

RECEIVED

JAN 26 2000

**WASHTENAW COUNTY, MI
CLERK/REGISTER'S OFFICE**



Washtenaw County Michigan Road Patrol Study

January, 2000

Alexander Weiss, Ph.D.

William Stenzel, D.Sc.

Road Patrol Study for Washtenaw County Michigan

Introduction

This report is prepared by the Northwestern University Traffic Institute in response to a contract awarded by Washtenaw County Michigan in July 1999. The objective of the project, as specified in the RFP, was to determine the appropriate number of road patrol deputies for the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department (WCSD) and to establish a methodology for identifying a price for contract deputy positions.

Our methodology for conducting this analysis consisted of many steps including:

- Extensive interviews and discussion with senior staff of the WCSD,
- Interviews with the County Administrator and Chair of the County Board of Commissioners,
- Interviews with officials of several townships including Ypsilanti, Superior, Scio, Augusta and Lodi,
- Communication with several law enforcement organizations engaged in contract policing including Oakland County Michigan, Los Angeles County California, King County Washington, San Diego County California, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.
- Literature review.

The outline of this report is as follows. In this chapter we provide a brief overview of contract policing, and describe the issues related to contract policing in Washtenaw County. In chapter two we provide alternative methods for establishing the costs of contract policing. In chapter three we examine the road patrol staffing requirements. Finally, chapter four details our summary and recommendations.

Contract Policing: A Brief Overview

One of the enduring tenets of American policing is decentralization. This country maintains over 15,000 distinct local, state and federal law enforcement agencies. This fragmented system of policing has traditionally been valued because it provides local control and limits the potential police power of the government. As a result of this high degree of decentralization police organizations are remarkably diverse in size, structure and function. Substantial proportions of agencies have fewer than ten officers, while others, like the New York City Police Department has over 40,000.

While many communities support decentralization of policing on political grounds (Cook County Illinois, for example has over 150 separate police departments) it is argued by many that this approach is inefficient. Critics ask for example whether it is prudent for two adjoining communities each with 10,000 people, to establish separate police

departments, each with its own facility, vehicles, chief, and detective unit? Some would say no.

One approach to the efficiency problem has been consolidation of organizations. For example, in both Jacksonville Florida and Las Vegas Nevada the city police departments merged with their county sheriff to form one agency. Both of these consolidations have proven successful.

An alternative to consolidation is contracting. In a law enforcement contract environment small communities, very often suburban, contract with a larger, nearby law enforcement organization. The best known of these arrangements is the Contractual Services Plan in Los Angeles California, better known as the Lakewood Plan.¹

The Lakewood plan had its origins in 1953 when Lakewood California, in an effort to avoid annexation by neighboring Long Beach, incorporated. The new city contracted for a number of services (including law enforcement) with Los Angeles County. By 1973 thirty cities contracted for police services with the Los Angeles County Sheriff (LASD). This represented about seventeen percent of the LASD budget. In an early study of the Lakewood plan Kirlin suggested that the LASD contracts were successful for three reasons:

- The price was kept as low as possible,
- The LASD modified policy and structure to accommodate the contract cities, and
- The LASD provided better service to the contract cities than the service they provided for the unincorporated areas.²

Contract policing remains quite strong in Los Angeles County. Today, 42 local jurisdictions have police service contracts. Contract policing is also used extensively in other Southern California counties.

Experience has shown that these contractual arrangements can considerably reduce policing costs. For example the annual per capita costs for policing in the city of Tustin California (with its own police department) is \$160. For the similarly sized city of Lake Forest (a contract community) the cost is \$90 per capita. In April 1993 the City of San Clemente California faced significant financial stress. In response they disbanded their police department and entered into a contract with the Orange County Sheriff. This resulted in \$2 million reduction in costs and a significant increase in service.

Another example of extensive contract policing is in Canada. ³ The Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) employ about 10,000 members (57% of its staff) in contract

¹ Peter W. Colby. "Intergovernmental Contracting for Police Services". Journal of Police Science and Administration, 10: 1, 1982.

² J.Kirlin. "The Impact of Contract Services Arrangements on the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department and Law Enforcement Services in Los Angeles County. Public Policy 21:553-583, 1973.

³ RCMP. "The RCMP Contract Policing Program" RCMP Gazette 59: No.6, 1997.

arrangements. Of that group 6,000 provide services through contracts with provinces and 4,000 provide contract policing to some 200 local communities.

Contract policing brings the federal government about \$700 million each year. The philosophy of the Canadian government concerning pricing is straightforward. It seeks to recover the costs its "partners would pay if they were operating their own police force."

King County (Seattle) Washington recently developed a new approach to contracting. In 1990 the Washington State Legislature passed an act that required fast growing counties to develop a growth plan. King County's plan included an element in which several unincorporated areas would be either annexed or would be incorporated. Twelve communities chose to incorporate and contracted for police services with the King County Sheriff. The King County contracting system has several unique characteristics including the following:

- Contract cities can select services they want to receive from a "menu". For example, a city may contract for basic patrol delivery and a drug enforcement unit. Another city can provide its own patrol but contract with the sheriff for a canine unit, or investigators.
- Cities have a strong voice in setting priorities and selecting personnel.
- Cities can choose to provide distinctive uniforms and vehicles with a city logo, providing the appearance that the city has its own department.

Contract Policing in Washtenaw County

The provision of law enforcement services in Washtenaw County has many of the attributes that we have observed in other communities, but it is somewhat unique. Our examination of road patrol in Washtenaw County has identified a number of issues that weigh heavily on the analysis and interpretation of our data. In chapters two and three we will examine the technical aspects of these issues, and in chapter four we will outline a series of recommendations. Below we identify the issues.

Issue One

The statutory responsibility for police service delivery in the county is not well defined. Most readings of Michigan law suggest that neither the Sheriff of a county nor the townships are *required* to provide police services. However, in Washtenaw County the County Board has remained committed to the provision of road patrol through the general fund. At the same time some townships have opted to contract for police services with the Sheriff, while some others have not. This has created a complex and at times inequitable system. The areas of the county without contracts receive a modest level of road patrol. Some areas have contracts but the number of contract deputies is not adequate to cover the area's service demands, and thus the Sheriff must provide resources from the non-contract areas to make up the difference. Finally, some areas have contracts, but express concerns that they receive a similar level of service as those that pay far less.

Issue Two

The issue of cost allocation is confounded by the ambiguity of the service delivery responsibility. One of our tasks in this project was to identify those portions of the Sheriff's budget that should be included as indirect costs for the contracts. But in order to do this one must make certain assumptions about the relationship between the general road patrol and the contract policing. For example, some township officials told us that the cost of central dispatch should not be included as an indirect cost for the contracts because even if there were no contracts the sheriff would still be required to maintain a dispatch center for the road patrol. This, we believe, obscures the central point. That is in order to assess what something costs or how those costs should be allocated it might be more appropriate to determine what it would cost for the contract community to provide it itself. Interestingly, this debate over the relative responsibilities of the contract agencies and the county led Oakland County Michigan to abandon road patrol and adopt a policy of contract policing only.

