## A-12: Operation Rio Grande (\$3.525 Million Total)

Council Members expressed an interest to explore increasing police patrol beyond the 27 new officers (and equipment in the first year) proposed by the Administration. The intent is to (1) help address some of the issues associated with Operation Rio Grande that certain neighborhoods throughout the City are experiencing and (2) increase the service level of patrol officers citywide. The Council discussed increasing police resources before Operation Rio Grande, and added 15 FTEs in FY 2017 to the Police Department as part of that ongoing conversation.

Staff prepared the table below showing cost estimates for the Administration's proposed 27 FTE entry level patrol officers and cost estimates for 30, 40 or 50 new officers. Any final decision by the Council on number of police FTEs would need to be reviewed by the Administration to determine if supervisory level positions (and therefore budget) would need to be added. The \$97,193 cost per police officer for FY 2018 is more than the $\$ 61,941$ cost per police officer shown in the Administration's Operation Rio Grande funding proposal. Staff asked the Administration for additional information on the difference between the two cost estimates (see policy question below table).

## Comparing Additional Police Officer Scenarios by Cost Estimates

| Scenarios | Based on Operation Rio Grande Cost Estimates |  |  |  | Based on Finance's Police Officer Cost Estimates |  |  |  | Difference between Two Cost Estimates |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FY 2018 |  | FY 2019 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY } 2018 \\ \text { (Half Year) } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY } 2019 \\ \text { (Full Year) } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY } 2018 \\ \text { (Half Year) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY } 2019 \\ \text { (Full Year) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Administration Proposal - 27 FTEs* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| salary | \$ | 889,412 | \$ | 1,810,588 | \$ | 987,998 | \$ | 1,975,995 | \$ $(98,586)$ | \$ | $(165,407)$ |
| equipment | \$ | 783,000 | \$ | 392,294 | \$ | 1,636,200 | \$ | 409,050 | \$ $(853,200)$ | \$ | $(16,756)$ |
| Total | \$ | 1,672,412 | \$ | 2,202,882 | \$ | 2,624,198 | \$ | 2,385,045 | \$ (951,786) | \$ | $(182,163)$ |
| Cost per Police Officer FTE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| salary | \$ | 32,941 | \$ | 67,059 | \$ | 36,593 | \$ | 73,185 | \$ $(3,651)$ | \$ | $(6,126)$ |
| equipment | \$ | 29,000 | \$ | 14,529 | \$ | 60,600 | \$ | 15,150 | \$ $(31,600)$ | \$ | (621) |
| Total | \$ | 61,941 | \$ | 81,588 | \$ | 97,193 | \$ | 88,335 | \$ $(35,251)$ | \$ | $(6,747)$ |
| Additional Cost to bring to 30 FTEs* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| salary | \$ | 98,824 | \$ | 2,011,764 | \$ | 1,097,775 | \$ | 2,195,550 | \$ (998,951) | \$ | $(183,786)$ |
| equipment | \$ | 87,000 | \$ | 435,882 | \$ | 1,818,000 | \$ | 454,500 | \$ (1,731,000) | \$ | $(18,618)$ |
| Total additional budget needed | \$ | 185,824 | \$ | 2,447,647 | \$ | 2,915,775 | \$ | 2,650,050 | \$ $(2,729,951)$ | \$ | $(202,403)$ |
| Additional Cost to bring to 40 FTEs* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| salary | \$ | 428,235 | \$ | 2,682,353 | \$ | 1,463,700 | \$ | 2,927,400 | \$ $(1,035,465)$ | \$ | $(245,047)$ |
| equipment | \$ | 377,000 | \$ | 581,176 | \$ | 2,424,000 | \$ | 606,000 | \$ (2,047,000) | \$ | $(24,824)$ |
| Total additional budget needed | \$ | 805,235 | \$ | 3,263,529 | \$ | 3,887,700 | \$ | 3,533,400 | \$ $(3,082,465)$ | \$ | $(269,871)$ |
| Additional Cost to bring to 50 FTEs* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| salary | \$ | 757,647 | \$ | 3,352,941 | \$ | 1,829,625 | \$ | 3,659,250 | \$ $(1,071,978)$ | \$ | $(306,309)$ |
| equipment | \$ | 667,000 | \$ | 726,470 | \$ | 3,030,000 | \$ | 757,500 | \$ $(2,363,000)$ | \$ | $(31,030)$ |
| Total additional budget needed | \$ | 1,424,647 | \$ | 4,079,411 | \$ | 4,859,625 | \$ | 4,416,750 | \$ $(3,434,978)$ | \$ | $(337,339)$ |

[^0]> Policy Questions - The Council may wish to ask the Administration:

1. What accounts for the different cost estimates?
2. How much of the cost difference could be absorbed by the Police Department's current budget?
3. Would some equipment expenses be incurred next fiscal year?
4. Does the funding request for 27 new patrol officer FTEs need to be revised upward?

