



Date: September 3, 2014

To: Patrick H. West, City Manager *JHW*

From: Jim McDonnell, Chief of Police /s/
George Chapjian, Director of Parks, Recreation & Marine /s/

For: Members of the Budget Oversight Committee

Subject: **Responses to Questions from the August 19, 2014 Budget Oversight Committee Meeting**

Below are the responses to the questions raised by members of the Budget Oversight Committee (BOC) during the August 19th BOC meeting. Although the budget was adopted early on September 2nd, this memo is being provided in order to answer questions that had not yet been answered before budget adoption.

Parks/Security/Safety

- **What is the number of Rangers needed to patrol all parks in the City and at what cost (recurring and non-recurring)? How many rangers would be needed to patrol only "hot spots" and at what cost? How many "hot spots" would this number of rangers cover?**

At the August 19, 2014 Budget Oversight Committee (BOC) meeting, the Department of Parks, Recreation and Marine (PRM) provided a brief overview of the costs related to restoring the Park Ranger Program to FY 08 levels. FY 08 represented the last year that PRM provided "citywide" park patrols.

The incremental cost to restore the program to the FY 08 levels (12.0 FTE) is roughly \$790,000, or a total Park Ranger Program budget of \$1.17 million, plus \$180,000 in one-time fleet acquisition costs. This will provide for "citywide" service 7 days a week. This level of staffing would provide calls-for-service responses at all City parks, followed by routine patrols of 40 of the City's most heavily used parks (or "hot spots"), including those PRM-staffed community centers and locations with known illegal activity, such as drinking and drug dealing/use in a park. These routine patrols will be dependent upon resolving the calls for service first, and may total anywhere between 1-3 visits to a park per day. Depending on park activity at the time, a patrol may entail a drive through/around the park, or a brief, on-foot, visit to assess activity.

Any desired park patrol activities above the 1-3 daily patrols of our 40 or so most heavily used parks would require additional staffing and vehicles. It is important to note that additional staffing would not enable a visit to all 160 parks, but rather a more frequent, concentrated patrol of the most heavily used parks. Park Ranger personnel would be responsible for adjusting patrols to other parks, as necessary, resulting from calls for service data and other crime indicators.

In consultation with the Police Department, PRM has determined that it would take a total of 17.0 FTE of various Park Ranger positions to provide an effective park security program. The incremental increase to the existing Park Ranger Program budget would be \$1.25 million, for a total budget of \$1.63 million. There would also be a one-time capital expense of \$315,000 for the purchase of 7 new vehicles.

This level of staffing would provide for 3 citywide patrols during the week (Sun-F), in addition to the one daily patrol at the El Dorado Regional Park. Saturday coverage would be increased to 6 citywide patrols. This level of coverage would allow the Park Rangers to spend more time at the park to better engage the community and deal with persistent and time-consuming issues, such as with the homeless

- **Discuss ways to use more innovative models to patrol city parks that are cheaper than the previous Park Ranger program or use alternate funding sources. Specifically, are there opportunities to utilize Marine Patrol, retired peace officers, cadets, explorers, etc?**

Presently, the Police Department (PD) is responsible for patrolling and responding to calls for service in the parks. Staff assigned in each of the three geographical patrol divisions meet with PRM staff on a regular basis to discuss trends and issues. In the summer of 2014, the PD began training PRM staff who were selected for the new "Park Patrol" program. In addition, PD and PR&M partner with the Health Department, Homeless Services Outreach staff to address complaints of nuisance and crime activity from homeless persons in parks.

At the Budget Oversight Committee Meeting on 8/19/14, PRM and PD were directed to consider alternatives to the current model. Suggestions by the committee included Reserves and Explorers. These and other options considered are:

Police Reserves

- Reserves number less than 20 and work only part time. They are strictly volunteers who donate their free time to achieve the primary mission of supplementing the PD. Typically Reserves work in the field as patrol officers, serve as backup resources to aid the PD in the event of a natural disaster or civil unrest, participate as a component of the Incident Command System, provide additional staff for special events, Jail, Business Desk, Detectives, Traffic, Youth Services, and Records. Historically, as the number of Reserves has waned, it has been an increasing challenge to staff events and special assignments. Considering the demand that already exists within the PD, Reserves are not available for a daily or weekly park patrol assignment.

Police Explorers

- Explorers are young people, ages 14 - 21, who must be directly supervised in the field. Typically, Explorers work DUI Checkpoints and assist with community outreach and flyer distributions. Explorers are not a viable option for park patrol.

Police Cadets

- Cadets are young adults, working part time while attending college. The PD Cadet program was discontinued approximately three years ago due to funding challenges.

Unarmed Special Service Officer II (SSO)

- Unarmed Special Service Officer II (SSO) positions were also reviewed for park patrol but not recommended. Functionally, SSOs would operate in the same manner as the Park Patrol staff members. They wear a tan and green uniform. They do not have powers of arrest and do not transport prisoners. The PD staffs several operations with SSOs including the Jail, City Hall Security, and Marine Patrol. This staffing model would require adding new positions in the PD, as well as a hiring and background process. Although functionally equivalent to the Park Patrol program, this classification is more expensive and requires 832 PC certification.