Issue Three

Some of the contract agencies use their own funds to support the contract deputies. Both Ypsilanti Township and Superior Township provide office space for their officers at no charge to the county. They also provide additional support in terms of equipment and supplies (Appendix N). This raises questions both about equity (Scio Township, for example, provides space but charges the county rent) and about whether the county is adequately supporting the contract deputies.

Police Service Cost Methodology

A principal task of our engagement was to examine the provision of police services by contract. Specifically, we were asked to examine the current system for establishing the cost of those contracts, and if indicated, suggest alternatives. To that end, in this chapter we evaluate the current costing methodology and propose three new approaches to costing for police services in Washtenaw County.

Each of these alternatives makes certain assumptions about the nature of the contractual relationship between the Sheriff and the local community. Moreover, each includes assumptions about the quality and quantity of service delivered. Those assumptions are outlined below.

Four Alternative Costing Models

Current Model

The current method of costing for police service contracts in Washtenaw County was developed in 1983, and was based on a study conducted by Susan Kattelus of Eastern Michigan University. This study was well done and provided a good framework for standardizing the contracts. The formula for this approach includes the following direct costs:

- Salary
- Fringes
- Uniform Allowance
- Uniform Maintenance
- OT/Holiday/Shift Premium
- Commodities
- Training
- Liability Insurance

An indirect cost rate of 39% is added to this sum to arrive at the annual cost per deputy. Moreover, communities are charged a rate of 33 cents per mile for use of a county police vehicle.

There are a number of reasons to suggest that this costing method is no longer valid, and in fact, undervalues the true cost of providing these services.

1. This method makes a distinction between road patrol positions and support officer positions. That is, the indirect cost rate of 39% includes the cost of management, supervision, investigations and other Sheriff's personnel. While one could make the

case for assigning a portion of senior management time as an indirect cost, it is more difficult to do so in the case of supervisors, whose time is often devoted exclusively to contract areas, and who, moreover, can and do respond to calls for service. This is even more so the case with investigations. While it may be the case that investigative resources are allocated in proportion to the extent of contract policing, it is just as likely that those resources are not distributed equitably, nor are they covered by the current costing methods. Consider the potential costs associated with a major crime or protracted hostage incident. The indirect funding provided under the current system could be exhausted in a very short time.

2. The sum included for liability insurance (\$196 per deputy in 1998) seems remarkably low. This amount is currently based upon the cost per deputy of *liability insurance*. However, the cost of liability should be viewed as considerably greater. One of the extraordinary benefits provided by contracting is the assumption of liability risk by the WCSO. As we are all painfully aware, police organizations today are under constant threat of litigation, and significant judgements are not uncommon. A portion of the risk that is currently borne by the county should be passed on to the contract agencies. Right now the amount collected for liability does not even cover the judgements and legal fees that the county is paying. To see just how low this cost is consider Oakland County Michigan where the 1998 contracts for police services included a charge of \$1947 for each deputy to cover liability, a factor of 14.
3. The cost of vehicle operation is too low. In fact, it is the amount that has been used since 1983, and that cost was based on a cost of \$9,100.00 per police vehicle. It appears that the true cost of operating these vehicles is more like 50 cents per mile.

Alternative Models

Because of these issues related to the current method of costing we are proposing three alternative methods. These methods are based on the actual expenditures for police services in 1998. These expenditures are as follows:

Salary and Fringe	\$9,500,008
Supplies	224,926
Other Services	250,899
Transportation ¹	651,033
Cost Allocation ²	536,407
Capital Outlay	5,035
Transfers	10,163
Central Dispatch	922,850

¹ The Sheriff's budget does not differentiate between the transportation costs for police services and those for corrections. We therefore estimated that 75% of the cost should be allocated to police services.

² This is the indirect cost charge for services provided by the county to police services. It includes, among other items, the cost of insurance and legal services.

Total Personnel Costs	\$9,500,008
Total Non-personnel Costs	2,601,313
Total Costs	\$12,101,321

Method One

Our first costing method is very straightforward. It includes two values, the total personnel costs for the police services budget and the total non-personnel costs (including the entire cost of the central dispatch and the cost of transportation. It expresses the ratio of personnel costs to non-personnel costs.

Using this approach we divide the total non-personnel costs by the personnel cost, or

$$2,601,313 / 9,500,508 = .27 \text{ or an indirect cost rate of } 27\%$$

This method assumes the basic good provided by the WCSD is police service and that the personnel of the WCSD provide that service. It suggests further, that for each dollar spent on personnel the county must spend an additional 27 cents on support.

This model would be applied differently than the current one. The principal difference is that contract agencies would have to pay for the direct costs of supervision, management and investigation. For example, a contracting agency would be required to pay for the salary of a sergeant for every six contract deputies (places with fewer than six would pay for the proportionate sum). Agencies would also have to pay for investigators. This could be accomplished by either contracting for a full time or part-time investigator or paying on an hourly basis. In most cases time consumed by WCSD senior managers would not be charged directly. Because the cost of transportation is included in the indirect charge there would not be an additional charge for mileage.

Method Two

Our second method takes a different approach. In this method we divide the total support personnel cost plus non-personnel support costs (\$5,592,481) by the personnel costs for the 110 road deputy positions (\$6,208,840). The formula is as follows:

$$\$5,892,481 / 6,208,840 = .94 \text{ or an indirect cost rate of } 94\%$$

This approach suggests that the good provided by the WCSD is the road deputy, and that for each personnel dollar spent on that road deputy another 94 cents is spent in support.

Using this approach the contracting agency would pay the personnel cost for each contract deputy and apply a 94% indirect cost charge. Like the current costing method this one includes supervision, and investigation as an indirect charge, so contracting agencies would not be required to pay additional funds for support. This method also includes costs for transportation.

Method Three

In our third approach we attempt to allocate costs between the contract and non-contract police services. Based on our study of resource allocation we estimate the number of deputies required for the contracts to be 66. We further assumed that they would require 12 supervisors. This would represent approximately 65% of the WCSD police service staffing. In order to develop the indirect cost rate we divided 65% of the non-personnel costs by the personnel costs of the 66 deputies and 12 supervisors, or

$$\$1,690,853 / \$4,709,993 = .35 \text{ or an indirect cost rate of } 35\%$$

We note that this rate is similar to the indirect cost rate used in the current system. However, under this model agencies would be required to pay for the direct cost of supervision and other staff support costs. This indirect rate also includes the cost of transportation.

