

LONGMONT POLICE
DEPARTMENT

STAFFING STUDY

UPDATED JANUARY 2006

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
METHODOLOGY.....	2
Calls for Service & Response Time.....	2
Workload Information.....	2
Long-Range Strategic Plan.....	3
Citizen Service Evaluation & Benchmarks.....	3
FINDINGS.....	4
Calls for Service & Response Time.....	4
Officer Safety.....	7
Factors Affecting Response Time.....	8
Administrative Duties.....	8
Workload Information.....	8
UCR Crime Rate.....	11
Long-Range Strategic Planning Recommendations.....	12
Staffing to Population Ratio.....	12
Administrative Loss.....	14
Attrition & Hiring.....	17
Need for Proactive & Coactive Policing.....	18
Budget Impacts.....	18
Citizen Service Analysis & Benchmarks.....	20
Trends That Impact Police Staffing.....	21
Clandestine Methamphetamine Labs.....	21
Computer Crime Trends.....	23
Animal-Related Complaints & Calls.....	23
Multi-Housing Increase.....	24
Spanish-Speaking Only Population Increase.....	25
Domestic Violence.....	25
Efforts to Maintain Efficiency.....	25
SUMMARY.....	26
RECOMMENDATION.....	27
CONCLUSION.....	28
APPENDIX A (Authorized Staffing).....	29
APPENDIX B (Call Type by Priority).....	31
APPENDIX C (Call Breakdown by Work Unit).....	36

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Response Time Goals for the Longmont Police Department.....	4
Table 2.	Percent of Time Patrol Officers Meet Response Time Goals By Priority, 2002 - 2005	6
Table 3.	Number of Times a Two-Officer Call is Handled by One Officer	7
Table 4.	Total Police Calls For Service, 1996 Through 2005	8
Table 5.	Traditional Workload Per Officer: A Comparison by Year.....	10
Table 6.	Calls For Service by Responding Personnel, Longmont Police Department, 2005	11
Table 7.	2004 UCR Part I Crimes Per Thousand For Comparative Front-Range Cities	11
Table 8.	Front-Range Officer & Civilian Personnel Ratio, Per 1,000 Population.....	13
Table 9.	Past & Projected Longmont Police Department Officer and Personnel Ratio Based on City Population	14
Table 10.	Average Administrative Loss Time in Hours For the Three Patrol Shifts, 2002, 2003, 2005, & 2005.....	15
Table 11.	Department-Wide Time Loss, In Hours, Due to Training 1997 Through 2005	16
Table 12.	Number of Applicants and Outcome, 2002 Through 2005	17
Table 13.	Requested & Approved Budgeted Positions, As Recommended In the Long-Range Strategic Plan	19
Table 14.	CSO-Animal Control Calls For Service, 2002 Through 2005.....	24
Table 15.	Recommendations for Future Positions, 2005 To 2008	28

POLICE STAFFING STUDY

INTRODUCTION

In late July 2002, Chief Mike Butler authorized the formation of a study-group to address perceived inadequate police staffing levels in the Longmont Police Department. Specifically, officers voiced concern that inadequate coverage heightened the risk to their overall safety; that there has been a general drop in some areas of citizen service; and that the number of support personnel remain insufficient. Chief Butler requested that the group answer the following questions:

- Is there a lack of staffing in critical areas?
- Does the lack of staffing in critical areas reduce citizen service?
- Does the lack of staffing in critical areas increase the risk to officer's safety?
- Would increased staffing levels correct these problems?

The first staffing study task force began collecting data in October 2002.¹ Since the first report was completed in 2003, it has been periodically updated, and now contains data through 2005.

¹ Commanders Fixmer, Olander, Ericson, Managers Wood and Melocco, Sergeant Dave Orr, Crime and Research Analyst Dr. Elise Flesher, Crime Analyst Jennifer Chrisman. The Task Force was reconvened in early 2004, and was comprised of Commanders Ericson, Fixmer, Earhart, Zuber, and Dr. Flesher. The paper has been periodically updated, with the last update in January 2006, using 2005 year-end data.

METHODOLOGY

The staffing study task force has focused their research on four key areas of performance. Each of the measures directly relate to staffing levels and the department's response to citizen needs. Information and data in the staffing study include the following:²

- Calls for Service & Response Time
- Workload & Dedicated Time by Unit / Function
- The Longmont Police Department Long-Range Strategic Plan
- Citizen Service Evaluation & Longmont Police Benchmark data

Calls-For-Service & Response Time

Response times to calls-for-service are measured by how quickly the police department arrives at certain call-types. The Longmont Police "Managed Police Response" (MPR) protocol has categorized calls into nine priorities and established response time goals that support police effectiveness, overall safety, and citizen service.³ The analysis will look at several reasons why response time goals for the highest priority calls are not met, including "administrative loss" of staffing, emphasis on proactive and coactive policing efforts, overall workload, and heavier service demands due to surfacing crime trends.

Data for this section were gathered through the Communication's Computer Operated Dispatch Records (CAD), Cadmine, the AS400, training logs, and administrative and budgetary records.

Workload Information

There is some agreement among community policing departments that a patrol officer's day should be divided between reactive, coactive and proactive policing. Though no nationally recognized standard exists, the Longmont Police Department strives for a benchmark where patrol officers, on a routine and daily schedule, spend at least 60 percent of an average day handling calls for service and report writing (reactive), 30 percent conducting proactive and coactive patrol, and 10 percent dedicated to administrative duties, such as briefing, court appearances, meal breaks, meetings, etc).⁴ Given both the volume and nature of our call load, and the willingness

² The data collection systems currently available in the Police Department have variable sources of entry (e.g., records clerks, property technicians, communications' specialists, and officers). Their respective databases are not linked with one another and must be queried separately (e.g., master files via AS400; inventory logs via stand-alone database; computer aided dispatch (CAD) via Printrak and Cadmine;² and the report writing system via Lotus Notes. Therefore, there is limited reliability between databases (such that numbers gleaned from one, might not match another). With this awareness, and given the constraints of the existing systems, all possible steps were taken to obtain the greatest accuracy and it is believed that careful scrutiny has minimized any error.

³ For this analysis, only Priorities 1 through 7 will be reviewed. For further explanation, see fn4.

⁴ Note that this time breakdown does not include training time. Training time is recognized as a necessary addition to every officer's on-duty obligations, however, it is not an everyday event. When training is provided, it will reduce the percent of time spent in the other three areas for that particular day or week.

of our community to partner in problem-solving efforts, we believe that this percent breakdown is an ideal to strive for.

Long-Range Strategic Plan

In the mid 1990's the Longmont Police Department began the groundwork to create a long range Strategic Plan. Since 1996, the Plan has been updated three times. This document continues to guide the Department toward an envisioned future of excellence. One strategy calls for the Department's sworn and civilian staff to maintain an acceptable personnel-to-population ratio. These numbers have been compared with other front-range departments of similar size to assess a "norm." While some may argue that a staff to population ratio is not a viable indicator of adequacy, it remains a standardized benchmark often used to compare one agency with another.

Citizen Service Evaluation & Benchmarks

The task force reviewed survey findings that measured Longmont resident's perception of community safety and disorder. This is measured through the Longmont Police Department Citizen Satisfaction Survey that is administered biennially by mail to a random sample of Longmont households. The Biennial Survey began in 1999 and was repeated in 2001, 2003, and 2005. The survey focuses on five key areas of performance: citizen **satisfaction** with police services; citizen **perception** of police services, crime **victimization**; citizen **prioritization** of police roles; and citizen **participation** in police programs.

The Biennial Survey has created a baseline with which to measure police performance over time. Aspects of the survey are also used to provide the City governing powers with benchmarks for "quality of life" indicators. Toward this end, the Police Department has established benchmarks that measure citizen sense of personal and property safety as well as their perception of disorder.

FINDINGS

The following tables and text identifies change over time and the impact the current demand for service is placing on the Department. The report details *calls for service* and *response time* by work group; *workload* level per employee; goals set by the *Strategic Plan*; staffing reduction due to *administrative loss*; citizen *evaluation* of police services; and *crime trends* that will impact resources

Calls For Service & Response Time

The Longmont Police Department has created a system to categorize all calls for service in terms of response priority. This system, known as “Managed Police Response” (or MPR) is a relatively common practice by police agencies to manage their call load in the most efficient and effective manner possible. Longmont’s MPR has divided its call load into seven priorities.⁵ Within those priorities, the Department has established a recommended response time. While these goals cannot always be met, they do reflect optimum results. The priorities dictate that emergency calls will always be the highest police priority. Routine calls, however, can be delayed without lessening solvability or citizen satisfaction. The benefit of a delayed response is that officers are afforded some discretion in their response time, allowing them to complete one task before moving on to another. This uninterrupted time is often most useful when officers are engaging in proactive and problem-solving efforts. The following table defines the priorities and the response time goals. **Response time begins when the call is received in the Communications Center and ends when the first unit arrives “on-scene.”**

Table 1
Response Time Goals for the Longmont Police Department

PRIORITY	TYPE	RESPONSE TIME GOAL	PERCENT OF TIME
Priority 1	Emergency	5 minutes or less	100% of time
Priority 2	Immediate	10 minutes or less	100% of time
Priority 3	Crime Just Occurred	15 minutes or less	100% of time
Priority 4	Routine Field Call	45 minutes or less	75% of time
Priority 5	Officer Lobby	30 minutes or less	75% of time
Priority 6	PST Report	120 minutes or less	75% of time
Priority 7	Officer Phone	45 minutes or less	75% of time

An emergency call involves an imminent and serious threat to someone’s safety. The Department has determined that due to the nature of the call, officers should arrive on-scene within five minutes, 100 percent of the time. While some may argue that a 100 percent response time rate is an unrealistic goal, we counter-argue that a delayed response may compound an already grave threat and that a lesser standard expressly condones it. The following two tables compare call-type response from 2002 through

⁵ There are actually 9 priorities, however for response time purposes, only seven are applicable. Priority 8 is defined as *Choice*, allowing the officer a choice to either phone or meet with a complainant. Priority 9 is *Delayed*, because Communications deliberately delays dispatching the call, usually at the request of the caller. See Appendix B for a list of call types by priority.