Although expansion of the Park Rangers is also under discussion, this model would actually result in a reduction of a proactive park presence because Park Rangers would spend much of their shift driving to various parks. In addition, it has become evident over time, in various City operations, that there has been confusion in the community about who to contact to report crimes and seek law enforcement assistance when multiple Departments provide overlapping services. In addition to Park Rangers, other examples of overlap with PD include, Marine Patrol and Harbor Patrol. The public should be assured that they will receive prompt law enforcement assistance by calling the Communications Center at either 911 or 562-435-6711.

The use of police officers for proactive park patrol and response to calls for service is the most functional and consistent model, particularly when combined with the new Park Patrol program. The parks are located within police beats, patrolled by officers who know both community members and neighborhood trends. The PD has solid working relationships with other City departments and is able to help coordinate multi-department responses to issues. The Park Patrol pilot program currently underway is an effective way to augment the already existing PD efforts.

Preliminary police response data on the 15 busiest parks in the City (five per geographical division) was reviewed from 1/1/14 to 8/15/14. This data revealed that in the majority of these parks, more than 50% of officer responses are self initiated, with either District Car Checks - DCC (increased presence) or Code 6 (out for investigation). The incidents referenced below are Part 1 violent and property crimes.

EAST DIVISION

El Dorado Park

Calls for Service: 776 - 67% proactive [DCC (30%) and C6 (37%)]

Incidents: (19) - 10 – Auto Burg, 2 – Comm Burg, 1 – Attempt Auto Burg, 1 – Assault (b/t tagging crews), 1 – Theft from Auto, 1 – Bike Theft, 1 – Arson, 1 – Robbery (b/t gang members), 1 – Battery (unfounded)

Heartwell Park

Calls for Service: 557 - 79.5% proactive [DCC (61.5%) and C6 (18%)]

Incidents: (5) - 1 - Commercial Burg, 2 – Theft from Auto, 1 – Grand Theft Auto, 1 – Auto Burg

Recreation Park

Calls for Service: 109 - 37% proactive [DCC (31%) and C6 (6%)]

Incidents: (4) - All theft from Auto

Stearns Park

Calls for Service: 165 - 79% proactive [DCC (72%) and C6 (7%)]

Incidents: (4) - 1 Battery (soccer players from opposing teams), 1 Theft from Auto, 1 Auto Burgs

Bixby Park

Calls for Service: 481 - 62% proactive [DCC (35%) and C6 (27%)]

Incidents: (3) - 1 – Assault w/ Deadly Weapon (weapon = beer bottle), 1 – Bike Theft, 1 – Robbery (susp/vict are former roommates)

NORTH DIVISION

Coolidge Park

Calls for Service: 535 - 72% proactive [DCC (64%) C6 (almost 9%)]

Incidents: (3) – two commercial burglaries and a petty theft (all copper thefts)

Houghton Park

Calls for Service: 455 - 69% proactive [DCC (56%) C6 (13%)]

Incidents: (2) – both were petty thefts (items taken from park-goers)

Deforest Park

Calls for Service: 465 - 69% proactive [DCC (59%) C6 (10%)]

Incidents: (1) – a commercial burglary (tools taken from one of the construction workers)

Scherer Park

Calls for Service: 246 - 51% proactive [DCC (39%) C6 (12%)]

Incidents: (6) – 2 robberies (of park-goers), 1 aggravated assault (domestic violence), 2 commercial burglaries (park office and gardening equipment) and a petty theft)

Ramona Park

Calls for Service: 267 - 60% proactive [DCC (53%) C6 (7%)]

Incidents: (1) robbery

WEST DIVISION

Silverado Park

Calls for Service: 620 - 86% proactive [DCC (84%) and C6 (2%)]
Incidents: (3) - 2 petty theft, 1 auto theft

Lincoln Park

Calls for Service: 463 - 59% proactive [DCC (41%) and C6 (18%)]
Incidents: (3) - 1 robbery, 1 petty theft, 1 grand theft property

Admiral Kidd Park

Calls for Service: 358 - 72% proactive [DCC (65%) and C6 (7%)]
Incidents: (6) - 1 robbery, 2 battery, 1 petty theft, 1 grand theft prop, 1 attempt murder

Drake Park

Calls for Service: 294 - 62% proactive [DCC (50%) and C6 (12%)]
Incidents: (3) – all auto burglaries

MLK Park

Calls for Service: 294 - 77% proactive [DCC (70%) and C6 (7%)]
Incidents: (2) - 1 robbery, 1 petty theft

JG LE
K:\BUDGET\FY 15\COUNCIL HEARINGS AND MEETINGS\8.19.14\RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS 08.19.14 BOC.DOCX

ATTACHMENTS

CC: MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL
JYL MARDEN, INTERIM ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER
REGINALD I. HARRISON, DEPUTY CITY MANAGER
TOM MODICA, DEPUTY CITY MANAGER
ALL DEPARTMENT HEADS