

Phase 1 Report – Police Services Analysis

KENSINGTON POLICE PROTECTION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT

DRAFT



May 21, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Introduction and Executive Summary	1
2	Kensington Police Service Environment	6
3	Current Service Delivery Issues	22
4	Standards for Small Agency Police Service Delivery	34
5	Recommendations for Improving Kensington Service Delivery	39
	Attachment A – Profile of Kensington’s Police Services	42
	Attachment B – Results of the Community Questionnaire	53

1. Introduction and Executive Summary

1 Goals of the Study

The Matrix Consulting Group was retained by the Kensington Police Protection and Community Service District to conduct a multi-phased Police Services Options Analysis. This Phase 1 report is designed to evaluate current police services and to develop standards related to retaining in-house police operations or to seek service delivery alternatives.

2 Methodology and Process Used to Conduct the Study

The project team utilized a number of approaches in order to fully understand the service environment and issues relevant to the study, including the following:

- **On-site interviews** with members of the Board, the General Manager, the Chief of Police, and staff of the District's police services.
- **Data collection** across a wide range of areas in order to facilitate our analysis. While computer-aided dispatch (CAD) records from Albany Police Department were provided, other data from Kensington was limited but included budgets, policies and procedures, and various Excel spreadsheets, principally relating to service costs.
- **Community feedback** was obtained from a variety of sources including two Town Hall meetings (on March 17, 2018 and April 28, 2018), a web-based survey, and invitation for e-mail comments. This information provided a wide variety of opinions on police services. It is clear that the Kensington community is very engaged on public service issues. The results of the community survey are provided in Attachment B to this report.
- **A Profile document** was provided as an interim deliverable to identify basic staffing, scheduling and operational protocols of Kensington's police services. This was circulated and corrected and serves as a factual baseline for many of the findings in this report. This "Profile" is provided as Attachment A to this report.

This **draft report** represents the culmination of this Phase 1 effort, presenting the

results of our analysis, including specific recommendations for Kensington operations, staffing, deployment, and other relevant issues.

3 Executive Summary

Kensington's Police services have faced many staffing and management issues in recent years. Like most police agencies in California and across the country, recruiting police officers is challenging in a full employment economy and in an environment of intense public scrutiny. A small agency faces even bigger challenges. These challenges have been addressed in prior Board efforts to examine their options for police services, including this study and an internal study conducted last year.

There are numerous findings in this report about Kensington's police service environment and issues which need to be addressed. The following reflects some of the highlights of our review of Kensington's current police service.

- "Major crime" (as defined by the FBI in its Uniform Crime Reports) are not common in Kensington, averaging approximately one per week – and are mostly property related (burglaries and thefts). Kensington, based on these crimes, is among the top 7% of safest communities in California.
- Kensington suffers from significant challenges related to maintaining sworn staffing levels, with continual declines in staffing over the past three years. Recruitment and retention will remain a challenge in Kensington due to several factors that include compensation and an operational environment that is not considered "challenging" to many potential recruits and laterals.
- Approximately two-thirds of the time only one sworn personnel is deployed in the District—and regularly there is no supervisor on duty.
- Requests for police services (i.e., community-generated calls for service) occur at low levels in Kensington too, and averaged about four (4) calls per day in 2017. Mostly, requests for police services are for 'quality of life' issues and minor crimes.
- Response times are reasonable considering the composition of most of the service

requests, though there is opportunity to improve dispatch queue time.¹

- The ability of staff to be proactive is exceptional – 81% of total field time in 2017 was available for proactive problem solving and/or working with the community. However, despite high proactive levels, recorded self-initiated activity by officers during this time is modest, at only four activities per day. However, these activities appear to be increasing.
- Access to and use of better equipment should be considered a priority.
- There are a variety of operational issues in Kensington’s police services relating to inconsistent internal management, leadership and oversight.
- There is a significant opportunity to develop a more strategic approach to law enforcement service delivery in Kensington consistent with problem-oriented and community-oriented policing philosophies.
These issues are explored in more detail in the body of the report. The section,

which follows, summarizes the key recommendations for change in Kensington’s current police services.

4 Summary of Recommendations

Throughout this report the project team provides evaluation and analysis of the operations and services provided by Kensington police operations and, where appropriate, makes suggestions for improvements. The table, below, provides a summary of the recommendations and/or opportunities for improvement that appear in this report.