## Authorized and Actual Staffing by Division - Nov 21, 2017

|  | Office of Chief | Watch Command | Liberty Patrol | Pioneer Patrol | Special Operations | Invest. | Support | Professional Standards | Academy | FTO | Unfunded | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chief | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| AC | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| DC | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| CPT | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| LT | 1 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| SGT | 3 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 13 | 11 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |
| OFF | 15 | 0 | 83 | 96 | 91 | 79 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 392 |
| Auth | 23 | 8 | 95 | 108 | 108 | 93 | 5 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 474 |
|  | Office of Chief | Watch Command | Liberty Patrol | Pioneer Patrol | Special Operations | Invest. | Support | Professional Standards | Academy | FTO | Unfunded | Total |
| Chief | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| AC | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| DC | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| CPT | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| LT | 1 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| SGT | 3 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 13 | 11 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |
| OFC | 15 | 0 | 83 | 92 | 88 | 79 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 365 |
| Actual | 23 | 8 | 95 | 104 | 105 | 93 | 5 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 447 |
| Vacancies | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | -1 | 20 | 27 |

Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Hiring Grants
The Council also may wish to consider the escalating City responsibility for the 15 FTEs that were added in FY 2017 as part of the COPS grant program (the difference each year has been slowly absorbed into the General Fund):

- FY 2017- \$851,131
- FY 2018-\$1,031,000
- FY 2019-\$1,340,000 (note: because $\$ 1$ million was included in the base budget for FY 18, only the difference would need to be found in FY 19-\$309,000, and the same would be true in FY 2020)
- FY 2020-\$1,600,000 (full cost in fourth year)


## Retention of Existing Police Officers

Council Members asked if additional funds could be allocated to retain existing officers eligible for retirement. The Police Department indicated significant funding would likely be necessary to retain officers who retire and are then eligible to take senior positions elsewhere (often out-of-state, in the private sector or at UTA, to avoid the State's prohibition on accepting a law enforcement position within one year of retirement). In these situations, the new salaries are augmented by their retirement pay from Salt Lake City (a.k.a. "double dipping"). The Council could discuss how widely an incentive program might be offered (for example, would it be for all eligible FTEs, or patrol only?). Staff has inquired with the Administration how many patrol officers are eligible to retire in the next year and what size an effective retention incentive would need to be.

Police Department Current Staffing Levels (Attachment H)
The following summary chart was provided by the police department to clarify current staffing levels. See
Attachment H for a detailed breakdown of authorized FTEs and current staffing levels by rank and division. The Police Department is planning a new recruit class in J anuary to fill the current 27 vacancies.

## POLICE DEPARTMENT FY 17

FTE

| General Fund Sworn | $\mathbf{4 5 8}$ | General Fund Civilian | $\mathbf{1 0 7}$ |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Sworn Funded | 437 | Civilian | 108 |
| Sworn Unfunded | 20 |  | -1 |
| Evidence Sgt. | 1 | Evidence Supervisor | $\mathbf{3 . 5}$ |
| Grant Sworn | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | Grant Civilian |  |
|  |  |  | 1.5 |
| COPS Grant | 15 | VOCA | 0.5 |
| RMHIDTA Grant | 1 | VAWA | 0.5 |
|  |  | ElderAbuse | 1 |
|  |  | GTEAP |  |
| Total Sworn | $\mathbf{4 7 4}$ | Total Civilian | $\mathbf{1 1 1}$ |

Note: RMHIDTA stands for Rocky Mountain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area Grant

- The below information was discussed at the November $14^{\text {th }}$ and $21^{\text {st }}$ briefings -


## ISSUE AT-A-GLANCE

Budget Amendment Number One of Fiscal Year (FY 2018) contains 36 adjustments requested by the Administration totaling $\$ 60.6$ million. Of this total, $\$ 50$ million is for the Department of Airports to make interest payments on outstanding bonds. The amendment includes approximately $\$ 4.9$ million in expenditures from General Fund fund balance. If the Council approves all of those expenditures remaining fund balance is


[^0]:    *Note: FTEs are spread across 3 shifts. 27FTEs $=9$ per shift; 30 FTEs $=10$ per shift; 40 FTEs $=13.3$ per shift; 50 FTEs $=16.7$ per shift

