	3.8	5.7	3.8	4.8	3.8

CITY OF PACIFICA, CALIFORNIA
Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency Study of the Police Department

Swing Shift Schedule (1600-0200) – 2 Sergeants, 1 Corporal, 7 Officers

	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Sergeant 1	1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1			
Sergeant 2				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1
Corporal 1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1
Officer 1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1
Officer 2	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1
Officer 3			1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1	
Officer 4			1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1	
Officer 5				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1
Officer 6				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1
Officer 7	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1
Authorized	5	5	5	6	5	7	7	5	5	5	6	5	7	7	5	5	5	6	5	7	7	5	5	5	6	5	7	7
Actual	4.8	4.8	4.8	5.7	4.8	6.7	6.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	5.7	4.8	6.7	6.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	5.7	4.8	6.7	6.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	5.7	4.8	6.7	6.7

Night Shift Schedule (2200-0800) – 1 Sergeant, 2 Corporals, 4 Officers

	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Sergeant 1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1
Corporal 1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1
Corporal 2	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1
Officer 1	1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1			
Officer 2	1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1			
Officer 3			1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1	
Officer 4	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1
Authorized	5	3	4	4	4	4	4	5	3	4	4	4	4	4	5	3	4	4	4	4	4	5	3	4	4	4	4	4
Actual	4.8	2.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	4.8	2.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	4.8	2.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	4.8	2.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8

2. POSSIBLE 23 PERSON STAFFING LEVEL (REDUCTION OF 2 OFFICER POSITIONS).

Each of the three shift deployments below are based on a staffing of 5 Sergeants, 5 Corporals and 13 Officers; using the current 10 hour shift schedule (4 days on, followed by 3 days off).

Dayshift (0700-1700) Schedule – 2 Sergeants, 2 Corporals, 4 Officers

	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Sergeant 1	1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1			
Sergeant 2	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1
Corporal 1	1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1			
Corporal 2	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1
Officer 1	1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1			
Officer 2		1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1		
Officer 3			1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1	
Officer 4				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1
Authorized	5	5	5	6	4	4	3	5	5	5	6	4	4	3	5	5	5	6	4	4	3	5	5	5	6	4	4	3
Actual	4.8	4.8	4.8	5.7	3.8	3.8	2.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	5.7	3.8	3.8	2.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	5.7	3.8	3.8	2.9	4.8	4.8	4.8	5.7	3.8	3.8	2.9

CITY OF PACIFICA, CALIFORNIA
Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency Study of the Police Department

Swing Shift Schedule (1600-0200) – 2 Sergeants, 1 Corporal, 5 Officers

	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	
Sergeant 1	1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				
Sergeant 2				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1	
Corporal 1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	
Officer 1	1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				
Officer 2		1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1			
Officer 3			1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1		
Officer 4				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1	
Officer 5	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	
Authorized	4	4	4	6	5	5	4	4	4	4	6	5	5	4	4	4	4	6	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	6	5	5	4
Actual	3.8	3.8	3.8	5.7	4.8	4.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	5.7	4.8	4.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	5.7	4.8	4.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	5.7	4.8	4.8	3.8

Night Shift Schedule (2200-0800) – 1 Sergeant, 2 Corporals, 4 Officers

	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Sergeant 1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1
Corporal 1	1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1			
Corporal 2				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1
Officer 1	1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1			
Officer 2		1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1		
Officer 3				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1
Officer 4	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1
Authorized	4	3	3	5	5	4	4	4	3	3	5	5	4	4	4	3	3	5	5	4	4	4	3	3	5	5	4	4
Actual	3.8	2.9	2.9	4.8	4.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	2.9	2.9	4.8	4.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	2.9	2.9	4.8	4.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	2.9	2.9	4.8	4.8	3.8	3.8

3. POSSIBLE 21 PERSON STAFFING LEVEL (REDUCTION OF 4 OFFICER POSITIONS).

This staffing level is not recommended but shown to illustrate the number of staff that would be deployed at this level. Each of the three shift deployments below are based on a staffing of 5 Sergeants, 5 Corporals and 11 Officers; using the current 10 hour shift schedule (4 days on, followed by 3 days off).

Dayshift (0700-1700) Schedule – 2 Sergeants, 1 Corporal, 4 Officers

	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Sergeant 1	1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1			
Sergeant 2				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1
Corporal 1		1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1		
Officer 1	1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1			
Officer 2				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1
Officer 3	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1
Officer 4	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1
Authorized	4	4	3	5	4	4	4	4	4	3	5	4	4	4	4	4	3	5	4	4	4	4	4	3	5	4	4	4
Actual	3.8	3.8	2.9	4.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	2.9	4.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	2.9	4.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	2.9	4.8	3.8	3.8	3.8