¹ Queue time is dispatch processing time – the elapsed time from the receipt of a call in the communications center to the dispatch of an officer in the field.

Recommendations

Staff-Related Recommendations

Develop an organizational structure consisting of one (1) Chief, four (4) sergeants, one (1) corporal, (4) four officers and one (1) Police Services Specialist for a total of 11 staff positions. This would provide for a presence in Kensington of two personnel on duty each shift, one of whom should be a supervisor.

The corporal position, providing line support and back-up supervision to sergeants, should be rotated for coverage purposes and receive compensatory pay when rotated off their baseline "Day Shift" assignment.

Deploy all sergeants and officers/corporal on the team-based 12-hour shift schedule.

Eliminate the detective position and assign all investigative efforts to patrol sergeants and officers.

Fill the vacant reserve position. The Chief should attempt to double the size of the reserve program to four (4) officers while retaining the minimum 20 hours of service per month.

The Chief should develop a Volunteers program for local seniors wishing to support the Kensington community through Vacation Watch, administrative support, and other efforts.

Operations-Related Recommendations

Explore supporting contract services with another police department for support services – records, property and evidence, internal affairs investigations, and recruitments (excluding backgrounds).

Ensure that all sworn personnel obtain, at minimum, 24-hours every two years of Continuing Professional Training (CPT) and 12-hours of Perishable Skills training for a total of 36-hours every two years. Endeavor to provide voluntary training of an additional 22-hours per officer per year for career / skill / leadership enhancement, resulting in an average of 40-hours annually for in-service training.

Over the next year provide the Chief with dedicated managerial training and mentorship.

Strongly consider adopting use of Tasers and body-worn cameras consistent with best practices.

Explore with the contract dispatch agency, Albany, the average 6.08-minute dispatch 'queue' time², impacting overall response time, and endeavor to reduce this queue time by 50% over the next year.

² Queue time is dispatch processing time – the elapsed time from the receipt of a call in the communications center to the dispatch of an officer in the field.

Recommendations

Devise more comprehensive recruitment strategies to expedite new officer hires.

The Police Chief, in concert with the General Manager, the Board and the community, should develop a Kensington Policing Strategic Plan consistent with the approach detailed in the *IACP Building Police-Community Partnerships in Small Towns*.

The Strategic Plan should contain, at minimum: 1) community and internal survey; 2) community planning retreat, and 3) design and development of the Strategic Plan.

As part of the strategic planning effort, devise a specific Community Action Plan developed to identify services, programs and related community-focused efforts to conduct during proactive policing activities.

As part of the Community-oriented Action Plan effort, develop a performance management program with relevant output and outcome measures designed to report on key metrics important to the Kensington community.

Metrics that should be considered include: 1) response times; 2) formal complaint tracking; 3) annual training hours obtained; 4) neighborhood watch meetings conducted; 5) non-injury, injury and fatal traffic accidents; 6) traffic and parking citations and warnings; 7) business and home security checks performed; 8) sergeant follow-up contacts made on officer performance; 9) special events supported; and 10) case clearance rate.


Relevant performance metrics should be updated quarterly and reported on the Kensington website similar to the 'old' Activity Log and Monthly Report.

2. Kensington Police Services Environment

The following chapter provides an overview of key characteristics associated with the Kensington Police Protection and Community Services District police services environment. This chapter is intended to supplement information provided in the Profile located in Attachment A of this report.

1 Overview of the District



Kensington Police Protection and Community Services District (KPPCSD or hereafter 'District') is an unincorporated community in Contra Costa County of approximately 5,364 full time residents covering one square mile.



As shown, Kensington is surrounded by the municipalities of Berkeley, Albany, El Cerrito and Richmond. As an unincorporated area, the Kensington Police Protection and Community Services District has local jurisdiction over its police, parks and sanitation services. Kensington has two voter-approved assessments. There is a Kensington Fire Protection District (KFPD) which contracts with the City of El Cerrito to provide fire protection services.

2 Crime Environment in Kensington


Kensington has a very low rate of ‘major crimes’ (as defined by the FBI in its Uniform Crime Reports) – violent crimes, in fact, are rare in the community. The following table shows “Part I” crimes as reported from years 2012 to 2016, as reported to the FBI.