2005. These numbers represent only patrol and traffic officers' response to calls (not Police Service Technician (PST) or Community Service Officer (CSO)).⁶ Additionally, to obtain a more accurate calculation of call response time, any activity with a "response time" of five seconds, or less, was believed to be "officer-initiated activity," and was therefore, eliminated.

In 2002, we were **unable to meet our response time goals for emergency calls over half the time. This has remained the case in 2003, 2004, and 2005.** In fact, the unmet percentage **grew to 58 percent in 2005** (see Table 2). Our current inability to respond in a timely manner to emergency and immediate priority calls is not only a citizen service concern; it is a police effectiveness, efficiency, and public safety issue. The Police Department's inability to meet its response time goals places the general public's safety at risk in life-threatening situations and in some cases, reduces our effectiveness in crime intervention and solution. Insufficient staffing not only impacts response time, it affects how safe an officer remains when he or she arrives at a scene.

Though nine new officers were hired in 2005 (two replaced vacant positions), it typically takes a full year to train a new recruit before an agency can see the benefits of that added manpower. It's anticipated that the extra officers will improve response rate and officer safety.

⁶ PST's work in the Records Section or as Report Takers. CSO's duties are classified as Animal Control or General (primarily traffic). CSO's answer calls for service in the field and are able to issue summonses.

Table 2
Percent of Time Patrol (& Traffic) Officers Meet Response Time Goals, By Priority
2002 through 2005

CALL PRIORITY	YEAR	≤5	≤10	≤15	≤30	≤45	≤120	Percent Unmet
		minutes	minutes	minutes	minutes	minutes	minutes	
P1 Emergency ≤5 min – 100% of time	2002	44	86	95	99	100	100	56
	2003	45	87	96	99	99	100	55
	2004	45	87	96	99	100	100	55
	2005	42	87	96	99	99	100	58
P2 Immediate ≤10 min – 100% of time	2002	35	74	89	98	99	100	26
	2003	34	74	89	98	99	100	26
	2004	34	76	90	98	99	100	24
	2005	33	75	90	98	99	100	25
P3 Just Occur ≤15 min – 100% of time	2002	21	48	66	86	93	99	34
	2003	21	51	67	86	93	99	33
	2004	19	49	68	88	94	99	32
	2005	21	51	69	88	94	99	31
P4 Routine ≤45 min – 75% of time	2002	33	49	59	73	81	95	0
	2003	28	45	56	72	80	95	0
	2004	27	45	56	73	81	96	0
	2005	27	46	57	73	82	96	0
P5 Lobby ≤30 min – 75% of time	2002	29	49	62	82	90	98	0
	2003	25	43	56	78	88	98	0
	2004	26	48	62	81	90	99	0
	2005 ²⁷	26	45	59	81	90	99	0
P6 PST ≤120 min – 75% of time	2002	57	77	84	89	91	94	0
	2003	54	74	82	89	91	95	0
	2004	61	85	92	97	98	99	0
	2005	60	81	89	94	96	98	0
P7 Phone ≤45 min – 75% of time	2002	17	27	35	50	61	87	16
	2003	16	27	34	50	61	87	14
	2004	16	28	36	53	65	90	10
	2005	17	29	38	55	67	91	7

*Source: "Events by Priority & Response Time." In this report, a five second delay factor was installed so that activities showing an immediate response time (such as traffic stops and other officer-initiated activities) are eliminated (to prevent the low response times from skewing the results). All P200 units were queried for this report.

Officer Safety

It is essential that an officer's safety be one of the highest priorities among police administrators. Safety can be critically impacted by the lack of available patrol units in the field at any given time. In Longmont, many of the calls for service that a police officer responds to are high risk in nature, meaning they present a risk to the safety of the responding officer as well as the general public. These calls require more than one officer to respond. A multiple unit response is necessary for several reasons:

- More than one officer reduces the likelihood of officer or citizen injury
- More than one officer may be necessary to contain the threat
- More than one officer may be needed to protect the scene, retain witnesses, and to attend to any victims
- More than one officer may be needed to set up *Incident Command* at a major rescue or crime scene

Typically, these calls fall under the three highest priorities and can include a wide range of situations. **For four years running, officers were unable to meet their response time goals for priority 1, 2, and 3 calls an average of 38 percent of the time.**

As part of this study, the group determined how often one police officer is sent to a call that, by MPR standards, require two or more officers. Yearly data since 2002 shows that, at least **35 percent of the time**, one police officer has responded to a call that required a minimum of two police officers. This happens because there are not enough available patrol units in the field who can cover or assist another officer on a priority call.⁷ This statistic is also supported anecdotally. A number of officers have expressed concerns to their supervisors and the Chief that they often respond to a two-officer call as the solo officer.

Table 3
 Number of Times a Two-Officer Call Is Handled By One Officer

Year	Number of Incidents Requiring Multiple Unit Response	Number of Incidents that had Multiple Units Respond	Percent of Time that a Multiple Unit Call was Handled by One Unit
2002	9,147	5,839	36 percent
2003	10,060	6,338	37 percent
2004	10,230	6,569	36 percent
2005	10,188	6,653	35 percent

The percent of high priority calls that require a dispatcher to break an officer from a lower priority call has been increasing over time. In both 2002 and 2003, dispatchers were forced to **break an officer off a lower priority call to respond or cover a higher priority call**, SIX percent of the time. This increased to NINE percent in 2004 and to **ELEVEN** percent in 2005.⁸ Breaking officers from one call to handle another is doubly inefficient because participants at both the emergency call and the routine call suffer from the shortage of staffing.

⁷ These numbers reflect the number of police officers that arrive at a multiple-unit call. If an officer on-scene cancelled the backup car, a one-unit response is recorded. It is not possible to identify how many times this may have happened.

⁸ Higher priority calls are considered P1, P2, and P3 calls. In 2005, this totaled 33,884 calls for service.

Factors Affecting Response Time

Research has indicated that our inability to attain our response time goals for *Emergency* and *Immediate* calls may be due to several factors. These factors have not significantly changed since the first staffing study in 2002. Primarily, the reasons involve unit availability and staffing hours lost due to administrative-loss factors.

Administrative Duties

Another factor impacting response time and officer availability are the myriad of administrative facets of the job (some are demands and some are benefits). Overall, the largest administrative loss involves officers utilizing their benefit leave time. An officer's availability is also impacted by in-service and specialized training, report writing, court testimony, and information exchange. For a breakdown of training, vacation, and attrition loss, see the section under *Strategic Planning, Administrative Loss*.

Currently, the Longmont Police Department uses several automated systems for police report writing and prisoner booking and transport. Patrol officers can only access these systems at the Longmont Police Department and at three remote sites (Twin Peaks Mall, Longmont Emergency Unit Headquarters, and Stonehenge Apartment Complex). Currently, the system does not allow police officers to write field reports on mobile laptop computers nor does it allow for the dictation of reports either in the station or while mobile. Additionally, none of the computer systems are integrated, so most of the information that a police officer enters in one system must be duplicated in another. Concern over replication should lessen when the new Tiberon Records Management System becomes operational in 2006.

Workload Information

Total police calls for service continues to increase each year. Many are handled each year by the Communication Center. In 2004, dispatch handled 11,570 calls. This increased to 14,264 calls in 2005.⁹ Though many are police related, they are handled over the telephone by a dispatcher. Dispatchers handle a myriad of citizen concerns that in previous year's, might have been dispatched to a field unit. While these numbers may not reflect directly on the patrol division's workload they are a clear indication of the substantial volume of calls demanding police services.

Table 4
Total Police Calls for Service, 2002 Through 2005

	2002	2003	2004	2005	Percent change 2002-2005*
Total Calls for Service	65,260	69,375	71,633	78,117	19.7
All Patrol p200 calls for service	40,071	44,388	44,444	47,513	18.6

Source: Cadmine report, "Monthly Event Volume by Type." Earlier years are not available in Cadmine.

*Equation for change over time = $\frac{T2 - T1}{T1}$

⁹ Source: Cadmine "Monthly Event Volume by Type" Report with either an X (cancelled call) or Y (handled by dispatch) disposition.

Traditionally, police output was measured using the an officer's daily activity log which noted all actions performed during a single tour of duty (i.e., the number of contacts, special patrol requests, reports, arrests, citations, etc.). Over time, our workload per officer has remained fairly stable (see Table 5). However, what the numbers fail to reflect through reports or arrests, is the additional proactive, problem-solving, and coactive activities that exemplify community policing. These activities are better measured through problem resolution and client/officer satisfaction. Proactive and coactive policing efforts are an ingrained part of Longmont's practice of policing. Since it has grown to be second nature and merely a way of doing business, proactive and coactive projects often go undocumented.

In the absence of any systematic method to collect proactive/coactive activity, five year's worth of Patrol Division meeting notes were reviewed. Between 1998 and 2002, approximately 285 directed patrol or problem oriented policing projects have been initiated. The majority involve on-going or problem-focused contact with involved or affected parties. This study group concluded that, while the statistics are rough, it provided some reflection on the proactive and problem-solving workload of officers.

Since the last Staffing Study, the Department agreed that a more accurate method to capture patrol's proactive/coactive activity was needed, and a process was formalized in late 2003. Activities are separated by crime-related or traffic-related concerns. During 2004, sixty-eight (68) crime-related activities were documented, enlisting 129 police personnel.¹⁰ A majority of issues focused on quality of life concerns, such as graffiti/vandalism, noise, loitering, code enforcement, and animal control. A third of the reported problems occurred in city parks and along the greenway. In many cases, multiple tactics were used to address the concern. Officers are able to draw from a repertoire of strategies that include assessing the nature of the problem through crime analysis and intelligence sources, as well as responding with saturation patrol and zero tolerance enforcement. In a number of cases, neighbors and landlords were contacted to elicit their help in reducing the problem.