Comparison of Costing Methods

Each of these methods will result in different costs for contracting of police services. In Table 2-1 we compare the costs for contracting six deputies under the current system and under the three proposed systems. There are several things to remember when examining this table. We assume that six deputies will require at least one supervisor. In both methods one and three the contract agency must pay the salary of that supervisor. In method one and three the contracting agency must also pay the direct costs of other staff support, including investigations. Finally, methods one, two and three all include the cost of mileage in the indirect cost. We estimate the annual mileage cost for six deputies to be \$50,000.

Table 2-1 Comparison of Alternative Costing Methods

Method	Current	One	Two	Three
Six Deputies	339666	338664*	338664	338664
One Sergeant		72645		72645
Sub-total	339666	411309	338664	411309
I/C rate	39%	27%	94%	35%
Indirect Cost	132469	111,053	318,344	143,958
Total	472135	522,362	657,008	555,267

* The unit cost for each deputy is slightly lower in the proposed methodology because items such as commodities and supplies have been included in the indirect cost rate.

Chapter 3

Staffing Analysis for Patrol Services Provided by the Washtenaw County (Michigan) Sheriff's Department

Introduction

This chapter examines the staffing requirements for the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department (WCSD) to provide patrol services in Washtenaw County, Michigan. The remainder of this chapter is divided into three sections. The next section describes Washtenaw County and the patrol services provided by the WCSD. This is followed by a description of the methodology and data used to estimate the staffing requirements for patrol which are presented in the final section.

Washtenaw County, Michigan

Physical Description

Washtenaw County is located in southeastern Michigan, approximately 30 miles west of Detroit. Four citirres (Ann Arbor, Milan, Saline, and Ypsilanti) and four villages (Barton Hills, Chelsea, Dexter, and Manchester) are located in the County. Ann Arbor serves as the County Seat. The County, rectangular in shape, extends 30 miles east-west and 24 miles north-south. The County consists of 20 townships, each six miles square, and has a total area of 720 square miles. The population of Washtenaw County is expected to reach 300,000 by the year 2000. The two largest cities are Ann Arbor, home to the University of Michigan, with a population of approximately 108,000, and Ypsilanti, home to Eastern Michigan University, with a population of 23,000.

Law Enforcement

The WCSD has primary patrol responsibility for the entire County except in those areas where other police entities have been established. The patrol service provided by the WCSD falls into three categories: general patrol, contract services, and backup services. Each category is described below and a summary of the services provided to the townships, cities, and villages in the County is presented in Table 3-1.

General patrol. The WCSD provides patrol services to 10 townships and one village that do not have their own police force and have not contracted with the WCSD for patrol services.

Table 3-1

**Type of Patrol Services, Washtenaw County Sheriff's
Department**

Type of Patrol Service	Townships	Cities	Villages
General Patrol	Bridgewater, Freedom, Lima, Lyndon, Manchester, Salem, Saline, Sharon, Sylvan, Webster		Barton Hills
Contract Services	Ann Arbor, Augusta, Dexter, Lodi, Scio, Superior, York, Ypsilanti		Dexter, Manchester
Backup Services	Northfield, Pittsfield	Ann Arbor, Milan, Saline, Ypsilanti	Chelsea

Contract services. Eight townships and two villages that do not have their own police forces have elected to contract directly with the WCSD for patrol services. A summary of the contract hours for each township and village is presented in Table 3-2.

Backup services. Two townships (Northfield and Pittsfield), four cities (Ann Arbor, Milan, Saline, and Ypsilanti), and one village (Chelsea) maintain their own police forces which provide the primary police presence in their respective jurisdictions. In these areas, the WCSD provides backup patrol support on a request basis.

Methodology and Scope of the Staffing Analyses

PAM Procedure

The methodology used to estimate patrol staffing requirements for the WCSD is based on the procedures developed for the "Police Allocation Manual" (PAM) by the Northwestern University Traffic Institute under the direction of Dr. William Stenzel, co-author of this report. Development of PAM was supported by a series of grants from the United States Department of Transportation (Office of Police Traffic Services, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration). The PAM model was created to help state, county, and municipal police agencies determine how many officers and supervisors are needed to provide acceptable levels of patrol and traffic services. The procedure uses workload data, personnel policies, geographic and roadway information about the jurisdiction, and operational performance objectives to estimate staffing levels. An overview of the PAM procedure is presented in Appendix A.

The PAM procedure estimates staffing requirements by determining how much time will be required to handle all patrol responsibilities in a jurisdiction. The PAM model divides all deputy time, both on and off-duty, into either patrol or non-patrol activities. Non-patrol time includes all off-duty time and on-duty time spent on non-patrol activities (e.g., extended training and special assignments). Non-patrol time is determined by the operational practices, work schedules, and personnel policies of an agency, and is summarized quantitatively in the "shift relief factor." The shift relief factor indicates how many deputies are required to keep one shift position covered every day.

All on-duty time is divided into four components:

- **Reactive** - Time spent responding to calls-for-service including accidents (CFS).
- **Proactive (SI/COP)** - Time spent on self-initiated (SI) and community-oriented policing (COP) activities.

Table 3-2

Contract Services, Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department

Patrol Area	Contracted Services	
	Number of Deputies*	Hours Per Week**
Ann Arbor Township	2.00	80.00
Augusta Township	1.00	40.00
Dexter Township	0.50	20.00
Dexter Village	4.50	180.00
Lodi Township	1.00	40.00
Manchester Village	4.00	160.00
Scio Township	2.50	100.00
Superior Township	5.50	220.00
York Township	2.00	80.00
Ypsilanti Township	42.00	1,620.00
Total Contract Services	65.00	2,540.00

* "Number of Deputies" represents contract staffing levels used in 1998. Does not include two additional deputies recently added to Scio Township.

** Contract hours include normal benefit time off and non-patrol time (i.e., time off for holidays, sick leave, training, etc.). The current work schedule, training policies, and benefit time-off policies of the WCSD produce an on-duty factor of 0.885; that is, on the average, 40 hours of deputy time for provide approximately 37.4 hours of on-duty patrol time).

- **Proactive (patrol)** - Time spent on "free" or "uncommitted" patrol to provide "visibility" for general deterrence, "availability" for rapid response to emergency CFS, and to identify SI/COP opportunities.
- **Administrative** - Time spent on patrol activities not included in either the reactive or proactive categories; typical administrative activities include on-duty court time, personal time (e.g., meals), training, and various agency administrative duties.

The PAM procedure uses information about the workload, operations, and patrol objectives of an agency to estimate the time required for each on-duty component. These times are then used to estimate the number of on-duty deputies that will be required to handle the CFS workload and meet the performance objectives set by the agency. The SRF for the agency is then used to determine the total number of deputies, both on and off-duty, that are needed to provide the required number of on-duty deputies each day.

