

GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (GMOC)

Threshold Standard Compliance Questionnaire

Police – 2017

Review Period:

July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016 to Present Time and 5-Year Forecast

THRESHOLD STANDARDS

1. Priority 1 – Emergency Calls¹. Properly equipped and staffed police units shall respond to at least 81% of Priority 1 calls within 7 minutes 30 seconds and shall maintain an average response time of 6 minutes or less for all Priority 1 calls (measured annually).

2. Priority 2 – Urgent Calls². Properly equipped and staffed police units shall respond to all Priority 2 calls within 12 minutes or less (measured annually).

¹Priority 1 – Emergency Calls are life-threatening calls; felony in progress; probability of injury (crime or accident); robbery or panic alarms; urgent cover calls from officers. Response: Immediate response by two officers from any source or assignment, immediate response by paramedics/fire if injuries are believed to have occurred.

²Priority 2 – Urgent Calls are misdemeanor in progress; possibility of injury; serious non-routine calls (domestic violence or other disturbances with potential for violence); burglar alarms. Response: Immediate response by one or more officers from clear units or those on interruptible activities (traffic, field interviews, etc.)

Note: For growth management purposes, response time includes dispatch and travel time to the building or site address, otherwise referred to as “received to arrive.”

Please update the tables below.

Priority 1 – Emergency Calls or Services			
Fiscal Year	Call Volume	% of Call Responses Within 7 Minutes 30 Seconds (Threshold = 81%)	Average Response Time (Minutes) (Threshold = 6 Minutes)
FY 2016	742 of 67,048	71.0%	6:31
FY 2015	675 of 64,008	71.2%	6:49
FY 2014	711 of 65,645	73.6%	6:45
FY 2013	738 of 65,741	74.1%	6:42
FY 2012	726 of 64,386	72.8%	6:31
FY 2011	657 of 64,695	80.7%	6:03

Priority 2 – Urgent Calls for Service		
Fiscal Year	Call Volume	Average Response Time (Minutes) (Threshold = 12 Minutes)
FY 2016	19,288 of 67,048	13:50
FY 2015	17,976 of 64,008	13:50
FY 2014	17,817 of 65,645	13:36
FY 2013	18,505 of 65,741	13:44
FY 2012	22,121 of 64,386	14:20
FY 2011	21,500 of 64,695	12:52

1. During the review period, were police units properly equipped to deliver services at the levels necessary to maintain Priority 1 and Priority 2 Threshold Standard compliance? If not, please explain and describe what is necessary for police units to be properly equipped. Also, please provide status information on implementation of the new CAD/AVL system.

Yes _____

No X

The Department continues to work toward replacing the computer aided dispatch (CAD), computers, purchasing additional body worn cameras, upgrading radios and making significant improvements to its information technology infrastructure. These necessary updates and purchases will continue into the current fiscal year with complete rollout anticipated in the next 18 months. The CAD Project team held the official kickoff meeting and set project expectations and timelines. The tentative go-live schedule is mid-year 2017. The new CAD will allow dispatchers to utilize Automated Vehicle Locator system, which allows them to see the closest unit to a call and dispatch accordingly.

2. During the review period, were police units properly staffed to deliver services at the levels necessary to maintain Priority 1 and Priority 2 Threshold Standard compliance? If not, please explain and describe what is necessary for police units to be properly staffed.

Yes _____

No X

During this reporting period the Department was able to make great progress in achieving the Priority 1 response time threshold by reducing the average response time by 18 seconds. The Department continues to be committed to keeping the Patrol Division fully staffed in an effort to meet the Priority 1 threshold. The Department is analyzing calls that are reporting an excessive response time to determine if these calls were given the correct priority call for service level. These calls may be unnecessarily skewing response times. We are working with our Dispatchers to better understand these circumstances around these calls.

3. Will current facilities, equipment and staff be able to accommodate citywide growth forecasted and meet the threshold standards for the next 12 to 18 months? If not, please explain.

Yes _____

No X

There are still significant concerns with staffing and equipment. As stated above the Department continues to experience attrition due to retirements. This puts a significant strain on the Department to maintain staffing levels in the Patrol Division.

Patrol vehicles replacement continues to be an area where the current funding available is unable to keep up with the demands. The Department continues to work with the Finance Department to identify funding to replace the aging vehicle fleet. During fiscal year 2016 the Department received City funding to replace 17 patrol vehicles. Due to the aging Patrol fleet the reliability and replacement of the patrol vehicles continues to be of concern. Any significant growth in the next 18 months will place additional strain on the Patrol Division to comply with GMOC threshold standards.

- 4. Will current facilities, equipment and staff be able to accommodate citywide growth forecasted and meet the threshold standards during the next five years? If not, please explain.