Kensington Part I Crime Trends						
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	
Violent Crime	4	5	2	1	3	
Criminal Homicide	1	0	0	0	0	
Rape	0	0	0	0	0	
Robbery	3	0	0	0	0	
Aggravated Assault	0	5	1	1	3	
Property crime	85	85	46	86	56	
Burglary	30	36	16	21	20	
Larceny-Theft	45	35	25	52	36	
Motor Vehicle Theft	10	14	5	13	0	
Arson	2	2	0	0	0	
Part I Crimes Per 1,000	11.0					
5YR Violent Crime	▼ -25%					
5YR Property Crime	▼ -34%					

Overall, Kensington is a very safe community with both violent and property crime rates trending downward. Indeed, Part I Crimes Per 1,000 residents shows Kensington ranking 31st of 461 California communities reporting (top 7%).

3 Overview of Police Service Delivery


The District, which also provides solid waste and parks services, is overseen by a General Manager who supports all KPPCSD services. Recently, the roles of the Chief of Police and General Manager have been separated into two distinct positions. Police services are now led by an interim Chief of Police, and are provided to the District by the following authorized staff positions assuming all authorized positions are filled:

Kensington Police Services Organizational Chart

Currently (and historically) the Department has consisted of ten (10) authorized sworn Officers, which includes the Chief of Police, and one (1) Police Services Specialist for a total of 11 staff. Recently, however, the total number of sworn police department personnel was reduced by one position to nine (9) staff, leaving the Master Sergeant position unfilled.

At the time of this report, one field sergeant position, one detective and one patrol officer position were vacant—a 33% vacancy rate. During this time, one officer position

was filled and was serving in a field training tour of duty. The following graph shows the number of police positions on staff and compares this to the number actual on patrol-related duty after subtracting the civilian position, personnel on long-term injury or other leave, and similar extended absenteeism.



As shown, staffing has been in decline from 2015-2017 with a 29% reduction in on duty staff over the three-year period. This has been an ongoing issues for police services in Kensington, resulting in the inability to field targeted staffing on shifts, potential safety issues, and employee burn-out possibilities.

The following shift schedule, based on the *existing* staff deployment, is based on the following key operational aspects:

- **Dark Gray** shows scheduled days off for staff.
- **Light Gray** shows days in which more than one sworn personnel is deployed.
- **Red** shows days in which only one sworn personnel is deployed for the entire shift.

- **Gold** shows days in which only one sworn personnel is deployed for a portion of the shift.

Team	Officer	Start	End	Week 1							Week 2							
				S	M	T	W	Th	F	Sa	S	M	T	W	Th	F	Sa	
1	Chief	1000	1800	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	
	Officer 1	1800	0600	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Gold	Gold	Red	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Gold	Gold	Gold	Red
	Officer 2	1800	0600	Red	Gold	Gold	Gold	Grey	Grey	Grey	Red	Gold	Gold	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	
2	Sergeant	1200	2200	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	
	Officer 3	0600	1800	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Gold	Gold	Red	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	Gold	Gold	Gold	Red
	Officer 4	0600	1800	Red	Gold	Gold	Gold	Grey	Grey	Grey	Red	Gold	Gold	Grey	Grey	Grey	Grey	

As demonstrated in the schedule above, the entire weekend has only one officer deployed while during the remainder of the week there are also periods in which only one patrol officer is fielded. Approximately 113 hours are expended monthly to provide scheduled and unscheduled leave coverage, but this overtime is not used to fill permanent vacancies. In effect, 66% of the time only one full-time officer is fielded in Kensington without supervision. In addition to permanent staff, there are two police reserve officers that provide 20 or more hours each. These additional resources do not fill the gap in staffing needed.

These issues are discussed further later in this report.

4 Patrol Workloads and Service Levels

One of the key workloads for patrol staff is handling community-generated calls for service (CFS) – unique incidents which are requests for service from the community. These workloads are an important (though not the only) driver of staff resource needs in a police agency. The project team was provided CFS data from the Albany Police Department for July 2017 through January 2018 and annualized this information because of the change in contract dispatch services. In total and on an annualized basis there

were 1,565 community generated calls for service, just over 4 such incidents per day.

The following tables and graphs describe various descriptive elements surrounding CFS in the District.

The first table displays the total number of community generated calls for service handled by patrol units by hour of day and day of week.