Swing Shift Schedule (1600-0200) – 2 Sergeants, 2 Corporals, 4 Officers

	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	
Sergeant 1	1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				
Sergeant 2				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1	
Corporal 1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	
Corporal 2	1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				
Officer 1		1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1			
Officer 2			1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1		
Officer 3				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1	
Officer 4	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	
Authorized	4	4	4	6	5	5	4	4	4	4	6	5	5	4	4	4	4	6	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	6	5	5	4
Actual	3.8	3.8	3.8	5.7	4.8	4.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	5.7	4.8	4.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	5.7	4.8	4.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	5.7	4.8	4.8	3.8

Night Shift Schedule (2200-0800) – 1 Sergeant, 2 Corporals, 3 Officers

	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Sergeant 1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1
Corporal 1	1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1			
Corporal 2				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1
Officer 1	1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1			
Officer 2		1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1		
Officer 3	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1	1				1	1	1
Authorized	4	3	3	4	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	3	3
Actual	3.8	2.9	2.9	3.8	3.8	2.9	2.9	3.8	2.9	2.9	3.8	3.8	2.9	2.9	3.8	2.9	2.9	3.8	3.8	2.9	2.9	3.8	2.9	2.9	3.8	3.8	2.9	2.9

APPENDIX D – SAMPLE 12 HOUR PATROL SCHEDULE

1. CURRENT 25 PERSON STAFFING LEVEL.

The two shift deployments below are based on the current staffing of 5 Sergeants, 5 Corporals and 15 Officers; using a 12 hour shift schedule of 2 days on, 2 days off; 3 on, 2 off; 2 on, 3 off.

Dayshift (0600-1800) Schedule – 3 Sergeants, 2 Corporals, 8 Officers

	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Sergeant 1	1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1			
Sergeant 2			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1
Sergeant 3		1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1	
Corporal 1	1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1			
Corporal 2			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1
Officer 1	1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1			
Officer 2	1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1			
Officer 3	1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1			
Officer 4	1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1			
Officer 5			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1
Officer 6			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1
Officer 7			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1
Officer 8			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1
Authorized	6	7	7	6	6	6	7	7	6	6	7	7	7	6	6	7	7	6	6	6	7	7	6	6	7	7	7	6
Actual	5.7	6.7	6.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	6.7	6.7	5.7	5.7	6.7	6.7	6.7	5.7	5.7	6.7	6.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	6.7	6.7	5.7	5.7	6.7	6.7	6.7	5.7

CITY OF PACIFICA, CALIFORNIA
Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency Study of the Police Department

Night Shift Schedule (1800-0600) – 2 Sergeants, 3 Corporals, 7 Officers

	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Sergeant 1	1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1			
Sergeant 2			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1
Corporal 1	1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1			
Corporal 2			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1
Corporal 3	1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1			
Officer 1	1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1			
Officer 2	1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1			
Officer 3	1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1			
Officer 4			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1
Officer 5			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1
Officer 6			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1
Officer 7			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1
Authorized	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Actual	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7

2. POSSIBLE 23 PERSON STAFFING LEVEL.

The two shift deployments below are based on a staffing of 5 Sergeants, 5 Corporals and 13 Officers; using a 12 hour shift schedule of 2 days on, 2 days off; 3 on, 2 off; 2 on, 3 off.

Dayshift (0600-1800) Schedule – 3 Sergeants, 2 Corporals, 7 Officers

	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Sergeant 1	1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1			
Sergeant 2			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1
Sergeant 3		1	1					1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1
Corporal 1	1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1			
Corporal 2			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1
Officer 1	1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1			
Officer 2	1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1			
Officer 3	1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1			
Officer 4	1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1			
Officer 5			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1
Officer 6			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1
Officer 7			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1
Authorized	6	7	6	5	6	6	7	6	5	6	7	6	6	5	6	7	6	5	6	6	7	6	5	6	7	6	6	5
Actual	5.7	6.7	5.7	4.8	5.7	5.7	6.7	5.7	4.8	5.7	6.7	5.7	5.7	4.8	5.7	6.7	5.7	4.8	5.7	5.7	6.7	5.7	4.8	5.7	6.7	5.7	5.7	4.8

CITY OF PACIFICA, CALIFORNIA
Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency Study of the Police Department

Night Shift Schedule (1800-0600) – 2 Sergeants, 3 Corporals, 6 Officers

	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Sergeant 1	1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1			
Sergeant 2			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1
Corporal 1	1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1			
Corporal 2			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1
Corporal 3	1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1			
Officer 1	1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1			
Officer 2	1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1			
Officer 3	1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1			
Officer 4			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1
Officer 5			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1
Officer 6			1	1				1	1			1	1	1			1	1				1	1			1	1	1
Authorized	6	6	5	5	6	6	6	5	5	6	6	5	5	5	6	6	5	5	6	6	6	5	5	6	6	5	5	5
Actual	5.7	5.7	4.8	4.8	5.7	5.7	5.7	4.8	4.8	5.7	5.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	5.7	5.7	4.8	4.8	5.7	5.7	5.7	4.8	4.8	5.7	5.7	4.8	4.8	4.8