The Traffic Unit receives a number of complaints from citizens regarding traffic violations within the City. Citizens are most concerned about drivers speeding on neighborhood streets. Directed patrols are typically assigned to more than one officer for a minimum 30 days. Traffic related projects have involved 308 officers. The primary tactic involved visible patrol and high levels of enforcement. About one-third of the cases were referred to the Traffic Mitigation Office.

¹⁰ Nearly all efforts involved patrol officers. In some cases, CSO's were also instrumental.

Table 5
Traditional Workload per Officer: A Comparison by Year
(Numbers reflect **authorized** line-level staffing, not actual staffing)*

WORK TYPE	2002	2003	2004	2005
Calls for Service	53,894 / 86 = 627	59,128 / 86 = 688	59,566 / 88 = 677	63,308 / 93 = 681
Reports Written per Officer, SRO, Detective, CSO, or PST-RT	12,929 / 96= 135	12,540 / 96= 131	12,995 / 98 = 133	12,206 / 104 = 117
Citations Written per Sworn Officer or CSO	7,233 / = 90 80	7,643 / = 90 85	6,942 / 93 = 75	7,613 / 99 = 77
Arrests per Sworn Officer	3,076 / = 83 37	2,832 / = 83 34	2,780 / 86 = 32	2,880 / 92 = 31

*Supervisors are not included in these numbers as their primary responsibility lies in administration and management. Though supervisors do complete reports and arrest or cite offenders, those numbers remain relatively small. Supervisors are eliminated in the denominators so that the study can provide a more accurate picture of the call load falling on the line level staff who are ultimately responsible for handling it.

CFS: Most calls for service are handled by line level patrol & traffic officers, CSO's, PST-RT, & SRO. CFS that are cleared by dispatch (x-y disposition), or are assigned to another entity (i.e., utility, water, signal, or streets) have been eliminated (n=14,809).

Reports per officer: All original & supplemental reports for line level patrol and traffic officers, all CSO's, PST-RT; SRO, & case detectives. Reports DO NOT include accident reports.

Citations: Line level patrol and traffic officers, case detectives, all CSO's & SRO's.

Arrests: Line level patrol and traffic officers and case detectives

In the 2004 Staffing Study, we explored various options for greater staffing efficiency. There are a number of police-related functions currently assigned to patrol that do not warrant a sworn police presence. Since a great deal of an officer's time is taking cold reports with minimal evidence processing, it is plausible to increase the number of non-sworn personnel who can complete certain calls (and limited follow-up), previously fielded by a police officer.

It is hypothesized that if more CSO's were hired, they could begin their duties more readily (shorter training period, no need to attend an Academy) and could respond to a number of calls now being handled by patrol officers. The potential to expand the duties for a CSO-FI means two things. First, with greater staffing, they can handle a greater percent of the call types that they currently respond to, as well as handle some calls that now handled exclusively by patrol or animal control. Not only could CSO's take some call load burden off of patrol, they would be equally capable of handling any call that is currently given to the PST desk. Currently, the duties of CSO's focus on traffic related issues (around 10 percent of the calls). Theoretically, a CSO could cover over 27 percent of the call load. This added staffing could leave sworn officers for other enforcement and community-building tasks.

While filling vacant and allotted sworn officer positions remain a priority, the addition of CSO's to the patrol division can help strengthen and concentrate the efforts of the sworn officers for emergency and immediate calls, as well as problem solving activities. The potential for CSO's to handle a larger percent of the call load is obviously dependent on the staffing level for that position. These numbers are merely a hypothetical for establishing a redistribution of call load responsibility and this table represents one possibility for call redistribution. The key point that the table represents is that that the expanded use of additional civilian personnel may improve an officer's availability and response time to emergency calls while allowing for more uninterrupted time for proactive and coactive policing. Both could happen without reducing community satisfaction with the department's response to routine calls.

For Table 6, the Cadmine report, *Unit Activity Summary* was explored. Each individual badge number was queried so that the exact workload of each officer within

each unit could be established. In order to assign a call type to one work unit, the first step was to identify the call types that were clearly the purview of one unit over another (e.g., an animal cruelty to Animal Control; a shots fired call to Patrol). On the other hand, there are a number of calls that might be assigned to any of the workgroups depending on the circumstances and/or availability (e.g., burglary; gas theft). In this event, if the call type appeared to routinely go to one work group unit over another, it was thus assigned (See Appendix C for a breakdown for call assignment). The following table summarizes the most likely scenario for call assignment.

Table 6
Calls For Service By Responding Longmont Police Department Personnel, 2005

Yearly Number	Sworn Officer	Sworn Traffic	CSO-FI	Secondary CSO Duties	Animal Control	PST	Secondary PST duties	Total
Personnel Number *	72	5	3		4	5		89
Call-Types	137	19		32	18	12	6	186***
Percent Call-Type**	73.7	10.2		17.2	9.7	6.5	3.2	100%
Officer Response***	72,887	2,885	3,550	7,755	7,737	4,499	4,306	91,558

Source of Data: CadMine Unit Summary Statistic Report (each officer compiled separately). If two officers arrive at the same scene, it is one call for service, but the Unit Summary statistic will show two entries -- one for each officer. While the total number of calls for service has totaled at 78,664, it is not uncommon to have more than one staff member respond, thus the two totals don't match.

* Personnel Number: See Appendix A for authorized staffing numbers.

**Call types actually total 190. However, 4 call types are eliminated from this computation because they are handled by any and all units on a routine basis (follow-up; phone message; information & other)

***Officer Response: secondary duties for CSO and PST are estimated by identifying how many responses equate with those call types using the CadMine Monthly Event Summary by Type Report.

Comparing Front-Range UCR Crime Rates

Longmont's 2004 reported crime rate is compared with eight front-range cities of similar size. Among the eight cities, Longmont ranks second highest in the reporting of Part I crimes. Though our resident and business surveys indicate overall satisfaction with police services, it should be noted that our agency is dealing with a higher reported crime rate than other comparative front-range cities (see Table 7). This is an additional factor to consider in recognizing Longmont's level of workload per officer.

Table 7
2004 UCR Part I Crimes Per Thousand
For Comparative Front-Range Cities

Front-Range City	All UCR Part I Crimes
Arvada	37.17
Boulder	42.01
Fort Collins	39.66
Greeley	66.55
Longmont	61.00
Loveland	35.94
Thornton	45.56
Westminster	52.58

UCR Part I Crimes includes murder and non-negligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, & arson.

Long-Range Strategic Planning Recommendation

Since the mid-1990's the Longmont Police Department has been guided by its long-range strategic planning process. To retain our level of excellence, significant concern has focused on staffing levels. This includes issues around recruitment, retention, special projects and needs, and citywide growth. In a 2002 Strategic Recommendation, the Plan addressed staffing concerns by seeking to attain a staff ratio proportionate to our population, recognizing the impact of administrative loss, and emphasizing proactive and coactive policing solutions. In summary, the Strategy states:

Ensure that police staffing levels keep pace with city growth and service area growth (nearby rural areas) and service demands in reactive, proactive, and coactive policing activities. The Strategic Recommendation specifies that staffing levels should take into consideration the administrative loss factors common to police departments, i.e. vacation, sick leave, training, injuries, etc., and to strive to maintain a loss factor that is manageable.”

The purpose of this recommendation was to help command staff determine the personnel required to effectively respond to calls for service while maintaining a strong proactive and coactive policing approach. This challenge has grown even greater due to Longmont's spurt in growth. The primary components of this strategy include:

- 1) Maintaining an appropriate ratio of staff personnel to area population;
- 2) Maintaining an overall administrative loss factor that is manageable
- 3) Maintaining adequate staffing to support the police department's desire to perform problem-oriented and community-oriented policing.

Staffing to Population Ratio

To maintain an adequate staffing based on population, the Department has written that, “the police department should be staffed comparatively with other Front Range police departments in proportion to the service population of the city and rural areas.” The formula is a simple ratio of sworn and civilian population to the jurisdiction's population. The study reveals that police staffing levels have NOT kept pace with city growth. In 2005, **the front-range average for sworn police officers to population was 1.57 officers and .847 civilian** police employees per 1,000 residents.¹¹ In 2005, **the city of Longmont ratios were 1.45 police officers and .682 civilian employees per 1,000 residents.**

The Strategic Plan suggests that the ratio include the surrounding rural population adjacent the city limits. Because the outlying residents live in relative isolation from any other city center, they are likely to work, shop, and recreate in Longmont. As such, they can become a tax on city resources. If the rural population were taken into account as defined by the benchmark, the population served would increase by approximately 10,000 residents, reducing our ratios even more.

¹¹ Ratios are based on a survey of seven northern Colorado cities of comparable size to Longmont. Longmont is not part of this average.

Table 8
Front-Range Officer & Civilian Personnel Ratio, Per 1,000 Population
(Population does not include student campus population)*

City	2005 population	2005 sworn number	2005 sworn ratio	2005 civilian number	2005 civilian ratio
Arvada**	104,000	139	1.34	72	.692
Boulder	74,673	171	2.29	92.25	1.235
Ft. Collins	112,230	162	1.44	90.5	.806
Greeley	77,744	127	1.63	105	***
Longmont	82,798	120	1.45	56.5	.682
Loveland	61,871	82	1.33	42	.679
Thornton	113,000	149	1.32	38	***
Westminster	110,000	178	1.62	90.7	.825
Average With Longmont Included			1.55		.820
Average Without Longmont Included			1.57		.847

***Population figures do not include the university student population** in Greeley, Fort Collins, or Boulder. Students were eliminated for 3 reasons: First, most students are gone three months out the year. Second, each University has its own campus police that handle crime and disorder on-campus. Furthermore, they are certified peace officers who have full authority within each respective city. They often assist the city police, especially on emergency calls. Last, there a number of commuters who attend these universities, but live elsewhere. Though data is only known for CU campus, it is estimated that approximately 25 percent of that student population lives outside the city limits (7,253 commuters for 28,624 students). CSU and UNC do not collect information this specific.