Calls for Service by Hour and Weekday


Hour	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Total
12am	14	10	5	5	0	3	2	39
1am	0	3	7	3	3	2	10	29
2am	7	2	0	3	2	3	5	22
3am	3	0	2	0	0	2	0	7
4am	0	3	2	2	0	0	0	7
5am	2	2	3	2	2	2	0	12
6am	3	5	3	0	0	7	5	24
7am	7	9	3	3	3	10	2	38
8am	2	14	17	17	7	15	9	81
9am	14	27	21	26	21	22	3	134
10am	10	27	24	17	27	9	19	134
11am	14	29	19	19	26	17	9	132
12pm	10	10	15	12	12	15	9	84
1pm	21	12	12	19	9	10	15	98
2pm	7	15	27	21	7	14	7	98
3pm	10	14	17	19	17	21	5	103
4pm	19	19	17	24	12	21	5	117
5pm	9	7	24	10	15	12	5	82
6pm	7	15	12	10	7	10	5	67
7pm	15	14	12	12	5	10	5	74
8pm	7	12	10	7	3	12	7	58
9pm	7	7	9	9	2	3	17	53
10pm	9	2	5	5	0	10	7	38
11pm	0	2	0	7	5	12	10	36
Total	195	261	267	252	185	243	161	1,565

The data above shows variations in CFS by time of day and day of week. The data

underscores the low volumes of community generate workloads – the numbers in square represent total calls in that daily and hourly time block for an entire year. For example, from midnight until 8 a.m. calls for service average only one-half of a call every day reflecting an extremely quiet period for staff on patrol. Yellow – Red represent busier times of the day and Green less busy.

As shown, below, the CFS by time of day are particularly infrequent in the early morning hours (which is common) with calls for service peaks taking place in the mid-morning hours. In most communities, calls for service peak in later afternoons and/or during the later evening hours. A review of call types, however, shows that in the morning residents are reporting abandoned vehicles and vandalism, asking for information and requesting welfare checks. The busiest times Kensington experiences are in the morning from 9 a.m. to 11 a.m. This time block, however, only experiences slightly more than one call for service per day during the two-hour period.


Calls for Service by Hour



The following table reflects the top 10 most common call types. The table also

shows the relative frequency in which these calls occur (darker is more frequent).

CFS Incident Types by Time Block




Interestingly, the 10 most common CFS represent approximately two-thirds of the police call types received by the District. All of these calls would be considered lower priority events in most police agencies as they typically represent neither high risk or serious criminal events. These call types are relatively self-explanatory with the exception of “Misc. Automobile” which reflects some kind of automobile-related issue whether a vehicle blocking a driveway, an unlock assist, etc.

The project team also evaluated response times to call for service. Response times

³ Classified as Mis Pub Auto in the CAD software.

are composed of two elements: 1) Call processing time in the dispatch center and, 2) the travel time for the officer once the dispatched call is received. As shown in the graph below, response times in Kensington average approximately 14 minutes.

Total Call for Service Response Time in Minutes (13.83 Min.)



Kensington response times need to be viewed in the context of the previous finding that virtually all activities requiring police response are lower priority – most are quality of life and not crimes and life threatening calls are rare. This impacts response needs, including the speed of response. The street network and topography of the District are also factors. As a result, average response times in Kensington are adequate from a service level perspective and conform to common response time averages in communities with low priority calls for service.

One potential issue, however, is that calls for service are being held in the dispatch center an average of six minutes. This length of time for a dispatch agency is atypical, and not consistent with best practices, though also an indicator of low priority calls.

5 Patrol Service Requirements

The next step for the project team was to evaluate the amount of workload these community generated workloads represent in order to assess how highly utilized staff are in handling these workloads. The intention of the analysis is to estimate in a reasonable range of work requirements and officer availability to perform various tasks.

The table, below, builds a portrait of the amount of time community generated workloads represent. Calls for service have a 'handling time' associated with the time taken to resolve the reason for the call. Call handling time represents 31.6 minutes for the primary unit. However, there is other work that must be accounted for in a CFS. In Kensington, however, existing information on some of these additional workload metrics is unavailable. As a result, normative values had to be used for such factors as report writing time, back-up rate and time on a back-up. These normative values are based on the project team's nationwide experience in conducting over several hundred law enforcement studies and err on the side of caution.