The PAM model produces staffing estimates for "autonomous patrol areas" (APAs). An APA is defined as a contiguous geographic area within a jurisdiction with the following characteristics:

- almost all CFS that originate in the APA are handled by the deputies assigned to the APA (or conversely, few CFS in the APA are handled by deputies assigned to other APAs),
- deputies assigned to the APA are rarely dispatched to CFS outside the APA, and
- deputies assigned to the APA may be dispatched to CFS anywhere within the APA.

In a small jurisdiction, one APA may be used for the entire jurisdiction. A large jurisdiction may be divided into several APAs to account for differences in workload and physical characteristics in different parts of the jurisdiction.

Application of the PAM Procedure to Washtenaw County

For Washtenaw County, eleven APAs were used: one for each of the ten contract areas (eight townships and two villages) and one for General Patrol (i.e., the area covered by all non-contract townships, cities, and villages in the County without other police patrol services). Two staffing estimates were obtained for each APA: an "ideal" staffing estimate and a "minimum" staffing estimate.

The ideal staffing estimate for each APA was produced based on the following requirements:

1. **Sufficient patrol time will be available to handle all CFS within the APA.**
Historical information based on 18 months of data (see discussion of data below) was used to estimate the number of deputies required to handle all CFS within the APA. The historical data included CFS handled by both contract deputies or General Patrol deputies.

2. **Sufficient patrol time will be available to meet the performance objectives for self-initiated (SI) and community-oriented policing (COP).** Performance objectives for both SI and COP were set by the WCSD by specifying the average amount of time each deputy would spend on SI/COP activities per hour.
3. **Sufficient patrol time will be available to meet the performance objectives for visibility and availability.** The performance objectives for visibility were set by the WCSD by specifying a "patrol interval" time for each roadway type in each APA. The patrol interval, expressed in hours, indicates how long a motorist will have to wait, on the average, before a deputy will drive by on free patrol. The performance objectives for availability were set by the WCSD by specifying average response times, in minutes, for both emergency and non-emergency CFS.
4. **Sufficient time will be available for agency administrative activities.** The PAM procedure provides two methods for estimating the amount of administrative time required per hour: (1) specify the time by policy, or (2) estimate the time based on historical information. For each APA in Washtenaw County, values were obtained using both methods (i.e., the policy time was set by the WCSD and an empirical estimate was obtained based on historical data). For each APA, the lower of the two values was used in the PAM procedure to obtain the ideal staffing estimate.
5. **No special assignment personnel will be included.** Non-patrol personnel (e.g., school liaison officers, community service officers, and warrant officers) were not included in the staffing estimates. The only exception was the inclusion of three "secondary road patrol" deputies for General Patrol. This was done because the secondary road patrol deputies spend almost all their time handling accidents in the non-contract areas of the County.

The minimum staffing estimate for each APA identified the number of deputies that would be needed if patrol was limited to only answering CFS and performing minimal administrative duties (i.e., no time would be available for SI/COP activities or to provide visibility and availability). While such a staffing level would, theoretically, be able to respond to all CFS, "service" as indicated by time spent on SI/COP activities, patrol visibility to deter crime and traffic violators, and availability to provide rapid response to CFS would be almost non-existent. The minimum staffing estimate for each APA was produced based on the following requirements:

1. **Sufficient patrol time will be available to handle all CFS within the APA.** Historical information based on 18 months of data (see discussion of data below) was used to estimate the number of deputies required to handle all CFS within the APA. The historical data included CFS handled by both contract deputies or General Patrol deputies.

2. **No patrol time will be available to meet the performance objectives for self-initiated (SI) and community-oriented policing (COP).** No time was included to provide time for either SI or COP activities.
3. **No patrol time will be available to meet the performance objectives for visibility and availability.** No patrol time was included to provide for visibility or availability. As a result, a motorist would rarely see a deputy on free patrol and response times would, for most CFS, be very high.
4. **Minimal time will be available for agency administrative activities.** For the minimum staffing estimates, the administrative time was set at six minutes per hour per deputy. The other 54 minutes per hour per deputy are used to respond to CFS.
5. **No special assignment personnel will be included.** Non-patrol personnel (e.g., school liaison officers, community service officers, and warrant officers) were not included in the staffing estimates. The three "secondary road patrol" deputies included in the ideal staffing estimate for General Patrol were not included in the minimum staffing estimate.

Data for the PAM Procedure

All data used to determine the staffing estimates for the PAM procedure were provided by the WCSD. As noted above, the PAM procedure requires extensive information about the workload, operations, policies, and physical characteristics of a jurisdiction. Few police agencies have all the data required for the model. In most cases, the data required is obtained by using both historical information and sound estimates provided by agency personnel. Such was the case for Washtenaw County. Historical data based on an 18-month period (January 1, 1998 through June 30, 1999) was used to determine the CFS workload of each APA. When historical data was not available, estimates were provided by WCSD. Definitions of the data items used in the PAM procedure are shown in Appendix B. The values and sources for the data used for each of the 11 APAs can be found in appendixes C - M.

Staffing Estimates for Washtenaw County

A summary of the staffing estimates for each of the 11 APAs is shown in Table 3-3. The first 10 rows of the table identify the 10 contract areas in Washtenaw County. The first three columns to the right of the contract area name show the PAM minimum staffing estimate, the PAM ideal staffing estimate, and the contract staffing level.

The last column for each contract area, labeled "Staffing Index," compares the contract staffing level with the minimum and ideal staffing estimates. Each comparison can produce one of three possibilities:

Table 3-3

**Summary of the Staffing Analysis for Patrol Services in
Contract and Non-Contract Areas in Washtenaw County
(Michigan) by the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department**

Area Name	Number of Deputies and Field Supervisors		Deputies only	
	PAM Minimum Staffing*	PAM Ideal Staffing**	Contract/ Current Staffing	Staffing Index (%)***
Ann Arbor Township	1.34	7.40	2.00	10.90
Augusta Township	1.62	4.75	1.00	Below Minimum
Dexter Township	1.45	4.88	0.50	Below Minimum
Dexter Village	0.84	2.44	4.50	Above Ideal
Lodi Township	1.24	4.35	1.00	Below Minimum
Manchester Village	0.75	2.66	4.00	Above Ideal
Scio Township	5.32	9.57	2.50	Below Minimum
Superior Township	5.47	14.69	5.50	0.46
York Township	1.47	6.88	2.00	10.08
Ypsilanti Township	31.60	57.55	42.00	40.05
Total Contract Areas	51.10	115.17	65.00	24.82
General Patrol	9.23	48.25	26/13****	42.98/7.10
Washtenaw County	60.33	163.42	93.00	31.69

* Minimum staffing assumes that patrol personnel will only be used to respond to CFS. No additional deputies are included to insure timely responses to CFS, to engage in self-initiated activities, or to provide general patrol visibility in the jurisdiction.