**Arvada: Due to the passage of a public safety tax, Deputy Chief Wicks reports that they will be hiring 26 sworn and 7 civilian FTE's in 2006. This should increase their sworn and civilian ratio to 1.59 officers and .760 civilians per thousand population.

*** Greeley & Thornton civilian numbers are excluded because Greeley's Records Section is a combined City & County operation and Thornton's dispatch is Adams County.

To anticipate the impact of our city's growth, the following table shows our future personnel needs, given two assumptions. The first assumption is that the City of Longmont will continue to grow at an estimated rate of 1.0 percent each year, and second, that the front-range average will remain constant near 1.57 sworn and .847 civilian, per 1,000 population. Given those assumptions, the Longmont Police Department anticipates needing 134 sworn officers and 72 civilian employees by 2008.

Table 9
 Past & Present Longmont Police Department Officer & Civilian Personnel Ratio
 Based on City Population*

Note: Communications Staff Is Included Under Civilian Employees

YEAR	CITY POPULATION	OFFICERS/ 1,000	SWORN OFFICERS	CIVILIAN/ 1,000	CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES
1995	57,208	1.47	84	.778	44.5
1996	58,173	1.48	86	.765	44.5
1997	60,036	1.57	94	.780	48
1998	62,785	1.54	97	.780	49
1999	65,308	1.53	100	.766	50
2000	73,344	1.42	104	.709	52
2001	76,098	1.41	107	.703	53.5
2002	77,328	1.42	110	.750	58
2003	79,321	1.39	110	.706	56
2004	81,169	1.39	113	.671	54.5
2005	82,798	1.45	120	.682	56.5
2006	83,626	1.57	131	.847	71
2007	84,462	1.57	133	.847	71.5
2008	85,307	1.57	134	.847	72

The average growth rate for Longmont over last 5 years has been 2.42 percent. However, the last two years has shown a decreasing trend in growth. In 2004, the growth rate was 2.3 percent and for 2005, it has been 2.01. Since the average for the last two years is smaller than the five year average, and given the current trend, the projected growth figures in this table are based on the very conservative estimate of a 1.0 percent growth rate. Estimated numbers are rounded to the nearest half-time FTE.

Administrative Loss

The police function is a unique aspect of city government because it must fully operate twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. Often, staff are required to attend police-related assignments that fall outside of their normally scheduled work week (such as court testimony, training, meetings, formal and informal documentation needs, special assignments, major crime call-out's, etc). Because of the many overtime requirements and a finite overtime budget, officers are often compensated with compensatory time that must be taken at some later date.

The administrative time loss factor records the number of hours lost to regular work assignment due to vacation, sick leave, compensatory leave, training time, injury leave, bereavement, family medical leave, and suspension. All of these factors subtract from the total staff-hours that are available to the Patrol Services Division to staff its three primary shifts (see Table 10 & 11).

Table 10
Average Administrative Loss Time In Hours For The Three Patrol Shifts

January 1, 2002 Through December 31, 2002

Shift	Vacation	Sick	Comp.	Training	Injury	Other *	Totals	Ofc./Shift
I (n=16)	3,148	851	400	1,760	1,270	235	7,674	3.69
II(n=21-22)	3,691	686	769	2,815	448	270	8,679	4.17
III (n=17-18)	2,694	318	825	2,275	1,110	125	7,347	3.53
Totals (n=54-56)	9,533	1,855	1,994	6,850	2,838	630	23,700	11.39

January 1, 2003 Through December 31, 2003

Shift	Vacation	Sick	Comp.	Training	Injury	Other *	Totals	Ofc./Shift
I (n=16)	3,310	680	170	2,930	1,398.25	300	8,788.25	4.23
II(n=21-22)	3,560	1,080	470	3,490	247	860	9707	4.67
III (n=17-18)	3,360	640	460	2,100	442.50	310	7,312.50	3.52
Totals (n=54-56)	10,230	2,400	1,100	8,520	2,087.75	1,470	25,807.75	12.41

January 1, 2004 Through December 31, 2004

Shift	Vacation	Sick	Comp.	Training	Injury	Other *	Totals	Ofc./Shift
I (n=16-18)	3,380	750	340	1,650	580	1,500	8,200	3.94
II(n=21-22)	4,390	900	380	2,340	30	1,440	9,480	4.56
III (n=18-19)	3,480	210	290	1,710	200	1,760	7,650	3.68
Totals (n=55-59)	11,250	1,860	1,010	5,700	810	4,700	25,330	12.18

January 1, 2005 Through December 31, 2005

Shift	Vacation	Sick	Comp.	Training	Alt & Inj	Other *	Totals	Ofc./Shift
I (n=19)	4,790	940	170	1,850	410	2,360	10,520	5.06
II(n=22-24)	4,840	1,190	660	3,320	590	2,080	12,680	6.09
III (n=18-19)	3,490	1,090	530	1,370	360	1,710	8,550	4.11
Power (4)	380	90	90	280	120	120	1,080	0.52
Totals (n=63-66)	13,500	3,310	1,450	6,820	1,480	6,270	32,830	15.78

NOTE: Shift totals varied slightly throughout the year. Only officers assigned to the street are included. Table does not include unfilled positions, supervisors, traffic officers, court officer, or domestic violence officer. OFC/SHIFT Computed by dividing the total hours lost by 2080 (2080 normal work hours in a year)

* Other includes; Bereavement, Family Leave, Personal Leave, Suspension. In 2005, this also included special assignment, and adjusted days.

During the last four years, the number of line-level sworn officers assigned to the three patrol watches averaged fifty-eight (58). During this time, the average administrative loss for the Patrol Division averaged 4 officers per shift and 443 hours per officer.¹² For the Longmont Police Department to compensate for this administrative

¹² Equation: $[3.69 + 4.17 + 3.53] + [4.23 + 4.67 + 3.52] + [3.94 + 4.56 + 3.68] + [5.06 + 6.09 + 4.63 (W2+power)] = 51.77 / 12 = 4.31$
Equation: $(W1 \text{ total} / \# \text{ ofcrs}) + (W2 \text{ total} / \# \text{ ofcrs}) + (W3 \text{ total} / \# \text{ ofcrs}) = \text{SUM} / 3$.
(For 2002, $\text{SUM } 1282 / 3 = 427$). (For 2003, $\text{SUM } 1396 / 3 = 465$). (For 2004, $\text{SUM } 1289 / 3 = 430$)

loss, a level of staffing cushion must be planned so our minimum staffing requirements don't continually stress existing resources. The purpose of the strategy is to maintain daily staffing levels that exceed minimums, so that supervisors have some flexibility to approve training classes and requests for time off. As it stands today, patrol must often deny officers time off and/or training opportunities because any absences would place the shift below minimum staffing levels. In many cases, unanticipated absences place a watch below minimums. In those cases, the division is left paying an off-duty officer overtime pay to come in and cover the shift.

While this analysis is primarily focused on the Patrol Services Division, the same administrative loss factors apply across divisions. The most significant loss factor is related to training hours. For the last two years, this has equated to eleven full time positions.

The increase in training hours is no longer a "negotiable issue," given the current public safety environment that is particularly complex, lethal, and litigious. The very nature of policing continues to require greater sophistication, knowledge, skill sets, and professionalism on the part of each employee. For that reason, our training requirements will only increase. Some areas of training emphasis include:

- Search & Seizure
- Civil Liability
- Less-lethal Force
- Lethal Force
- Driver Training
- Domestic Violence
- Blood-borne Pathogens
- DUI
- Rapid Emergency Deployment
- Clandestine laboratory evidence and safety issues
- POST required annual certifications (e.g., CPR, first aid, self-defense, firearms)
- Variety of Communication Skills
- Problem-Oriented Policing
- Community-Oriented Policing

Table 11
Department-Wide Time Loss, In Hours, Due To Training, 1997 Through 2005

Training Type	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Outside Schools*	8,187	9,451	9,080	9,060	9,499	12,329	9,118	13,583	10,631
In-Service Training	3,380	5,372	4,548	4,500	6,798	6,702	6,714	7,108	8,906
Other Training**	2,673	1,578	1,436	2,080	2,632	4,462	1,840	2,335	4,258
Total Hours	14,240	16,401	15,064	15,640	18,929	23,493	17,672	23,027	23,795
Equivalent Staff Loss***	6.8	7.9	7.2	7.5	9.1	11.3	8.5	11.07	11.4

* Includes Police Academy Recruit Training

** Includes range, orientation, roll call, recruiting, and academy instruction

***Equation: training total / 2,080= FTE loss

(For 2005, the addition of a power shift changes the denominator to 4) SUM 1802 / 4 = 450
TOTAL: 427 + 465 + 430 +450 = 1772 / 4 = 443.

