

PS COMMITTEE #2  
May 1, 2009

**MEMORANDUM**

April 30, 2009

TO: Public Safety Committee

FROM: Linda McMillan, Senior Legislative Analyst 

SUBJECT: **Worksession: FY10 Operating Budget  
M-NCPPC Park Police (continued)**

*Expected for this worksession:*

Darien Manley, Chief, M-NCPPC Montgomery County Park Police  
Mary Bradford, Director of Parks  
Chris Mullin, Office of Management and Budget

At its April 16<sup>th</sup> session, the PS Committee reviewed the FY10 proposed budget for the Park Police, discussed crime statistics and trends, the current sworn complement, number of vacancies, plans for hiring recruits in FY10, and the need for replacement mobile computers. The Committee also received an update on the Park Ranger program.

The Committee was concerned that the proposed increase in the Park Police budget was higher than the overall increase for the County Police. It was noted that some of the Park Police increase was due to the expectation that there would be a general wage adjustment of 3.75% and that lapse overall for the Parks Department had been decreased. The Committee asked that the Park Police provide information on what the Park Police budget might look like if it was allocated a 2.7% increase or remained at its current FY09 authorized workyears.

At the April 22, the Committee received comments from Chief Manley about the impacts of further reductions to their operating budget, the action of the PHED Committee to increase lapse in the entire Park Fund by 1.5% (to 7.5%) that results in a \$174,400 reduction to the Park Police Division, and the need for fund to replace 31 mobile computers that were purchased in 2001 (29) and 2002 (2). Chief Manley's comments are attached at © 1-4. It was noted that the issue of the general wage adjustment planned for Park Police would be reviewed by the MFP Committee. The MFP Committee review is scheduled for May 8<sup>th</sup>.

The Park Police have an authorized complement of 97 Police Officers and 25 non-sworn staff. Currently, the Division has 13 Police Officer vacancies.

Council staff recommends the following regarding the Park Police Budget:

Fund all currently filled positions as planned for FY10	\$11,168,320
Fund overtime as requested in the budget	480,000
Fund supplies and materials as requested	630,800
<u>Fund other services and charges as requested</u>	<u>311,400</u>
<b>Subtotal – funding at current staff</b>	<b>\$12,590,520</b>

Total requested in Park and Planning budget for Park Police	\$12,979,700
Funding at current staffing level (above)	12,590,520

Account for additional lapse taken by PHED	174,400
--	---------

**Net remaining as potential savings** \$ 214,780

Additional Council staff recommendations:

Fund 31 mobile computers	\$ 150,000
--------------------------	------------

Fund 2 recruits starting in January	\$ 75,000
-------------------------------------	-----------

**Notes:**

**This total recommendation would require \$10,000 be allocated to the Park Police from the estimated PHED Savings.**

**Proposal would fund the replacement of the 7 year old and 8 year old mobile computers. The Council would expect that the Park Police would purchase the new computers through the County contract so that there would be consistent specifications and requirements for maintenance and support. The Committee should determine whether they feel that these funds need to be shown on the reconciliation list.**

**The recommendation assumes that 11 Police Officer positions remain vacant in FY10. The Division would operate for most of the year as it does now. Recruits are shown as funded in January based on the schedule for the County recruit class but it is understood that Officers may come in through transfer or a different police academy.**

**This recommendation does not make any adjustments regarding the proposed general wage adjustment. This will be addressed by the MFP Committee and Council during the compensation worksessions.**



**MONTGOMERY COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PARKS**  
THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

April 22, 2009

To: Public Safety Committee  
Montgomery County Council

From: Darien L. Manley   
Acting Chief, Park Police

Subject: Response to request from April 16, 2009, Public Safety Committee worksession on FY10 Park Police budget.

Council President Andrews,

I would like to thank you and the rest of the Public Safety Committee for the opportunity to come before you and discuss the FY10 Park Police budget.

During the Park Police FY10 Public Safety (PS) Committee operating budget worksession which took place on April 16, 2009, we were asked to outline the effects of maintaining our budget at either an FY09 funding level or a 2.7% increase in budget as was recommended for the Montgomery County Department of Police (MCPD) in FY10.

Prior to calculating these options, the Parks Department's operating budget went before the Planning, Housing and Economic Development (PHED) Committee on April 20, 2009, where Parks was directed to increase lapse to the 7.5% level it operated at last year. The PHED Committee also made other cuts which dropped the Parks Department budget below the level of funding recommended by the County Executive. As a result of the PHED Committee recommendation, the Park Police budget has already been reduced by an additional 1.5% lapse, valued at \$174,400, for a total work year reduction of 9.25 wys.

Following the PHED Committee worksession, discussion between Chairman Hanson, Director Bradford and myself led to our preferred recommendation that the Park Police budget maintain its funding outside of the 7.5% lapse to offset the significant cuts the Park Police took in FY09 and allow the Parks Department as a whole to work within the PHED Committee recommended budget.



M-NCPPC Park Police Response to Public Safety Committee Questions

April 22, 2009

2

Absent approval of this request, we begin at a new point, where the 2.7% increase limit from the FY09 funding level is applied, which results in additional cuts from the Park Police operating budget equaling \$393,600 or 5.56 wys. When the increased lapse imposed by the PHED committee is compounded by the PS Committee FY09 increase limit, the Park Police is facing a budget reduction of 14.81 wys or \$1,048,548, for a total recommended budget of \$11,931,452, which is 1% below FY09 funding.