** Ideal staffing assumes that patrol personnel will be used to provide full patrol service (i.e., will respond in a timely manner to CFS, will engage in self-initiated activities as needed, and will provide an acceptable level of patrol visibility in the jurisdiction.

*** The Staffing Index measures the staffing level provided by contract or current staffing by comparing the staffing with the minimum and ideal staffing estimates obtained with the PAM procedure. If the contract or current hours per week equal the minimum staffing hours per week, the Staffing Index equals 0%. If the contract or current hours per week equal the ideal staffing hours per week, the Staffing Index equals 100%.

**** Twenty-six deputies are allocated for General Patrol but only 13 are available for service.

1. Contract staffing is less than the minimum staffing estimate (e.g., Augusta, Dexter, Lodi, and Scio townships). This is indicated by "Below Minimum" in the Staffing Index column.
2. Contract staffing is greater than the ideal staffing estimate (e.g., Dexter and Manchester villages). This is indicated by "Above Ideal" in the Staffing Index column.
3. Contract staffing is less than the ideal staffing estimate but greater than the minimum staffing estimate. When this occurs, the relative position of the contract staffing level between the two PAM estimates is indicated by the percentage shown in the Staffing Index column. The percentage is always a number between 0.00 and 100.00. If the contract staffing equals the minimum staffing estimate, the percentage equals 0.00; if the contract staffing equals the ideal staffing estimate, the percentage equals 100.00. If the contract staffing level falls halfway between the two PAM estimates, the staffing index value equals 50.00%. In Ann Arbor Township, for example, the staffing index value of 10.90% indicates that the contract staffing level of two deputies is just slightly above the minimum staffing estimate of 1.34 deputies.

The total staffing estimates and contract staffing level for all 10 contact areas are shown in the Total Contract Areas row of Table 3-3. The minimum and ideal staffing estimates and the current patrol staffing level for General Patrol are shown in the next row. Although the general fund for the WCSD authorized 38.5 deputies for General Patrol in 1998, only 26 deputies are indicated since 12.5 deputies were assigned to non-road patrol activities. (It should also be noted that although 26 deputies were assigned to General Patrol, only 13 deputies were actually available for patrol duty since 10 positions were vacant and 3 deputies were on medical leave.) Based on a staffing of 26 deputies for General Patrol, the staffing index equals 42.98%. If the actual staffing level of 13 deputies is used, the staffing index for General Patrol falls to 7.1%.

Both PAM estimates shown in Table 3-3 include both deputies and field supervisors. The number of deputies and field supervisors in each estimate is shown in Table 3-4.

Additional information about the staffing estimates and contract staffing level for each contract area is shown in Table 3-5. The first row in the table duplicates the staffing information shown in Table 3-3. The second and third rows indicate the amount of on-duty staffing per day that would be available with the minimum and ideal staffing estimates. The fourth row indicates the number of contract hours per week, and row 5 indicates the number of on-duty hours that will be available each week with the PAM staffing estimates and with the contract staffing. Row 6 shows the staffing index percentage for the contract staffing. Table 3-6 replicates the information in Table 3-5 for General Patrol.

Table 3-4

PAM Staffing Estimates for Patrol Services in Washtenaw County (Michigan) by the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department, Number of Deputies and Field Supervisors

Area Name	PAM Minimum Staffing*		PAM Ideal Staffing**	
	Number of Deputies	Number of Field Supervisors	Number of Deputies	Number of Field Supervisors
Ann Arbor Township	1.15	0.19	6.34	1.06
Augusta Township	1.39	0.23	4.07	0.68
Dexter Township	1.21	0.24	4.07	0.81
Dexter Village	0.70	0.14	2.03	0.41
Lodi Township	1.06	0.18	3.73	0.62
Manchester Village	0.60	0.15	2.13	0.53
Scio Township	4.56	0.76	8.20	1.37
Superior Township	4.69	0.78	12.59	2.10
York Township	1.26	0.21	5.90	0.98
Ypsilanti Township	27.65	3.95	50.36	7.19
Total Contract Areas	44.26	6.83	99.42	15.75
General Patrol	7.91	1.32	41.36***	6.89
Washtenaw County	52.17	8.15	140.78	22.64

* Minimum staffing assumes that patrol personnel will only be used to respond to CFS. No additional deputies are included to insure timely responses to CFS, to engage in self-initiated activities, or to provide general patrol visibility in the jurisdiction.

** Ideal staffing assumes that patrol personnel will be used to provide full patrol service (i.e., will respond in a timely manner to CFS, will engage in self-initiated activities as needed, and will provide an acceptable level of patrol visibility in the jurisdiction.

*** Includes three "secondary road patrol" deputies.

Table 3-5

Staffing Analysis of Areas Within Washtenaw County (Michigan) that Contract for Patrol Services with the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department

	Ann Arbor Township			Augusta Township		
	PAM Minimum Staffing	PAM Ideal Staffing	Contract Staffing	PAM Minimum Staffing	PAM Ideal Staffing	Contract Staffing
Total Staffing (# of Deputies & Field Supervisors)	1.34 (1)	7.40 (1)	2.00	1.62 (1)	4.75 (1)	1.00
On-Duty Staffing Per Day (# of Deputies & Field Supervisors)	0.85	4.68	1.26 (2)	1.03	3.00	0.63 (2)
On-Duty Hours Per Day (3)	6.78	37.42	10.11	8.24	24.00	5.04
Contract Hours Per Week	----	----	80.00	----	----	40.00
On-Duty Hours Per Week	47.43 (4)	261.95 (4)	70.80 (5)	57.68 (4)	168.00 (4)	35.40 (5)
Staffing Index (%) (6)	----	----	10.90	----	----	Below Minimum

- (1) PAM staffing estimates include both deputies and field supervisors.
- (2) On-duty staffing per day equals the contract staffing divided by the shift relief factor (SRF). The SRF for the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department is 1.582.
- (3) On-duty hours per day equals the number of on-duty deputies per day multiplied by the shift length (8 hours).
- (4) On-duty hours per week equals the number of on-duty hours per day multiplied by seven.
- (5) On-duty hours per week equals the contract hours per week multiplied by the on-duty factor. The on-duty factor is based on the work schedule and the shift relief factor. The Washtenaw County Sheriff's department uses a 5 on - 2 off duty cycle schedule and has a shift relief factor (SRF) of 1.582 (PAM worksheet entry. The on-duty factor equals the (Number of days in the duty cycle schedule)/(Number of on-duty days in the duty cycle schedule x SRF). The on-duty factor for the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department is 0.885.
- (6) See Table 3-3 for an explanation of the Staffing Index.