Attrition & Hiring Process

A compounding factor of administrative loss is the normal attrition rate of officers resigning or retiring, and the time it takes to fill that position. Historically, we have lost about five officers a year to attrition. In 2003 and 2004, we lost eight and six officers, respectively, but in 2005, this dropped to only two. In many lines of work, hiring a replacement can be a relatively short process. However, for police personnel, the hiring and training process is arduous and time consuming. The standards that are required to work in law enforcement are stringent and selective. Many fail to have the background skills, integrity, or multi-tasking ability to do the job. Typically, the city will receive a number of applicants for various police positions but by the time the evaluation process is complete, we may have a pool that contains only 10 percent of the original list.¹³

The process is even more strenuous for police officers. Given optimum conditions, it takes about 20 weeks to complete the hiring process, 3-4 weeks for orientation, 14 weeks to attend an academy, and 14-16 weeks in a Field Training Officer (FTO) program before an officer is cleared to work "solo." In summary, it takes a new hire 54 weeks, or at least one year by the time they apply until they are qualified as a competent solo officer.¹⁴

To illustrate, in 2005, the department received 184 applications for police officer. By the time the initial hiring process was completed, eight were given job offers and seven were ultimately hired (after a job offer, some applicants may withdraw from the process, others may not pass a background check or medical assessment). Only four were post-certified (meaning they could forego the Academy and directly enter the field under the guidance of a training officer). The remaining seven (or 64 percent) required an academy before entering the field training program. See the following table for applicant numbers from 2002 through 2005.

Table 12
Number of Applicants & Outcome: 2002 Through 2005*

	Patrol Officer				PST				Dispatch			CSO	
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2002	2003	2004	2005	2003	2004	2005	2003	2004
Total Number of applicants	222	139	315	184	27	72	51	251	154	257	522	66	66
Number job offers	15	14	13	8	2	7	2	9	n/a	3	4	4	2
Number hired	5	10	9	7	2	1	1	7	6	1	4	1	1
% of Total Offered a Job	7%	10%	6%	4%	7%	10%	4%	4%	n/a	1%	<1	6%	3%
Percent of Total Hired	2%	7%	4%	4%	7%	1%	2%	3%	4%	0.3%	<1	2%	2%

*These numbers reflect those participating in that year's hiring process, even if their start date is in the following year. This is typically the case when the hiring process begins in the fall of the year. The Department did not run a hiring process for CSO's in 2005.

One possible avenue to lessen the impact of this extensive (though necessary) hiring and training process is to permit the department to "hire-ahead." What has constantly hurt our staffing level has been our inability to fill openings any sooner than one year after they are vacated (or allotted). Often, if additional staffing is allotted, those positions remained unfilled because the more urgent positions must be filled. First

¹³ Specifically, this statistic refers to sworn officers, community service officers, police service technicians, and communications specialists

¹⁴ However, if there is no academy being run at the time of the hiring, then the applicant is delayed in the process. At the extreme, in the recent past, it has taken as long as 23.5 months for this hiring and training process to conclude.

priority has been given to fill basic patrol officer positions that have been vacated or allotted so that staffing on each watch meets our basic needs. For example, in 2001, the City Council approved a second domestic violence officer position, but because attrition has been so great, it remained unfilled until June of 2004.

Need for Proactive and Coactive Policing

The underlying philosophy of the Longmont Police Department is “Policing in Partnership with the Community.” Partnership means relinquishing some police autonomy as it relates to crime control. The Police acknowledge that they can’t do the job alone, and greater strength must be given to the citizenry to help in the effort. When we talk of partnership, we are referring to proactive and coactive policing. According to the Strategic Plan, “staffing needs to take into account consideration of the available time officers have to devote to proactive and coactive policing activities (community interaction and problem solving) and strive to maintain staffing at a level which will enable an officer to spend 30 percent of his or her time in these areas.”

Budget Impacts

Federal and state law enforcement grants that were once available are being channeled to other federal and state programs. Our future opportunities for grant funding cannot be relied upon, and we will need to become less reliant on outside sources of revenue to fund needed positions.

Since 1996, when the Strategic Plan 2000 was established, the Longmont Police Department has used the Plan as a framework for its budget planning process and its request for positions. The Department **requested 61 positions**, often having to repeat the request over subsequent years. In several cases, the position was never granted. Over the eight years, **only 36.5 of the positions have been granted and filled (60% of the total requests).**

If the requests made in the Strategic Plan had been approved, staffing would be near recommended levels. This is not a statement of “we told you so,” as much as a reflection that the Strategic Planning process is well thought-out and the issues considered before a strategy is finalized is based on valid information and experience. The accurate foresight reflected in these recommendations speaks to the process and the seriousness by which each strategy is developed. **While it is clearly understood that citywide budget constraints have precluded filling all of the requested positions, the staffing need for the police department remains. The longer it takes to fill these positions, the farther behind we fall.**

To assist in offsetting staffing requirements, the Longmont Police Department has requested (through the city budget process) to purchase equipment that can make operations more efficient and effective. The requests have included an updated RMS system, an automated booking system, a new report writing module, report dictation capability, mobile data computers (MDC’s), and moveable storage shelves for Property and Evidence. The majority of these one-time items has been approved through the regular city budget process, but have not yet been purchased or fully operationalized because of spending limitations. When these items are eventually in place, they may help to reduce some of the department’s staffing concerns.

One extremely time-consuming task for patrol personnel is report writing. A full analysis of the time a patrol officer typically spends writing reports was completed in

March 2001. In 2005, the Department acquired a new Records Management System that will incorporate a dictation option with the Report Writing System. Based on the findings from a 2001 study, we anticipate that a dictation option will greatly reduce the amount of time it takes an officer to complete a report. We hope to determine a more precise staff-saving analysis by the end of 2006.

Table 13
Requested & Approved Budgeted Positions
As Recommended in the Long-Range Strategic Plan

POSITIONS REQUESTED * requested for several years	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Total Approved
Patrol Sergeant *			1	1				1	1
Patrol Officer	3	3 (2)			6 (3)		3	6 (5)	16 ^a
Traffic Officer				1	1				2
School Resource Officer			1	1	1				3
Jail Officer					1				
Domestic Violence Officer				1					1
Beat Support Team Officer		3	3 (2)				2		2
Gang Sergeant							1		
General Detective								1	1
SEU Detective	2							1	1
Mall Officer			1						1
ROP Detective *		1	1	1	1				
Intelligence Detective		1							1
Crime-Free Multi-Hsing Officer				2					
Senior Services Officer				1					
Communications Specialist								1 (2)	1
CSO – Animal Control	1							1	1
CSO –Traffic *		1	1	2	2			2	
CSO – Detectives *	1	1	1	1	1				
CSO – Evidence					1 (½)			½	½
PST – Records	3	1			1 (but elim)			1	1
PST – Report Taker		1	1						2
Community Program Coord *	1	1	1	1					1
Volunteer Coordinator	1								
Information Services Coord			1						1
Legal Advisor					1				
Administrative Technician *				1	1 (but elim)			1	
Requested Positions/Year	12	13	12	13	18		6^a	16.5	61 unrepeated requests
Approved Positions/Year	4	4	6	4	6.5		3^a	9	36.5

Bolded numbers reflect the approved positions.

^a In 2004, 3 patrol officer positions granted during budget process, though not formally requested.

Citizen Service Analysis & Benchmarks

One goal of the biennial *Longmont Police Citizen Service Survey* is to measure citizen perception of crime and disorder in Longmont. Specifically, residents are asked questions about their overall sense of safety in Longmont as well as an assessment of the amount of disorder that exists. The survey was conducted in 1999, 2001, 2003 and 2005. This particular measure has been used to establish a citywide benchmark for crime and disorder.

The first benchmark reads, “no more than 5 percent of the population should feel personally unsafe in Longmont.” In 1999, 3 percent of Longmont residents felt unsafe. It increased to 6 percent in 2001, dropped to 5 percent in 2003, and to 4 percent in 2005. The second benchmark states, “no more than 10 percent of Longmont residents should feel that their property is unsafe in Longmont.” In 1999, 10 percent of the residents reported that their property was unsafe. In 2001, it increased to 12 percent, and in 2003 and 2005, it remained at 13 percent. These results minimally exceed the police department’s benchmark for “Sense of Safety” and may reflect the rise in property related crimes especially car vandalism, car break-ins, and burglaries.

The benchmark measuring disorder states that, “at least 85 percent of residents should believe that any aspect of disorder is either ‘no problem’ or a ‘minor problem.’” The data from the survey indicates the department’s ability to meet this benchmark slipped from 86 percent in 1999 to 82 percent in 2001. However, in the following two survey years (2003 and 2005) it increased from 84 percent to 85 percent. Disorder issues significantly impact police resources because disorder-type crimes are often only surface indicators of a much more serious underlying problem. It often suggests a long-standing problem that is endemic to the neighborhood. The problem is usually not solved by making a single contact with a single household. Disorder issues often turn into Problem Oriented Policing projects, because their complex nature requires a multi-faceted approach toward mitigation or solution.

Trends That Impact Police Staffing

There are several trends that are adversely impacting police staffing. Should these trends continue as expected, the Longmont Police Department will have to allocate additional resources to keep pace with their proliferating and complex nature.

Clandestine Methamphetamine Labs

Over the last several years, Colorado has experienced an alarming rise in the use and production of methamphetamine. This illicit drug can be manufactured using common household chemicals and compounds that are unregulated and easily obtained. An illicit laboratory can be set up to produce methamphetamine by relative novices who produce the compound for personal use or minor distribution. In either case, these labs create a tremendous risk to the general public as they emit a variety of toxic and volatile chemicals that manufacturers discard haphazardly.

Experiences in other states across the America indicate that methamphetamine laboratories have a tendency to grow exponentially. In 1998, Colorado uncovered 31 laboratories. By 2001, this number had increased to 452 (increase of 1358%). The number of labs uncovered in Longmont has varied the last few years, though the report of methamphetamine use remains incredibly high. In 2000, the Longmont Police Department uncovered two clandestine laboratories. This increased to six in 2001 and to twelve in 2002, but decreased to five in both 2004 and 2005. Though, the number of labs lessened between 2003 and 2004, the Department still investigated 430 methamphetamine-related intelligence reports in 2005.

The reduction of seized clandestine laboratories is NOT because methamphetamine is losing popularity. Instead, manufacturers are changing how they do business and labs are harder to detect. The public has been educated about methamphetamine use, and thus more vigilant in spotting its signs. People who use the drug often behave bizarrely and unpredictably. Manufacturing products have a distinct odor, and unusual items of trash become visible. This "strangeness" draws the attention of outsiders who might otherwise have paid little notice. This level of detect-ability has driven manufacturers further underground.

