



## MEMORANDUM

**Date:** April 8, 2014  
**To:** City Council  
**From:** Bryan Montgomery, City Manager  
Paul Abelson, Finance Director  
**Subject:** **Police Services Study Update**

---

### Summary

This is a status update on the police services study undertaken to determine how to best position the City in providing for the long-term delivery of police services. Staff is taking a measured and deliberate approach to gathering the necessary data, and exploring the options and opportunities that may be available. Our goal is present a comprehensive, actionable analysis offering you the opportunity to evaluate and choose from a number of achievable long-term service delivery options that maintain or improve the City's existing level of service, and in the process, identifying whether a lower cost model exists or is likely to exist sometime in the foreseeable future.

To date, Staff has researched other studies of a similar nature, developed a scope and strategy for the Study, reviewed the service delivery models for the most recent top safest 50 cities (at the suggestion of Councilmember Hardcastle), and have conducted a regional survey of local police departments to learn what types of services are currently, and commonly, performed in-house vs. via contract; and to learn where possible, the names of the contractors serving these departments.

Staff intends in the next phase of work (Phase II) to continue to gather information by contacting several cities who have actually moved from a contract model to a more in-house model, to explore how the process worked, the timelines they experienced, the initial costs of transition, and lessons learned (what they'd do differently if they were doing it today). Staff will also begin reaching out to contractors identified in the above-mentioned survey, including the County, to find out how their services would be available to Oakley in the future, should the City decide in the future to move to an in-house or hybrid service delivery model; and of course, seek to understand their contract model and how they charge for their services.

In Phase III of the Study, Staff will develop and analyze potential models of service structure and delivery, at a minimum including models under a continuation of the County contract, formation of an all in-house Department, and one or more hybrid models with some in-house services and some contracted. We will also explore whether more comprehensive contracting options may exist with neighboring/nearby cities, and the potential for the formation of a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) bringing a number of cities together for all or some of the work necessary for successful, but less costly, public safety operations. Staff

---

also expects to engage two or three experienced public safety personnel outside of our organization to review the models and assist in making adjustments that ensure they reflect maintenance of current service levels, and that they include a plan that is achievable. In addition, due to the complexities of forming a new in-house department option, it may also be necessary to engage a compensation specialist to assist Staff in designing a reasonable compensation model to ensure the analyses of any in-house model reflects realistic costs needed to successfully attract any proposed public safety personnel, given the City is limited to utilizing the new State-mandated 2%@57 retirement plan for all new public safety hires.

In the last phase of the Study (Phase IV), Staff will summarize the results, and hold one or more work sessions to present the findings, including a description of the models, and Staff's observations about each one. From a financial perspective, the presentation is expected to include both shorter term comparisons, as well as longer term; and will look at the costs of each option vs current costs and those we might expect in the future as the City grows. Feedback by the Council and the Public from the work session(s) would then serve as a basis for Staff to bring the Council its recommendations.

#### **Discussion and Council Input**

Staff welcomes the Council's comments and any further direction regarding the Study's scope and strategy.

#### **Attachments**

1. Results from the review of the 50 Safest Communities

## 50 Safest Cities List

City	Contract	In-House
Saratoga	x	
Rancho Santa Margarita	x	
Los Altos		x
Aliso Viejo	x	
Temple City	x	
Laguna Niguel	x	
Moorpark	x	
Lincoln		x
Danville	x	
San Ramon		x
Soledad		x
Cupertino	x	
Calabasas	x	
Agoura Hills	x	
Lake Forest	x	
Yorba Linda	x	
Walnut	x	
Mission Viejo	x	
Foster City		x
Chino Hills	x	
Rancho Palos Verdes	x	
Goleta	x	
Pacifica		x
Hercules		x
Simi Valley		x
San Juan Capistrano	x	
San Clemente	x	
Poway	x	
Camarillo	x	
Windsor	x	
Diamond Bar	x	
Sunnyvale		x
Thousand Oaks	x	
Murrieta		x
Dublin	x	
Irvine		x
Santa Clarita	x	
San Gabriel		x
Lafayette	x	
Benecia		x
Oakley	x	
Corcoran		x
Petaluma		x
La Canada Flintridge	x	
Pleasanton		x
Belmont		x
La Mirada	x	
Maywood	x	
Eastvale	x	
La Puente	x	