The FY09 funding level for the Park Police yielded a net of 114.7 wys, with an approved cost of \$12,084,000. At this funding level, we would be forced to continue to freeze approximately 8 wys before the recommended 7.5% lapse is applied for a net of 17.5 wys. Before applying a general wage adjustment for the FOP, the FY10 budget should be \$12,282,495 to incorporate the service increment (merit) steps that will occur in FY10, notwithstanding additional personnel costs due to increased retirement and benefits contributions.

The PS Committee is comparing our increase to that of the MCPD, yet last year when we were cut significantly, resulting in 12 frozen positions out of 97 sworn to meet our budget. MCP was only required to freeze or abolish 13 positions out of a staff of nearly 1200 sworn officers. I mention freeze or abolish, because in reading the final approved budget on OMB website, it appears some of these wys were shuffled into Homeland Security or Animal Services when they moved functions around within MCPD and other County agencies. When you look at the proportional number of frozen positions for FY09, when compared to full-time staff, we took about a 12.3% cut in sworn personnel, versus their 1.0% reduction in sworn staff. For FY10, we will be looking at a reduction of 14.81 wys or 15.3% reduction of sworn personnel versus MCPD reduction of 1.4%.

Additionally, our Park Police salaries are generally lower than those of our MCPD counterparts and allowing the general wage adjustments to stay in the recommended budget will help to reduce that gap. The existing salary gap has always factored into recruitment and the loss of the wage adjustment would only add to the problem and negatively affect our retention of officers, which we all know is so important in a field where we make very large investments in the hiring, training and equipping our officers to serve our community.

I believe the Park Police operate in a very efficient/cost effective manner, by staffing specialty units on a 7 day a week basis to provide service and coverage with minimal use of overtime. By comparison, MCPD traffic, special operations, criminal investigators and gang units generally work M-F with weekends off. The majority of work done on the weekend is programmed OT and is expected.

While I am not a budget analyst, I have prepared the following analysis, based on personnel costs and not total budget with operating included for either agency.

Park Police: FY09 budget of 114.81 wys (97 sworn, 25 civilian before lapse applied) for an average cost of \$95,527/wy. Our sworn to civilian ratio is almost 4:1 and civilian staff generally cost much less due to salary and retirement costs.

## M-NCPPC Park Police Response to Public Safety Committee Questions

April 22, 2009

3

MCPD: FY09 budget of 1789 wys (1183 sworn and 606 civilian) at an average cost of \$110,863/wy. This figure also doesn't account for the fact that 202 of the civilian employees are part time and that their sworn to civilian ratio is almost 2:1, which means their sworn costs are significantly more than the average shows.

A better analysis would be to compare sworn workyear costs for the two agencies to see a fair comparison. It is understood that there is error in this analysis, because their civilian staff costs are generally less and they have a much lower ratio of sworn to civilian employees, thus their cost per workyear is believed to be even higher.

Additionally, our staff averages about 45 hours of overtime per year versus 115 hours of overtime by MCPD staff, with their average cost of overtime being \$51.97/hour and our cost at about \$45.00/hour for sworn staff. Our overtime rate would be an even lower average, if the average OT rate for civilian staff were factored in.

Based on historical budget documents, Park Police workyears were at 117 in FY07 and in FY10 we will have funding for 107 wys. If the full Council approves the non-recommended reductions outlined in this document, then we need to be prepared to see increased crime, citizen complaints and reduced customer service. Our staff will not be able to maintain the pace we have set this past year without additional bodies. We strongly believe the following areas will be affected by these cuts; some are still carryovers from FY09:

### FY09

1. CALEA (Commission on Accreditation of Law Enforcement Agencies)
2. HIDTA (High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area, MD area 34 participation)
3. Proactive Patrols of 105 parks (no citizen complaints or reportable incidents in 1 year)
4. Limited follow-up on criminal investigations for non-violent crimes
5. Limited plain clothes enforcement
6. Fewer Community Crime Prevention activities and CPTED surveys

### FY10 PROPOSED CUTS

1. Re-deploy three (3) Community Services Officers to patrol, eliminating #6 above altogether.
2. Discontinue participation in MC Gang and Secret Service Fraud task forces. Return two detectives, one (1) detective to Park Police Investigations and one (1) re-deployed to Patrol.
3. Do not fill Investigative Services vacancies.
4. Do not hire two additional seasonal Rangers.
5. No special details/tactical teams developed to address current problems. All staff dedicated to patrolling parks.
6. Eliminate/suspend motorcycle patrol and assign half of Special Ops personnel TDY to patrol duties. Results in reduction of horse mounted patrols as well.

Some of the negative impacts:

- More work for less people who are already doing too much.
- Community outreach, youth focused programs and Crime prevention efforts get tabled.
- Reduced trail patrols, loss of skills needed to safely operate police motorcycles. Most agency's (Fairfax, MCPD, PGPD etc) with motors practice every day to maintain proficiency.
- Fewer proactive park patrols
- Reduced traffic, criminal and civil enforcement (citations and arrests) with reduced staff

M-NCPPC Park Police Response to Public Safety Committee Questions

April 22, 2009

4

To limit these impacts and promote the safest possible Park system, I would recommend the PS and PHED Committees fund the Park Police at the CE's recommended FY10 level and then apply the 7.5% lapse.

I would also request that the joint PS/MFP Committees approve \$150,000 in additional operating funds to allow Park Police to process a one-time purchase of 29 MDT's. It is then requested that the Committees incorporate funding for the remaining MDT replacements in FY11, with continued funding in subsequent years to follow the DCM plan.