Law enforcement officers state-wide, are finding that the entire manufacturing process is being franchised out, and that the number of "middle-men" is so large it is hard to catch any one person with both the ingredients and the product. In previous years, a manufacturer would set up a base of operation, create the lab and sell the product. However, offenders have learned that a stationary operation is how they get caught. Now, the process involves separate individuals for every stage of the process. One obtains the ephedrine and another obtains the chemicals (needed to "cook" it). One keeps the glassware, another cooks, another transports, and yet another re-distributes the drug back down the line. The places where the methamphetamine is cooked remain very mobile and the participants continually cross jurisdictional lines. All of the various contents are kept by the manufacturers in sealed containers or backpacks, so that there is no risk of any "plain view" citizen observation or police seizure. Most of the cooking will occur over one night at an obscure location. They disband and leave for separate destinations in the morning.

Officers have found that the Mexican grade quality of methamphetamine has greatly improved, making them competitive with the local labs. The production in Mexico has grown exponentially. In 2004, DEA intercepted three cargo shiploads carrying

nothing but ephedrine en route to Mexico from the Far East (for the sole purpose of methamphetamine manufacturing).

The surge of methamphetamine use has hurt the economy of cocaine suppliers, so in order to compete, they are lowering their prices (nearly half), enhancing the quality (28% to 85% pure), and making it easier to find. Often, users are turning the drug into crack, and with this level of marketing, we can anticipate an increase in local use.

While drug-use alone is enough of a problem, it inevitably engenders a myriad of other social problems. First, there is an increase in the number of drug-related reports the police must investigate. Property theft increases because people need money to maintain a drug-abusing lifestyle. Fraud and forgery is a highlighted concern nationwide because drug users are stealing checks, credit cards, and personal identify in order to buy drugs. Effects of methamphetamine use include serious mental health disturbances, physical ailments, and aggressive sexual tendencies. In homes where there are children, there is a high likelihood that the child will be sexually abused by an associated adult. They have found that this activity is often fueled by pornography and the videotaping of their own deviant acts. Social Services are overwhelmed at the number of children that must be placed in foster care because their drug-abusing parents are neglecting their children's needs and jeopardizing their safety. People with this lifestyle may seek help for emotional and physical problems that doctors fail to recognize as methamphetamine-induced (e.g., liver disease; anxiety; schizophrenia; renal failure; heart attack).

Methamphetamine labs pose a significant risk to public safety and they require an inordinate amount of tactical planning and time to investigate and decontaminate. Officers must safely seize the evidence, arrest the offenders, dispose of the toxic waste, and help oversee the clean up the residual poisons. Currently the Special Enforcement Unit (SEU) of the Longmont Police Department conducts the investigations of these cases. The Special Enforcement Unit is staffed by three detectives and one sergeant. Should drugs use grow as expected, the current staffing levels of the SEU will need to be reassessed. Due to the increased sophistication of manufacturers and the inherently dangerous and unpredictable behavior of users, these cases often result in the execution of high-risk search warrants on clandestine locations. SEU detectives rely heavily on other department resources, such as S.W.A.T. and the patrol division for assistance. The additional drain on resources may not only require a larger pool of SEU detectives but backup personnel, as well.

In 2004, the Colorado legislature passed laws standardizing how methamphetamine labs are to be cleaned. The legislature mandates that the local county health department oversee the cleanup process, but unfortunately, the law did not provide any penalty for a property owner's non-compliance. Currently, Longmont is able to work through this handicap because our local Building Inspection Code gives our Inspectors the latitude to revoke the "Certificate of Occupancy" until a premise is satisfactorily cleaned.

In 2005, the Special Enforcement Unit had an authorized staffing of four detectives and one sergeant. However, the fourth detective position was not filled in 2005 because of staffing shortages in the patrol division. Additionally, during the last four months of the year, one position was vacant due to a detective's military obligation.

Computer Crime (Cyber-crime) Trends

Cyber-crime has grown over the last four years and now accounts for over 100 cases per year. Cases largely involve internet fraud and child predatory or exploitation cases. The Longmont Police Department anticipates that this will remain an increasing trend from year to year. In 2004, the detective division received 91 cyber-crime-related complaints. In 2005, it increased to 103 cyber-crime related cases. In addition to what is reported locally, the detective division has receives referrals each year from the Washington D.C.-based Internet Fraud Complaint Center (IFCC). The IFCC typically refer cases to the local jurisdiction where either the victim or suspect resides. In 2005, detectives received 67 IFCC referrals of internet fraud complaints.

Cases can only be worked as time permits. The increasing volume of cases, the complexity of the crime, and the lack of a full-time detective to handle the technical aspects of the investigation prevents the division from handling all reported or referred cases. Given these constraints, we are only able to investigate internet crimes that result in either a significant financial loss to the victim or cases where an offender poses a major risk to the community. For that reason, a majority of these crimes are not investigated and victims do not receive the police services they have come to expect.

Along with fraud, the department is receiving an increasing number of complaints that the internet is being used to exploit children. Exploitation can occur when pedophiles distribute images depicting child pornography or when sexual predators use the internet to develop relationships with children they intend to lure into contact for sexual gratification. Investigators report that it only takes a few moments on the computer for an officer posing as an adolescent female to have a predator make contact and begin the grooming process.

These two crime categories only reflect a small percent of the actual predatory crimes occurring over the internet. If staff levels were increased, cold case investigations could be completed. Added staff could begin a focus toward proactive work, so that criminals casting around cyberspace for new victims are caught in the act.

Computer internet cases take more time to investigate than your "average" crime. Typically, internet crimes involve writing and executing at least two search warrants (as opposed to the "average" crime, such as burglary, assault, or mischief, where search warrants are rarely needed). At the outset, internet crime requires the investigating agency to complete a search warrant to be served on an Internet Service Provider (ISP). Officers must locate account information for both the suspect and the victim. In child pornography/exploitation cases, another warrant is necessary to seize the suspect's computer. Once the computer is seized, another warrant is needed to search the computer files for evidence of the crime. The forensic search of a suspect's computer is a labor and time intensive task that requires the skills of a specially trained investigator. Overall, internet crimes (versus "average" crimes) take two to three times the staffing hours to investigate.

Animal-Related Complaints and Calls

As the population of the city of Longmont grows, so will the population of pets. Continued growth will also impact the habitats of wild animals, increasing the unwanted contact between humans and wildlife. Thus, animal complaints and issues are expected to rise over the next several years. Animal Control calls are primarily handled by (4) Community Service Officers (CSO) assigned to the Patrol Division. Over the last two years, animal-related calls for service increased by 19 percent.

Table 14
CSO-Animal Control Workload: 2002 Through 2005

	2002	2003	2004*	2005	Percent Increase 2002-2005
ALL calls handled by CSO-AC (animal and not-animal)	6,541	7,341	7,292	7,429	13.6%
ANIMAL Related Calls handled by CSO-AC	6,344	7,038	7,067	7,191	13.4%
ALL ANIMAL Control CFS (regardless who responded)**	7,488	8,303	8,613	8,903	18.9%

Source: Cadmine Report, Event Volume By Type.

* Calls handled by animal control officers dropped in 2004, because one officer took 3 mo. family leave.

** Does not include call types: General follow-up; General Information; Phone Message; Summons; Warrant; Relay (does include animal follow-up and animal information)

Animal control officers' primary duties involve addressing animal-related calls and concerns. On occasion, they may assist on other types of calls when the need arises. Similarly, traffic field investigators, report takers, and patrol officers may handle animal-related calls in the absence of an available CSO-AC. Currently, the number of animal-related calls for service exceed what the current CSO-AC's can handle. In 2002, animal control-related calls totaled 7,488 (regardless of the responding unit). In 2005, this increased to 8,903 calls. While the number of calls handled by CSO-AC's has increased about 14 percent in the last two years, the overall animal-related call load has increased by 19 percent. Overall, the four Animal Control Officers handle nearly 10 percent of the total calls for service for the Longmont Police Department (total calls = 78,117). In 2005, the average workload per Animal Control Officer was 1,857 calls per year. This exceeds the workload of sworn personnel, who average approximately 681 calls for service per year, per officer.

With the anticipated increase in population, these numbers are only expected to rise. Though Animal Control officers have obviously tried to spread themselves thin enough to handle a 19 percent increase, they cannot be expected to do so without an increase in staff. Though CSO-FI's will occasionally handle animal control calls, the majority of the overflow is assigned to patrol officers.

In order to reduce the workload of the four CSO's assigned to Animal Control, and to keep pace with the expected increase in animal issues, the department recommends an increase in staffing in this area.

Multi-housing Increase

During the recent "building-boom" in the City, several multi-housing developments were constructed. The city has over 20 complexes that have a hundred or more apartments or mobile homes that concentrating hundreds of residents in close proximity to one another. This trend presents additional challenges to police because historically, the more concentrated a population, the higher the rate of police-related concerns. Call for service data has shown that these multi-unit complexes have a much higher demand on police services than do single-family residential areas. Thus, the department can expect a higher rate of call-demand coming from these newer projects as they gain tenancy. To assist in dealing with this issue the department has proposed staffing a Crime-Free Multi-housing Program. These programs dedicate police resources to multi-family complexes to help mitigate crime and disorder through a comprehensive approach of prevention, intervention, and citizen and management partnership. Several programs around the nation have found this to be an extremely effective method of response.

Spanish Speaking Only, Population Increase

Census data comparing 1990 to 2000 indicates that the non-English speaking families living in the City of Longmont have increased from 261 families in 1990 to 855 families in 2000 (most are mono-lingual Spanish-speaking). Many of these families are transient, moving back and forth between the United States and Mexico.