Table 3-5 (continued)

Staffing Analysis of Areas Within Washtenaw County (Michigan) that Contract for Patrol Services with the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department

	Dexter Township			Dexter Village		
	PAM Minimum Staffing	PAM Ideal Staffing	Contract Staffing	PAM Minimum Staffing	PAM Ideal Staffing	Contract Staffing
Total Staffing (# of Deputies & Field Supervisors)	1.45 (1)	4.88 (1)	0.50	0.84 (1)	2.44 (1)	4.50
On-Duty Staffing Per Day (# of Deputies & Field Supervisors)	0.92	3.08	0.32 (2)	0.53	1.54	2.84 (2)
On-Duty Hours Per Day (3)	7.36	24.64	2.53	4.25	12.32	22.76
Contract Hours Per Week	----	----	20.00	----	----	180.00
On-Duty Hours Per Week	51.52 (4)	172.48 (4)	17.70 (5)	29.73 (4)	86.24 (4)	159.29 (5)
Staffing Index (%) (6)	-----	-----	Below Minimum	-----	-----	Above Ideal

- (1) PAM staffing estimates include both deputies and field supervisors.
- (2) On-duty staffing per day equals the contract staffing divided by the shift relief factor (SRF). The SRF for the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department is 1.582.
- (3) On-duty hours per day equals the number of on-duty deputies per day multiplied by the shift length (8 hours).
- (4) On-duty hours per week equals the number of on-duty hours per day multiplied by seven.
- (5) On-duty hours per week equals the contract hours per week multiplied by the on-duty factor. The on-duty factor is based on the work schedule and the shift relief factor. The Washtenaw County Sheriff's department uses a 5 on - 2 off duty cycle schedule and has a shift relief factor (SRF) of 1.582 (PAM worksheet entry. The on-duty factor equals the (Number of days in the duty cycle schedule)/(Number of on-duty days in the duty cycle schedule x SRF). The on-duty factor for the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department is 0.885.
- (6) See Table 3-3 for an explanation of the Staffing Index.

Table 3-5 (continued)

Staffing Analysis of Areas Within Washtenaw County (Michigan) that Contract for Patrol Services with the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department

	Lodi Township			Manchester Village		
	PAM Minimum Staffing	PAM Ideal Staffing	Contract Staffing	PAM Minimum Staffing	PAM Ideal Staffing	Contract Staffing
Total Staffing (# of Deputies & Field Supervisors)	1.24 (1)	4.35 (1)	1.00	0.75 (1)	2.66 (1)	4.00
On-Duty Staffing Per Day (# of Deputies & Field Supervisors)	0.78	2.75	0.63 (2)	0.47	1.68	2.53 (2)
On-Duty Hours Per Day (3)	6.24	22.00	5.05	5.92	13.44	20.23
Contract Hours Per Week	-----	-----	40.00	-----	-----	160.00
On-Duty Hours Per Week	43.68 (4)	153.98 (4)	40.46 (5)	41.44 (4)	94.08 (4)	141.59 (5)
Staffing Index (%) (6)	-----	-----	Below Minimum	-----	-----	Above Ideal

- (1) PAM staffing estimates include both deputies and field supervisors.
- (2) On-duty staffing per day equals the contract staffing divided by the shift relief factor (SRF). The SRF for the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department is 1.582.
- (3) On-duty hours per day equals the number of on-duty deputies per day multiplied by the shift length (8 hours).
- (4) On-duty hours per week equals the number of on-duty hours per day multiplied by seven.
- (5) On-duty hours per week equals the contract hours per week multiplied by the on-duty factor. The on-duty factor is based on the work schedule and the shift relief factor. The Washtenaw County Sheriff's department uses a 5 on - 2 off duty cycle schedule and has a shift relief factor (SRF) of 1.582 (PAM worksheet entry. The on-duty factor equals the (Number of days in the duty cycle schedule)/(Number of on-duty days in the duty cycle schedule x SRF). The on-duty factor for the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department is 0.885.
- (6) See Table 3-3 for an explanation of the Staffing Index.

Table 3-5 (continued)

Staffing Analysis of Areas Within Washtenaw County (Michigan) that Contract for Patrol Services with the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department

	Scio Township			Superior Township		
	PAM Minimum Staffing	PAM Ideal Staffing	Contract Staffing	PAM Minimum Staffing	PAM Ideal Staffing	Contract Staffing
Total Staffing (# of Deputies & Field Supervisors)	5.32 (1)	9.57 (1)	2.50	5.47 (1)	14.69 (1)	5.50
On-Duty Staffing Per Day (# of Deputies & Field Supervisors)	3.36	6.04	1.58 (2)	3.45	9.29	3.48 (2)
On-Duty Hours Per Day (3)	26.88	48.32	12.64	27.60	74.32	27.81
Contract Hours Per Week	-----	-----	100.00	-----	-----	220.00
On-Duty Hours Per Week	188.16 (4)	338.24 (4)	88.50 (5)	193.20 (4)	520.24 (4)	194.69 (5)
Staffing Index (%) (6)	-----	-----	Below Minimum	-----	-----	0.46

- (1) PAM staffing estimates include both deputies and field supervisors.
- (2) On-duty staffing per day equals the contract staffing divided by the shift relief factor (SRF). The SRF for the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department is 1.582.
- (3) On-duty hours per day equals the number of on-duty deputies per day multiplied by the shift length (8 hours).
- (4) On-duty hours per week equals the number of on-duty hours per day multiplied by seven.
- (5) On-duty hours per week equals the contract hours per week multiplied by the on-duty factor. The on-duty factor is based on the work schedule and the shift relief factor. The Washtenaw County Sheriff's department uses a 5 on - 2 off duty cycle schedule and has a shift relief factor (SRF) of 1.582 (PAM worksheet entry. The on-duty factor equals the (Number of days in the duty cycle schedule)/(Number of on-duty days in the duty cycle schedule x SRF). The on-duty factor for the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department is 0.885.
- (6) See Table 3-3 for an explanation of the Staffing Index.