Summary of Patrol Workload Factors

Category	Value	Work hours
Total Number of Calls for Service	1,565	
Avg. Primary Unit Handling Time (min.)	31.6	824
Backup Units Per CFS	0.50	
Avg. Backup Unit Handling Time (min.) @ 75% of Primary Unit	23.7	309
Reports Written Per CFS	0.33	
Time Per Report (min.)	45.0	387
Avg. Workload Per Call (min.)	58.6	
Total Workload Hours	1,528	1,540

Based on the information noted thus far in the report, an estimated 1,528 hours of CFS-related workload occurs annually.

Secondly, the project team needed to estimate the amount of annual time available for patrol personnel to perform their work. A typical patrol officer on a 12-hour shift schedule with one 8-hour bi-weekly tour is scheduled for 2,080 regular hours per year. However, patrol staff are actually on duty well below this due to scheduled and unscheduled leaves, administrative requirements such as meetings, etc. The table, which follows, provides the calculation of the “net availability” of Kensington patrol officers based on data provided to the project team. Where data was not available, estimates are provided based on other national law enforcement agency averages.

Breakdown of Net Availability

Calculation Factor	Value
Base Annual Work Hours	2,080
Total Leave Hours	– 226
On-Duty Training Hours	– 0
Administrative Hours	– 273
Net Available Hours Per Officer	= 1,582
<i>Number of Patrol Positions Currently Deployed (4 officers, 1 sergeant)</i>	
<i>x</i>	5
Total Net Available Hours	= 7,908

Proactive time addresses all other workloads that are not in response to a community-generated call for service. These include such important services as officer self-initiated activity: proactive or preventive patrol, investigative follow-up, traffic enforcement, pedestrian stops, foot patrols, etc. It is critical to recognize that all self-

initiated activity falls within an “uncommitted time” category. Increasingly, law enforcement agencies have come to the realization that the most important test of effectiveness in field services is the amount of proactivity and how it is utilized to support the community in problem-solving. For high service level residential communities proactive capabilities need to represent at least 40% – 50% of available time.

Based on the call for service and officer availability data, the following discussion builds the analysis of field proactive time based on the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{Total Net Available Hours} - \text{Total CFS Workload Hours}}{\text{Total Net Available Hours}} = \% \text{ Proactivity}$$

Using the variables calculated to this point, the amount of proactive time available to patrol officers in Kensington is shown below.

Overall Patrol Proactivity

Total Patrol Net Available Hours		7,908
Total Patrol Workload Hours	–	1,528
Resulting # of Uncommitted Hours	=	6,380
<i>Divided by total net available hours</i>	<i>÷</i>	7,908
Overall Proactivity Level	=	80.7%

Gross proactivity is quite high in Kensington – over 80%. This provides officers in the District with an exceptional ability to support the community in law enforcement related problems. The table, below, further supports this analysis by showing that these capabilities exist throughout the day, every day.


Proactivity by Hour and Weekday

Time	# Units	S	M	T	W	Th	F	Sa	Overall
2am-6am	0.8	95%	96%	97%	97%	96%	96%	98%	97%
6am-10am	0.8	74%	53%	75%	78%	76%	68%	78%	72%
10am-2pm	1.1	74%	66%	71%	55%	54%	48%	60%	67%
2pm-6pm	1.3	79%	84%	76%	71%	80%	50%	88%	76%
6pm-10pm	1.3	78%	88%	90%	85%	94%	82%	84%	87%
10pm-2am	0.8	87%	90%	91%	92%	96%	80%	86%	89%
Overall	1.0	81%	82%	83%	79%	84%	70%	82%	81%

As shown by the table above, proactive time ranges from 67% to 97%. At 81% proactivity overall, Kensington has exceptional abilities for patrol services to be able to respond to community-generated calls for service, while also having significant community-oriented proactive capabilities.

The current evidence suggests, however, that despite significant amounts of proactive time, according to CAD records Kensington patrol staff are not using this time to conduct progressive self-initiated activities. Approximately four (4) self-initiated activities are conducted per day, mostly related to business security checks and vehicular activities. This is shown in the following graph.

Number of Daily Activities Performed During Proactive Time



In addition to call handling and officer initiated activities, officers are assigned a variety of ancillary duties that they perform during their uncommitted time (e.g., public records response, etc.).