This trend has ramifications to police services in several ways. First, there will continue to be a high demand for Spanish-speaking officers, both in terms of bilingual recruitment and ongoing training. Second, transient populations typically lack a sense of commitment and empowerment in their temporary home, and are less willing to invest time and energy in neighborhood betterment. For this reason, it is harder to find willing resident partners for projects that could lessen crime and disorder. Without strong community partnerships, additional police time must target the more serious underlying problems.

Domestic Violence

In 1999, the Longmont Police Department and other government, non-profit, and for-profit organizations came together to address the problem of domestic violence in Longmont. The collaborative group identifies itself as Longmont Ending Violence Initiative (LEVI). The program is designed to increase awareness about the problem of domestic violence in the community through education, public information, and easy access to resources. The effort is aimed at getting citizens to lend supporting advice or guidance to a victim or offender and to involve the appropriate resources for help. As the program gains ground, the Longmont Police Department should expect a greater call load and investigative caseload for domestic violence calls.

For some time, Longmont has led the county in the number of reported domestic violence cases. For several years running, Longmont has investigated over 40 percent of all reported domestic violence cases in Boulder County.¹⁵ Our campaign to heighten the awareness around domestic violence may result in an increase of official reporting (whether the actual number of cases increases, or not, our reporting is likely to). The Police Department considers domestic violence the number one safety concern in Longmont.

Efforts to Maintain Efficiency

We continue our efforts to maintain an organization that is highly efficient without compromising our quality of service. This has been accomplished through the following strategies. First, the Department has eliminated several upper staff level positions by “flattening” the supervisory structure. This leaves more line-level personnel to respond directly to the needs of the community. Second, we have minimized the number of officers who hold administrative assignments. Many assignments once held by sworn personnel are now handled by civilians. We continue to maximize each employee’s capacity to make decisions. Additional automation will reduce or eliminate redundancy of effort. The Department is in the process of expanding the Citizens Volunteer Patrol.

¹⁵ Source: Domestic Abuse Prevention Project (DAPP), Boulder County Community Justice Services through 2004. Year-end 2005 statistics are not yet available.

These volunteers are trained to act as the “eyes and ears” of the Police Department for extra patrol needs or special events.

SUMMARY

The study group was asked to answer four questions. First, the shortage in staffing has impacted officer safety.

- During the last three years, only one officer is responding to calls that dictate a two-officer response at least 35 percent of the time.
- Since 2002 the need to break one officer from one call to handle another, of greater urgency has continued to increase. In 2002, this occurred six percent of the time; in 2005 this had increased to eleven percent.
- We are not meeting our response time goal for priority 1 thorough 3 calls 38 percent of the time.

Having too few officers available to respond to an emergency call in an acceptable time frame endangers both the public and the officer(s).

Second, we are experiencing a reduction in citizen service. In 2005, the Department has been unable to reach its response time goal for emergency calls 58 percent of the time (priority one calls). We are unable to maintain desired daily averages that officers can commit to proactive and coactive policing. Proactive and coactive policing have been strongly linked to citizens’ perception of safety and disorder. Our figures have varied slightly over the last three survey years, teetering closely around benchmark limits. Our ratio of sworn and civilian personnel to population is well below the front-range average. Based on the 2005 figures (population of 82,798), to merely meet the average (1.57 sworn; .847 civilian), we would need to increase sworn officers by 10 (to total 130 officers) and civilian staffing by 13.5 (to total 70 support personnel).

Third, we are experiencing a lack of staffing in critical areas. Overall calls for service are showing an increase.

- Since, 2002, calls have increased nearly 20 percent. Half of this increase actually occurred between 2004 and 2005.
- Animal control calls for service have increased over the last three years by 19 percent, yet there has been no increase in staffing.
- We are experiencing new crime trends that heavily tax our resources. Cyber-crime and methamphetamine lab investigations are time and staff-intensive and special expertise is required for each.
- Longmont experiences the highest rate of reported domestic violence agency in Boulder County (typically handling over 40 percent of the county’s cases).
- Our administrative loss in the patrol division has increased from 12 officers in 2004 to 16 officers in 2005.

Last, we believe an increase in staffing would alleviate these problems. We have shown that compensating for our administrative loss time, attrition rate, and extensive hiring process, can help minimize the impact of any temporary vacancies. Once sworn personnel positions are filled, some burden can be lifted from patrol assignment by

increasing CSO positions at a lesser cost (less training expense & time and lower salaries). Beyond staffing, however, we also recognize that some of the inefficient automated systems currently used compounds inefficiency. We anticipate that a number of these issues will be remedied, and interoperability enhanced, with the newly purchased Tiburon Records Management System. Once this system is operational, it is estimated that a dictation function will alleviate the time committed to report writing equal to three officers (Source: Analysis of a Dictation System for Report Writing, Longmont Police Department, March 2001).

RECOMMENDATION

Given the most recent 2005 staff additions (7 sworn and 2 civilian positions), the Police Department recommends that by 2008, the police department's staffing increase by a minimum of 15 civilian FTE's and 14 sworn FTE's. An added 29 FTE's reflect a staffing ratio comparative with front-range averages, given a projected growth rate in Longmont of only one percent. These numbers also reflect a proposal that reduces staffing costs by changing some sworn functions to civilian functions.

Many of these positions have been sought over the last several years, but were not granted due to budgetary constraints. Initially, the Department is anticipating a heavy hiring need to make up for the deficits we have had to work under for the last several years. The most critical positions for officer safety and call load / case load efficiency are recommended in 2005 and 2006. Additional staffing in 2007 and 2008 will fill the new positions needed to meet the city's and department's growth, and will provide the coverage required for effective reactive, proactive, and coactive policing. The following table identifies the Department's needs by year and position.

Table 15
Recommendation for Future Positions, 2005 To 2008
Longmont Police Department

2005	2006	2007	2008	TOTALS
5 - Patrol Officers 1 - General Detective 1 - SEU Detective	5 - Patrol Officers 1 - Patrol Sergeant	3 - Patrol Officers 1 - General Detective 1 - Beat Support Team Officer (BST)	3 - Patrol Officers	16 - Patrol Officers 2 - General Detectives 1 - SEU Detective 1 - Patrol Sgt. 1 - BST Officer
7 - Total Sworn	6 - Total Sworn	5 - Total Sworn	3 - Total Sworn	21 - Total Sworn *
2 - CSO - Patrol Field 1 - CSO Animal Control 1 - PST - Records 1 - Admin. Asst - Traffic 1 - Evidence Tech. 2 - Communications Specialist	2 - CSO Patrol Field 1 - CSO - Detectives 1 - Admin. Asst - Admin	1 - PST - Records 1 - Communications Specialist 1 - Criminalist	1 - CSO Animal Control 1 - Communication Specialist	4 - CSO - Patrol Field 2 - CSO Animal Control 1 - CSO - Detectives 1 - Criminalist 2 - PST - Records 1 - PST - Patrol 2 - Admin. Assts. 1 - Evidence Tech. 3 - Communications Specialists
8 - Total Civilian	4 - Total Civilian	2 - Total Civilian	2 - Total Civilian	17 - Total Civilian

* If the St. Vrain Valley School District provides essential financial support, four SRO's may be added to sworn numbers. Note that in 2005, 7 new officers and 2 civilian FTE's were approved. (Though nine officers were hired in 2005, two of those positions filled vacancies).

CONCLUSION

It is the conclusion, of this Staffing Study Group that the Longmont Police Department is understaffed in several areas and that this inadequacy is adversely impacting both citizen service and officer safety. Overall, the negative trends indicated in the original staffing study have not improved. Each employee is highly trained and committed, but there remains too few of us to reach the level of excellence that we seek and for which we are capable. While the Department recommends an increase in staffing, there are certain adjustments that the Police Department could make. Those adjustments may take in to consideration the elimination of specialized units, such as the Traffic Unit, School Resource Officers, and the Domestic Violence Unit.

The Staffing Study was first completed in 2003, and eventually it has served as a blueprint for determining additional police department resources. Though the results of the study suggest that increased staffing can alleviate many concerns, we acknowledge that funding additional resources is a potentially complex and difficult task. Staff looks forward to addressing these issues in collaboration with City Council, other City Departments, and the citizens of Longmont.

APPENDIX A

AUTHORIZED STAFFING

Appendix A

Authorized Staffing
2002 through 2005

CATEGORY	SUB-CATEGORY	YEAR			
		2002	2003	2004	2005
Total Personnel	(Dispatch included in parenthesis)	149 (168)	147 (166)	148.5 (167.5)	156.5 (176.5)
All Sworn		110	110	113	120
All Civilian	(Dispatch included in parenthesis)	39 (58)	37 (56)	35.5 (54.5)	36.5 (56.5)
SWORN					
Patrol	<i>All Patrol Sworn</i>	80	80	85	90
	Line Patrol	62	62	67	72
	Patrol Supervisors	12	12	12	12
	Line Traffic	5	5	5	5
	Traffic Supervisor	1	1	1	1
Detectives	<i>All Detective Sworn</i>	18	18	18	20
	Line Case	10	10	10	12
	Intelligence	1	1	1	1
	SEU (incl. 1 supervisor)	4	4	4	4
	Supervisors	3	3	3	3
Community Services	SRO	6	6	4	4
	Supervisor	1	1	1	1
Chief's Office		2	2	2	2
Support Services		3	3	3	3
CIVILIAN					
Patrol	<i>All Patrol Civilian</i>	16	15	14	14
	CSO – Traffic	4	3	3	3
	CSO – Animal Control	4	4	4	4
	PST- Report Takers	6	6	5	5
	Admin Assistant	2	2	2	2
Detectives		2	2	2	2
Community Services		1	1	1	1
Chief's Office		2.5	2.5	2	2
Support Services	<i>All Support Civilian</i>	17.5	16.5	16.5	17.5
	PST – Records	10	9	9	10
	Info. Systems	2	2	2	2
	Property & Evidence	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
	Crime Analyst	1	1	1	1
	Admin Asst	2	2	2	2
Dispatch	<i>All Dispatch</i>	19	19	19	20

APPENDIX B

CALL TYPE BY PRIORITY

APPENDIX B

Priority codes are shared with Boulder Regional Communications Center, Boulder. Any change requires a change system-wide.