Table 3-5 (continued)

Staffing Analysis of Areas Within Washtenaw County (Michigan) that Contract for Patrol Services with the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department

	York Township			Ypsilanti Township		
	PAM Minimum Staffing	PAM Ideal Staffing	Contract Staffing	PAM Minimum Staffing	PAM Ideal Staffing	Contract Staffing
Total Staffing (# of Deputies & Field Supervisors)	1.47 (1)	6.88 (1)	2.00	31.60 (1)	57.55 (1)	42.00
On-Duty Staffing Per Day (# of Deputies & Field Supervisors)	0.93	4.35	1.26 (2)	19.98	36.38	26.55 (2)
On-Duty Hours Per Day (3)	7.44	34.80	10.11	159.84	291.04	212.39
Contract Hours Per Week	----	----	80.00	----	----	1,680.00
On-Duty Hours Per Week	52.08 (4)	243.60 (4)	70.80 (5)	1,118.88 (4)	2,037.28 (4)	1,486.73 (5)
Staffing Index (%) (6)	----	----	10.80	----	----	40.05

- (1) PAM staffing estimates include both deputies and field supervisors.
- (2) On-duty staffing per day equals the contract staffing divided by the shift relief factor (SRF). The SRF for the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department is 1.582.
- (3) On-duty hours per day equals the number of on-duty deputies per day multiplied by the shift length (8 hours).
- (4) On-duty hours per week equals the number of on-duty hours per day multiplied by seven.
- (5) On-duty hours per week equals the contract hours per week multiplied by the on-duty factor. The on-duty factor is based on the work schedule and the shift relief factor. The Washtenaw County Sheriff's department uses a 5 on - 2 off duty cycle schedule and has a shift relief factor (SRF) of 1.582 (PAM worksheet entry. The on-duty factor equals the (Number of days in the duty cycle schedule)/(Number of on-duty days in the duty cycle schedule x SRF). The on-duty factor for the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department is 0.885.
- (6) See Table 3-3 for an explanation of the Staffing Index.

Table 3-6

Staffing Analysis of Patrol Services in Non-Contract Areas in Washtenaw County (Michigan) by the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department

General Patrol (Non-Contract Areas)

	PAM Minimum Staffing	PAM Ideal Staffing	Current Staffing
Total Staffing (# of Deputies & Field Supervisors)	9.23 (1)	48.25* (1)	26.00
On-Duty Staffing Per Day (# of Deputies & Field Supervisors)	5.94	31.08	16.43 (2)
On-Duty Hours Per Day (3)	47.52	248.64	131.48
Contract Hours Per Week	----	----	----
On-Duty Hours Per Week	332.64 (4)	1,740.48 (4)	920.35 (5)
Staffing Index (%) (6)	----	----	42.98

* Includes three "secondary road patrol" deputies.

- (1) PAM staffing estimates include both deputies and field supervisors.
- (2) On-duty staffing per day equals the contract staffing divided by the shift relief factor (SRF). The SRF for the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department is 1.582.
- (3) On-duty hours per day equals the number of on-duty deputies per day multiplied by the shift length (8 hours).
- (4) On-duty hours per week equals the number of on-duty hours per day multiplied by seven.
- (5) On-duty hours per week equals the contract hours per week multiplied by the on-duty factor. The on-duty factor is based on the work schedule and the shift relief factor. The Washtenaw County Sheriff's department uses a 5 on - 2 off duty cycle schedule and has a shift relief factor (SRF) of 1.582 (PAM worksheet entry. The on-duty factor equals the (Number of days in the duty cycle schedule)/(Number of on-duty days in the duty cycle schedule x SRF). The on-duty factor for the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department is 0.885.
- (6) See Table 3-3 for an explanation of the Staffing Index.

Discussion

Comparison of the staffing estimates and the current staffing levels in the 10 contract areas and for General Patrol suggests that, with few exceptions, staffing for patrol services in Washtenaw County is below and almost below minimum staffing levels. Table 3-7 summarizes the staffing levels for the 11 APAs based on the staffing index. Other than Dexter and Manchester villages, all other APAs have a staffing index below 50%. More striking is the fact that 7 of the 11 APAs have a staffing index below 11%. (This would be 8 out of 11 if the staffing index for General Patrol is revised using 13 deputies instead of 26.)

When staffing in an APA is below the ideal staffing level, the deficit manifests itself in one or both of two ways:

1. The patrol force is not capable of meeting the performance objectives used to determine the ideal staffing estimate; that is, there are not sufficient patrol personnel to:
 - spend time on free patrol for adequate visibility (i.e., the patrol interval will be higher than desired),
 - provide rapid response to emergency CFS (i.e., response times will be higher than desired), or
 - spend time on SI/COP activities.
2. The patrol force is not capable of handling all of the CFS in its assigned area. There is empirical evidence to suggest that, to some extent, this is happening in the contract areas. Table 3-8 indicates the average amount of time spent in each contract area by General Patrol deputies over an eight-month period in 1999.

It is not possible, without further investigation, to determine to what extent each of these results is occurring. The information in Table 3-8 suggests that, to some extent, the WCSO maintains an acceptable level of patrol performance (i.e., perform SI/COP activities, and provide visibility and availability) in the contract areas by using General Patrol units to handle some CFS in those areas. Caution must be taken in interpreting the information in Table 3-8. Recognizing that CFS arrive with varying degrees of intensity by time of day and day of the week, some spillover between contract and non-contract patrol areas should be expected; particularly in those areas which do not contract for sufficient hours to provide 24-hour patrol service, every day. At the same time, it would appear to be more than coincidence that the three townships with the highest percentage of General Patrol Time in Table 3-8 (i.e., Scio, Lodi, and Augusta) represent three out of the four townships with "Below Minimum" staffing indices in Table 3-3.

Table 3-7

Summary of the Staffing Indices for the Ten Contract Areas and General Patrol for Washtenaw County

Staffing Index	Number of APAs	APAs
Above Ideal Staffing	2	Dexter Village Manchester Village
Staffing Index (0-100%)	5	General Patrol (42.98%)* Ypsilanti Township (40.04%) Ann Arbor Township (10.90%) York Township (10.08%) Superior Township (0.46%)
Below Minimum Staffing	4	Augusta Township Dexter Township Lodi Township Scio Township

- If the staffing index for General Patrol is based on the 13 deputies currently being used for patrol, the staffing index would be 7.10%.

Table 3-9

Time Spent in Contract Areas by General Patrol Deputies, Washtenaw County Sheriff's Department

Contract Area	Average Number of Hours Spent Per Month in Area By General Patrol Deputies*	Average Number of Hours Spent Per Month Servicing All CFS in Area**	Percentage of Total Hours (General Patrol Hours/Total Hours)
Ann Arbor Township	50.77	166.54	30.48
Augusta Township	70.97	200.24	35.44
Dexter Township	17.39	176.95	9.83
Dexter Village	18.30	101.81	17.98
Lodi Township	63.11	153.44	41.13
Manchester Village	10.32	88.65	11.64
Scio Township	276.00	661.57	41.72
Superior Township	26.88***	670.78	4.01
York Township	36.92	179.33	20.59
Ypsilanti Township	19.27	3,455.51	0.56

* Average number of hours based on eight months of data (February - September 1999).