6 Summary of Kensington Police Service Delivery

The following bullets serve to summarize key law enforcement service delivery outcomes to the Kensington community:

- Part I (major) crimes are very low in Kensington, averaging approximately one per week. Kensington, based on these crimes, is in the top 7% of safest communities in California.
- Average community-generated calls for service are generally low in Kensington, averaging about four (4) calls per day. Calls for service are typically 'quality of life situations' and minor crimes.
- Response times to calls for service average close to 14 minutes from call-receipt to police unit arrival. This is not unexpected, however, given call characteristics and the road network in the community.
- Approximately two-thirds of the time only one sworn personnel is deployed – and regularly without direct on-site supervision.

- Based on patrol field resources available and call loads, proactive time is 81% availability for officers to conduct various activities beyond responding to calls. This is an extremely high level of uncommitted time that needs to be used wisely. *This level of proactivity exists even at current lower staffing levels.*
- Despite high proactive time, recorded self-initiated activity by officers during this time is low, and reflects only four activities per day. Very recent efforts have seen an increase in these activities.

The services provided by Kensington provide a foundation for the examination of future services that may be provided by the District in the context of best practices for a small police agency. These are discussed in the following chapters.

3. Current Service Delivery Issues

Based on the current police services environment in Kensington, as described in the previous chapter, there are a variety of issues that should be addressed in order to best meet service delivery needs in the community in the most effective, efficient and safe way. The following sections are categorized by service area.

1 Kensington Staffing Issues for Police Services

As a small policing agency Kensington suffers from some important staffing risks that are relatively common for many policing agencies. Kensington represents one in approximately 30 policing agencies in California with 10 or fewer sworn staff. In fact, nearly half (47%) of police agencies in the United States have 10 or fewer sworn⁴, micro agencies have staffing and operational difficulties not experienced by their larger counterparts. These difficulties provide various challenges that they community must either accept or attempt to resolve through a variety of potential solutions.

In Kensington, the problems of a small department are compounded by the number of vacant positions. Staff vacancies are presently resulting in only one officer available in Kensington frequently, resulting in several operational issues of importance.

These challenges include the following key issue areas.

(1) Recruitment and Retention Difficulties.

The Matrix Consulting Group's national experience suggests the following denotes a common theme throughout today's law enforcement profession:

⁴ <https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/studies/36697>

Ask any law enforcement executive worldwide to list the most challenging internal issue facing their respective agencies, and the vast majority will mention recruiting, selecting and retaining sworn personnel. The fact is, given the current environment of the policing profession, recruiting the next generation of police officers is more difficult than ever. With the pressures, demands, and expectations of the community, finding individuals who want to step into and stay in this uncertain and dangerous career is a daunting task.⁵

The *North Carolina Criminal Justice Analysis Center* conducted a study that concluded law enforcement had a higher attrition rate, at 14%, than both teaching and nursing, which were at 13% and 12%, respectively.⁶ As shown previously, Kensington suffers similar attrition, averaging approximately 13% from 2015-2017, and while such turnover is consistent with these reported national averages, these rates are higher than the attrition rates seen in other police studies conducted by the project team over the last ten years. Kensington has rarely had their full staffing contingent. This is due to multiple retention factors.

One factor is salary. While compensation comparisons are more complicated than just salary, they provide a good starting point. Based on data provided, Kensington officers mid-point salary is \$76,359 per annum. This can be juxtaposed against the following salary table for California.⁷

⁵ Police Foundation (2016) <https://www.policefoundation.org/recruiting-selecting-and-retaining-law-enforcement-officers/>

⁶ <https://www.thebalancecareers.com/what-to-do-about-police-retention-problems-974770>

⁷ <https://www.sokanu.com/careers/police-officer/salary/california/#employment-type>

Top End Police Officer Earnings The highest earning Police Officers in California earn:	\$61.44 an hour	\$127,799.10 per year
Senior Police Officer Earnings Senior Police Officers in California earn:	\$53.25 an hour	\$110,754.10 per year
Experienced Police Officer Earnings Experienced Police Officers in California earn:	\$45.32 an hour	\$94,268.50 per year
Junior Police Officer Earnings Junior Police Officers in California earn:	\$36.65 an hour	\$76,226.00 per year
Kensington Police Officer Earnings Mid-point Salary Kensington Officers earn:	\$36.71 an hour	\$76,359.00 per year
Starting Police Officer Earnings Starting Police Officers in California earn:	\$27.91 an hour	\$58,043.90 per year