Yes _____

No X

There are still significant concerns with staffing and equipment. However, the Department continues to implement the 2014 Strategic Plan. Specifically, the Department is developing a long-term comprehensive staffing plan. This report will highlight historical staffing in the Department, as well as identifying staffing needs to accommodate growth in the City and increasing calls for service. The Department will submit a proposed staffing plan to the City Manager before the end of the year. Any significant growth in the next five years, without additional staffing, will place a strain on the Patrol Division to comply with GMOC threshold standards.

- 5. During the review period, has growth in Chula Vista negatively affected the department's ability to maintain service levels consistent with the threshold standards? If yes, please explain and describe what factors contributed to not meeting the threshold standards.

Yes X

No _____

The Department still continues to be concerned about maintaining and ideally increasing staffing levels. The threat of upcoming retirements is of real concern and the Department continues to work very hard to identify highly qualified lateral and recruit candidates. By comparison the last time the Department met the Priority 1 response time threshold (using the new methodology) was in 2009/2010. The table below highlights some of the important differences in staffing and population then and now. Increasing staffing levels is imperative for the Department to continue to meet the growing demands in the City.

	2009/2010	2014/2015
Population	233,108	257,989
Authorized Staffing	240	225

Equipment needs is another area that continues to be of concern. The funds to purchase new equipment, as well as replacing aging equipment is limited. The Department is

committed to continuing to work with the Finance Department and the City Manager to identify funding for this critical need.

6. During the review period, did the Police Department reach its goal of 40% proactive available time for an officer on duty? If not, please explain.

The Department recently reviewed the proactive time calculation and between January-June 2016 we achieved an overall proactive time of 46.5%. This increase is directly related to the focus on hiring and maintaining staffing in the Community Patrol Division. This time is used by patrol personnel to problem solve crime and disorder issues in the community and meet with residents and businesses to strengthen their relationships.

7. Please update the table below:

Number of False Alarms Per Year	
Fiscal Year	Volume
FY 2016	3,479
FY 2015	5,047
FY 2014	6,119
FY 2013	6,116
FY 2012	6,234
FY 2011	6,424
FY 2010	6,694
FY 2009	5,924

8. Please explain the current false alarm policy and provide information on its effectiveness.

The City Council adopted an updated Security Alarm Ordinance in 2013, which went into effect in July 2014. The updated ordinance made several changes to the alarm program.

Those changes include:

- Alarm permit fee was changed to \$28.75 annually
- The false alarm fines:
 - First false alarm during a 12-month period is \$100 fine. Current permit holders have the option to take an online false alarm awareness class. Upon successful completion of the course the false alarm fine is waived.
 - Second false alarm during a 12-month period is \$200 fine.
 - Any additional false alarms within one year are \$500 per false alarm.
 - Any location that has four false alarm activations during a 12-month period will be placed on verified response. For alarm sites with four or more false alarms in a 12-month period, verification that a crime or attempted crime is in progress must be provided by the alarm company concurrently with a request for a police response to a security alarm. Verification shall be by real-time audio or video surveillance provided by the alarm system and reviewed by the alarm company, or by a third-party report from the alarm site sent to the alarm company, that positively verifies evidence of a crime or an attempted crime at the alarm site. This verified response requirement shall not apply to duress alarms.

After two years of implementation the updated ordinance continues to be effective in reducing the number of false alarm activations that officers are responding to. Since the ordinance false alarms have been reduced by 43%. The Department continues to work with alarm companies, as well as alarm permit holders to reduce the number of false alarm activations.

9. The GMOC's 2016 Annual Report recommended that the City Manager monitor the retention and recruitment programs and procedures for police officers so that the department will be properly staffed and response to Priority 1 calls can improve. Please report on how the City Manager's involvement has affected staffing levels.

The Department continues to focus on employee recruitment through the Strategic Plan. During this reporting year the City Council approved two additional sworn positions to establish a Homeless Outreach Team. In addition, a Homeless Outreach Team Coordinator was hired by the City to work with the sworn personnel. This team, along with City and community partners, is responsible for working with the local homeless population to help identify long-term housing solutions. In addition, this team is able to work with residents and businesses to reduce crime and disorder related to homelessness.

10. Please provide any other relevant information, recommendations or suggestions that you would like to relay to the GMOC and/or the city council.

The Department has been historically understaffed and any growth has a direct impact on meeting response time thresholds. Over the last four years the Police Department has been committed to implementing the recommendations made in the Matrix Staffing Study with the goal of increasing proactive time in Patrol. To date the Department has implemented numerous recommendations including: expanded the number of Community Service Officers in Patrol (5 total), who took over 3,300 reports during the reporting period, deployed a new hybrid staffing schedule, adopted the updated security alarm ordinance, reprioritized some call for service types, and redeployed Street Team back to their assignment of conducting proactive policing.

PREPARED BY:

Name: Melanie Culuko
Title: Police Support Services Manager
Date: October 3, 2016