Law Type Codes		Priority
ABVEH	Abandoned Vehicle	7
ACFUP	Accident Follow up	4
ALAUD	Audible Alarm	2
ALCAR	Car Alarm	2
ALHOL	Hold up Alarm	1
ALINT	Intrusion Alarm	2
ALPAN	Panic Alarm	2
AMMEL	Medical assist	2
ANBIT	Animal Bite	2
ANCOM	Animal Complaint	4
ANCRU	Animal Cruelty	4
ANFUP	Animal Follow up	4
ANINF	Animal Information	4
ANNEG	Animal Neglect	4
ARSOL	Arson	3
ASSAU	Assault	3
ATENT	Attempted Entry	4
ATCUI	Attempted Suicide	1
ATOGO	Animal to Go	4
ATTHE	Attempted Theft	6
AUTHE	Auto Theft	4
BACHE	Bar Check	4
BADOG	Barking Dog	4
BBGUN	BB Gun Complaint	4
BITHE	Bike Theft	6
BOTHR	Bomb Threat	1
BURGL	Burglary	4
CABIT	Cat Bite	4
CHABU	Child Abuse	3
CHCUS	Child Custody	4
CHILD	Child Neglect	1
CIASS	Citizen Assist	4
CIGAR	Smoking Violation	4
CISTA	Civil Standby	4
CIVIL	Civil Complaint	4
CMVEH	Criminal Mischief to Vehicle	6
COCRI	Computer Crime	7
CRMIS	Criminal Mischief	6
CROWD	Crowd Dispersal	4
CRTRE	Criminal Trespass	4
CTOGO	Cat to Go	4
CURFE	Curfew Violation	4
DEANI	Dead Animal	4
DEATH	Unattended Death	1
DISTU	Disturbance	2
DOBIT	Dog Bite	4
DOMES	Domestic	1
DRCOM	Driving or traffic complaint	4
DRUNK	Drunk Person	3
DTOGO	Dog to Go	4
DUI	Driving under the Influence	4

E911	911 Hang up	2
ELECT	Electric Callout	5
ESCAP	Escape	4
ESCOR	Escort	4
EXPLL	Explosion	1
EXPAT	Extra Patrol	5
FDASS	Fire Dept Assist	2
FDC	1 st Deg Crim Trespass	4
FEMEN	Felony Menacing	2
FIALL	Fire Alarm (law)	2
FIGHT	Fight	1
FIREW	Fire works Complaint	4
FISTL	Structure Fire	2
FOCHI	Found Child	3
FOLLO	Follow Up	6
FOPRO	Found Property	4
FORGE	Forgery	4
FRAUD	Fraud	4
GRAFF	Graffiti	6
GATHE	Gas Theft	4
HARAS	Harassment	4
HRACC	Hit and Run Accident	2
HOMIC	Homicide	1
INACL	Injury Accident	1
INEXP	Indecent Exposure	2
INFOR	Information	4
IMPER	Impersonation	4
INANI	Injured Animal	2
JAIL	Jail Transport	2
JUPRO	Juvenile Problem	4
KIDNA	Kidnapping	1
LILAW	Liquor Law Violation	4
LITTE	Littering	4
LOASS	Lock out assist	4
LOCHI	Lost Child	2
LODOG	Loose Dog	4
LOITE	Loitering	4
LOMUS	Loud Music	4
LOPRO	Lost Property	6
MATAM	Mail Tampering	4
MEDEL	Message Delivery	4
MENAC	Menacing/threats	1
MIPER	Missing Person	4
MITHR	Missile Thrower	4
MOASS	Motor Assist	4
NARCO	Narcotics Complaint	3
NEPRO	Neighbor Problem	4
NOISE	Noise Complaint	4
OBSTR	Obstructing	2
OPCON	Open Container	4
OPDOO	Open Door	2
OUASS	Outside agency assist	4
PADOW	Party Down	2
PARKI	Parking complaint	5
PARTY	Party Complaint	4
PDA	Property Damage Accident	2
PHONE	Phone Message	7

PRACC	Private Property Accident	2
PROWL	Prowler	2
REEND	Reckless Endangerment	3
REDDI	Reported Drunk Driver	3
REORD	Restraining Order Violation	3
REPRO	Recovered Property	9
RERUN	Returned Runaway	6
REVEH	Recovered Vehicle	4
ROBBE	Robbery	1
RUNAW	Runaway	6
SEASS	Sex assault	1
SHOOT	Shooting	1
SHOPL	Shoplifting	3
SHOTS	Shots Fired	2
SIANI	Sick Animal	3
SIGNA	Signals Callout	4
SOSER	Social Services Assist	4
SOLIC	Solicitor Complaint	4
STABB	Stabbing	1
STALK	Stalking	2
STREET	Streets Callout	5
SUICI	Suicide	1
SUPAR	Suicidal Party	1
SUSIT	Suspicious Situation/Vehicle or party	2
TEST	Test	4
THEFT	Theft	4
TRESP	Trespass	3
UNKNO	Unknown Problem	2
UNPAR	Unwanted Party	2
VEASS	Veicular Assault	2
VIDOG	Vicious Dog	2
WATER	Water Callout	5
WEAPO	Weapons Complaint	1
WEASS	Welfare Assist	5
WECHE	Welfare Check	3

Fire Type Codes

		Priority
AMALA	Medical Alarm	1
AMMED	Medical Call	1
AMDRF	Drowning /Ice/ Water Rescue	1
AMKNI	Stabbing	1
AMNON	Ambulance Non-emergent	2
AMSTA	Standby at Medical call	3
AMSUI	Suicide/attempted suicide overdose	1
AMSHO	Shooting	1
AMTRA	Trauma	1
ARSON	Arson	3
BOTHF	Bomb Threat	2
CAFIR	Car Fire	2
DUFIR	Dumpster Fire	2
EXPLO	Explosion	1
FEXTR	Extrication/ Special Rescue	1
FIALA	Fire Alarm (commercial)	1
FIALR	Fire Alarm (residential)	2
FICAL	Fire Call non specific	2
FICON	Controlled Burn	6
FIELE	Electrical Fire (outside)	2
FIFLU	Fuel or other materials spill	2
FISTR	Structure Fire	1
FGLEC	Gas Leak Commercial Building	2
FGLEA	Gas Leak Residential or Outside	1
FHEAD	Head-on Collision	1
FROLL	Rollover accident	1
GRFIR	Grass Fire	2
HAMAT	Hazardous Material Spill	2
INACC	Injury accident	1
ODINC	Odor Investigation (commercial)	2
ODINV	Odor Investigation (residential or outside)	2
PADOA	Party Down	1
PLCRA	Plane Crash	1
SMINC	Smoke Investigation (commercial)	2
SMINV	Smoke Investigation (residential or outside)	2
TTEST	Tone Test	3

APPENDIX C

CALL BREAKDOWN BY WORK UNIT

ELIMINATED

acc alert; cell phone; facil maint;
page; parks; utilities; simulcast; test
PATROL
alarms (all)
ambulance assist
ARC hold
arson assist
assault
attempt to locate
attempted suicide
bar check
bomb threat
child abuse
child custody
citizen standby
civil
computer crime
concealed weapon
criminal impersonation
crowd dispersal
curfew
death investigation
disturbance
domestic
drunk
DSS assist
dui
e-911
eluding
embezzlement
escape
escort
extortion
extra patrol
false reporting
FD assist (all)
felony menacing
fight
forgery
found child
fraud
FTR as sex offender
homicide
impersonation
indecent exposure
jail transport
juvenile problem
kidnap
loitering
lost child
menacing
mental hold
mental subject
missing person
mittimus
municipal warrant
narcotics violation
non-custodial arrest
obstruction
open container
open door
outside agency
outside agency assist
outside warrant
overdose
overdue party
party down
pedestrian contact

prowler
reckless endangerment
REDDI
robbery
search
sex assault
shooting
shoplift
shots fired
stabbing
stalking
suicidal party
suicide
suspicious person
suspicious situation
suspicious vehicle
threats
traffic stop
TRO violation
unwanted party
vehicle assault
warrant arrest
welfare assist
welfare check
weapons complaint

TRAFFIC OR CSO-FI

abandoned vehicle
accident follow-up
accidents
hit & run
injury
property
roll-over
unknown
driving complaint
motorcycle complaint
motorist assist
traffic complaint
vehicular assault
PRIMARY CSO-FI
abandoned vehicle
code enforcement
fuel spill
hazard
impound/tow
lock out assist
parking complaint
SECONDARY FOR CSO-FI
attempted entry
attempted theft
attempt to locate (non criminal)
bb gun
burglary
citizen assist
code enforcement
criminal trespass
directed patrol
extra patrol
fireworks
first degree criminal trespass
forgery
fraud
gas theft
graffiti
littering
loud music
loud party

mail tampering
message delivery
missile throwing
neighborhood problem
noise
recovered vehicle
relay
smoking
solicitor
streets
threats
trespass
unlawful acts

ANIMAL CONTROL

animal bite
animal cruelty
animal follow up
animal information
animal neglect
animal problem
animal to go
barking dog
cat bite
cat to go
dead animal
dog bite
dog to go
injured animal
loose dog
sick animal
vicious dog

PST

bike theft
criminal mischief
criminal mischief to vehicle
forgery
fraud
harassing phone calls
lost property
polycart
repossession
returned runaway
runaway
theft
SECONDARY FOR PST
abandoned vehicle
auto theft
burglary
found property
harassing phone calls
harassment

ALL WORKGROUPS

follow-up
information
other
phone message