Kensington average officer salaries can be compared to the midpoint salaries of the law enforcement agencies that surround it as shown in the table below:

Agency	Mid-point Annual Salary
Richmond	\$ 107,220
Berkeley	\$ 106,281
Albany	\$ 97,284
El Cerrito	\$ 96,534
Kensington	\$ 76,359

Kensington’s average salaries are 25% less than the average of the other four regional agencies. Kensington is attempting to attract candidates from the same regional pool of new cadets or laterals, and as such can be at a competitive disadvantage for higher paying jobs that provide the opportunity for crime-fighting, and specialized assignments.

While competitive salary is important and certainly one challenge, more critically

perhaps is the work environment of Kensington due to several factors. A recent academic study found other reasons for becoming a police officer. Salary ranked sixth of nine categories while “to help people” and “to fight crime” ranked first and second, respectively.⁸ While Kensington is an environment that best provides motivation to those interested in ‘helping people,’ it does not provide a locale for those interested in ‘crime fighting’, as Kensington is one of the safest locales in California.

Recruitment for law enforcement professionals is becoming more difficult throughout the nation, and as such Kensington should consider adopting certain strategies to attract qualified candidates. These include, but are not limited to:

- Focus on and expediting lateral officer candidates with a marketing strategy framing Kensington’s unique service environment.
- Focus attention on hiring potential recruits who are ‘guardians of the community’ and problem solvers rather than reflecting a ‘warrior culture’.
- Bolstering the reserve officer program as soon as practical.
- Coordinating recruitment efforts with adjoining (partnering) agencies to offer potential candidates choices in service environment.
- Accelerated selection process to potentially include further privatized efforts such as backgrounding, polygraph, etc. (approximately \$1,000 to \$2,500 per candidate) that can lead to a competitive edge against ‘slower’ selection processes in competing agencies.

In sum, Kensington should adopt more strategic and comprehensive strategies for its recruitment approach.

(2) Officer Safety Issues.

According to the *Pew Research Center*, the number of fatal attacks on officers has

⁸ ...*Motivations for Becoming a Police Officer*, Kennesaw State University, March 2017, pg. 56

grown in recent years. About nine-in-ten officers (93%) say their colleagues worry about their personal safety.⁹ Moreover, according to the same study, officers are regularly worried about their personal safety. Most police officers say that they face dangers on the job.

Most of the time, Kensington police personnel are operating on their own, with reasonable back-up availability only provided by surrounding jurisdictions. Despite this mutual aid, such back-up can be several minutes away, creating a higher risk environment than agencies able to field multiple officers on a shift. Even with a reserve program, the current staff contingent of two officers is insufficient to provide regular and consistent back-up. Indeed, this program is also suffering from recruitment issues as recent reserves have become full-time staff.

In fact, in one-officer deployments there are some calls that staff are responding to that best practice suggests requires two-persons for officer safety purposes. For example, all domestic disputes are being dispatched with two officers in most law enforcement agencies throughout the nation. Domestic Violence and Disturbances account for 40% of officer deaths resulting from a call for service.¹⁰ This suggests that even in the quiet community of Kensington, real officer safety issues could exist particularly with no near immediate back-up availability.

(3) Lack of Supervision.

According to a recent publication by *George Mason University*, the *Police Foundation* and others:

⁹ *Behind the Badge*, PEW Research Center, January 2017, pg. 5

¹⁰ *Deadly Calls and Fatal Encounters*, COPS- US Department of Justice, 2015, pg. 13

Your role, as the first line supervisor, is without question the most important assignment in any law enforcement agency. If any policing strategy is going to be successful, it will likely be due, in large part, to the effectiveness of the first line supervisor. You are expected to be an effective leader, coach, mentor, and supervisor of others, being responsible for both the performance of other people and for the outcome of events. Successfully performing this role and these responsibilities may not always be easy, but the rewards can be lasting and most gratifying.¹¹

The Matrix Consulting Group has long been proponents of effective levels of first-line supervision in public safety. It is the fulcrum between the directives of upper management and the performance of field staff. As such, the availability of sergeants (or their equivalents) is extremely important in maintaining an effective police organization.