** Average number of hours for Superior Township based on seven months of data (March - September 1999).

*** Average number of hours based on 18 months of CFS data (January 1998 - June 1999).

Chapter Four

Summary and Recommendations

Our analysis of road patrol in Washtenaw County has resulted in several significant findings. Based on these results we can offer several recommendations to the county. In this chapter we review these results and recommendations.

Major Findings

1. The Washtenaw County Sheriff Department has an effective program of contract policing. The contract agencies express a high degree of satisfaction with the WCSD and believe that the program is mutually beneficial to the county and the local communities.
2. The current mix of contract policing and general road patrol results in confusion and, in some cases, resentment over what appears to be an inequitable distribution of services. This occurs, we believe, because the county has not sufficiently articulated its policy about the quantity of law enforcement services that are to be delivered in the non-contract areas.
3. The current method of determining the costs for contract deputies does not sufficiently reflect the true cost of providing those services. This method significantly undervalues the cost of supervisory and investigator support, fleet operations and liability.
4. The contracts between Washtenaw County and the contract agencies lack sufficient detail about the roles and responsibilities of the parties, particularly relative to staffing.
5. At the current level of staffing the WCSD is not able to meet the performance objectives that it has specified. We constructed two measures of staffing a minimum (CFS only) and an ideal staffing level in which officers could provide full service patrol. In order to accomplish full service policing the county should employ 141 deputies and 23 field supervisors. The current staffing is substantially below that level. In fact, the staffing in the non-contract area in 1998 (13 deputies) was barely above the minimum level.
6. In several townships with contracts general road deputies provide a substantial proportion of policing. For example, in both Lodi and Scio Townships 41% of time committed to calls for service is provided by general fund deputies.

Recommendations

- 1. Washtenaw County should articulate a policy that defines the general fund road patrol program relative to the contract agencies.**

In most areas of the country the responsibility of the sheriff relative to the provision of police services is better defined than in Washtenaw County. Typically, an incorporated area has a responsibility to provide police service. The sheriff (or in some cases the State Police) assume responsibility to provide law enforcement services in the unincorporated areas. In these areas the incorporated communities can either form their own police department, or contract with another law enforcement agency to provide the service. All residents of the county, including those that live in the incorporated areas contribute towards the provision of law enforcement services in the unincorporated areas. That level of service is typically less than that in incorporated areas. Moreover, the level of service in the contract areas is generally only that which is contracted for.

In Washtenaw County this situation is a great deal more complex because the general fund road patrol is used in both the contract and non-contract areas, and because the number of officers under contract in some areas is far less than is required. For example, the PAM minimum staffing for Scio Township is 5.32 officers, but in 1999 they only contracted for 2.5.

It would seem that it is very important for the county to differentiate between the service that will be provided under contract policing from that which will be provided in non-contract situations.

- 2. Washtenaw County should require that communities contracting for police services employ a sufficient number of personnel to meet performance objectives.**

Once the county has identified that level of services to be provided through the general fund it then becomes important to ensure that communities seeking additional service contract for a sufficient number of personnel to reach an agreed upon performance level. Otherwise the county will have to provide additional general fund deputies in support of that community. For example, let us say that a township and the Sheriff agree upon a performance objective and that the required staffing to reach that level is 10 officers. The county may decide that the general fund can provide the equivalent of one deputy. It should be clear to all of the parties that unless the community contracts for the additional nine deputies then they will not meet that performance objective. They may decide to contract for fewer deputies but they should expect reduced performance.

3. Washtenaw County should adopt a new method for establishing the cost of a police services contract.

It is clear from experience around the country that it can be difficult to establish a fair price for police contracts. Every department that provides such services has dealt with this issue. A recent case in Pima County Arizona illustrates the point. The Sheriff in that county was charging contracting agencies \$131,124 per "law enforcement unit". The County Administrator, however, using full cost recovery methods argued that the cost of a law enforcement unit should be \$226,825.¹

There are two problems with the current costing mechanism. First, the indirect cost rate of 39% is too low to cover the significant costs of administration, supervision, and investigations. In fact, as we illustrated in chapter two, the indirect cost rate associated with supporting the road deputies in this approach is 94%. The second reason that the indirect cost rate is too low is because many contract communities utilize general road fund deputies to answer calls for service. That is, in the current system agencies that contract for some officers get additional officers at no additional charge.

Another related issue is that of officer "fill-in". In the current system when a community contracts for a deputy the price does not include replacement during benefit time off (i.e. vacation, holiday, and sick leave). That should mean that communities get less service during those periods, but knowing what we do about the patterns of service in Washtenaw County it probably means that the community gets a "fill-in" from the general road fund (i.e. at no additional cost). One approach to this problem is to offer contracts with a provision for fill-in. This system is currently in use in Oakland County Michigan. In their 2000 contract the cost for a deputy II without fill-in is \$83,076 but with fill-in the cost is \$93,976.

4. Washtenaw County should articulate a policy on in-kind contribution by contract communities.

Some of the contract communities make an independent contribution to their law enforcement program. This can be in the form of office space, equipment, vehicles or even staff support. The communities believe that this contribution reduces the Sheriff's support costs for policing and thus should be reflected in reduced indirect costs.

In reality, these contributions are of mutual benefit. Consider, for example, the issue of facilities. It is clearly in the best interests of a contracting community to provide a facility. A facility reinforces the notion of local control, and makes the officers more visible and accessible. The contract agency also benefits because the officer's shift starts and ends in the contract area. Consider the inefficiency of conducting "roll call" at the WCSO headquarters. Officers would spend a considerable amount of time at both the beginning and end of their shift driving to and from the area. At the same time, however,

¹ "Huckleberry's plan doubles policing costs for new cities" The Arizona Daily Star. September 23, 1997.

the fact that the townships and villages are maintaining facilities around the county allows the Sheriff to provide far less space at headquarters for staff. These "win-win" situations can be more common if they are articulated as part of the contracting process.

5. Washtenaw County should review the role of the contract communities in formulating WCSD policy and practice.

The Sheriff has placed a strong emphasis on providing community oriented policing in the county. His record here is commendable. He has extended this philosophy to the contract communities by allowing them considerable input in the policy-making process. In one village, for example, the sergeant assigned serves as the local "chief of police".

This approach has worked well. However, while it is the case that local input is a valuable component of a successful contract-policing program, it is important, nonetheless that the goals, objectives, policy and procedures of the department be uniform throughout the county. In Los Angeles County, where contract policing really began, the department worked to fine-tune their services to meet the needs of the contract cities. But as many observers pointed out, every city received the same professional, legalistic style of policing that was characteristic of the LASD at that time. For communities that objected to that style their choice was to find another agency to provide the service or to form their own department.