Currently, Kensington does not have adequate first-line supervision deployed. Indeed, one of two sergeant positions were vacant at the time of this report, putting the Chief in the position of performing as a first-line supervisor as opposed to department manager. On Mondays a supervisor (Chief) is available from 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. while on Tuesday through Friday some supervisor (Chief or Sergeant) is available from 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. Other hours, including all weekends, there is no supervisor deployed, though these represent the slowest days of the week with respect to calls for service.

With Kensington operating approximately two-thirds of a week without supervision, operational risks are exacerbated, as no formal decision-makers are available on-scene to address problems which first-line supervisors should provide experienced oversight. Consequently, the availability of timely first-line supervision is a core or best practice of any law enforcement agency irrespective of size.

¹¹ *Evidence-based Policing Leadership Training for First and Second Line Supervisors*, George Mason University, et. al., January 2014, pg. iii.

(4) Training Issues.

Training, particularly specialized training beyond California POST required Continuing Professional Training (CPT) and Perishable skills, is problematic. With minimal staffing, time for additional training is not readily available. In Kensington's fiscal year ending 2017 the training budget was only \$3,794 – well below the expected 1% to 2% of total police operational budget consistent with best practice in law enforcement.

While training is important for all law enforcement agencies, it is particularly important for less busy small agencies which do not have the opportunity to consistently practice their skills given the fundamental lack of calls for service. In the absence of “on the job” training opportunities, regularly scheduled on-going professional training can help close the gap to help ensure professionalism and safety.

With respect to management training, the interim Chief who has been in an acting role for a lengthy period of time, and while being considered for the permanent position should be afforded appropriate managerial training opportunities by the General Manager and Board. This training would encompass such approaches as:

- POST and supplementary training in managerial duties, responsibilities and personnel oversight approaches consisting initially of 80 hours with re-fresher training every two-years.
- Formal mentorship from a retired Chief of a small to moderate sized policing agency of approximately 120 hours over the course of six months.
- One-day team building retreat with a trained facilitator with all staff to address and resolve long-standing issues of importance. Kensington could formally request Albany PD to handle call-load during this period.

Such training is important to help ensure the success of a vital manager who has yet to be afforded such training opportunities that would help facilitate success. The costs

for the approaches described above is estimated to be \$25,000.

3 Equipment Issues

Kensington has not adopted some best practices with respect to equipment. Currently, officers are not equipped with Tasers which provide an appropriate escalation of force tool prior to lethal force usage.

Furthermore, Kensington has not adopted use of body-worn cameras which is becoming increasingly common and consistent with best-practice for transparency purposes. In a community with very high expectations and interest in police services, body-worn cameras should be adopted.

4 Leadership and Management Issues

In the absence of a full-time permanent Chief, consistent leadership and strategic and other managerial direction is not regularly apparent. For example:

- Kensington's last reported Activity Log and Monthly Report was January 2016.
- There is no strategic plan framing desired goals, objectives and policing operations.
- There is no directive formalizing the use of the significant amount of proactive time, including policies regarding community or problem-oriented policing.


Lack of leadership has resulted in the Board being too involved in the minutia of daily operations as opposed to focusing on broader issues such as community service, recruitment, retention, and broader police service initiatives.

5 Community Service Issues

It has become clear during the course of the Kensington engagement that the community has high public safety expectations. Many in the community are passionate

about its livability; this has been reflected in the various outreach efforts undertaken during this study.

While Kensington's police officers are involved in such specialized proactive activities as elderly checks, Supplemental Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) or Vacation Watch (the latter two which can be requested on the District's web) and perform other self-initiated activities as reflected in CAD records, their use of proactive time has been limited, as shown by the graphic below.



Each self-initiated activity takes approximately 12 minutes, and based on the number of activities per day based on CAD records, recorded time dedicated to such efforts reflects 49 minutes per shift. Importantly, given the high level of daily proactive time available, 81%, only a small portion of this is being used to perform recorded self-initiated activities. In fact, approximately 18.5 hours per day is transpiring in which no police activity is being recorded. This is not an appropriate use of proactive time available. It should be noted, however, that lack of field resources and potential back-up may

exacerbate issues related to effective use of proactive time, as patrol staff most often do not have timely support and are the only unit in the field to respond to calls for service. Therefore, there may be hesitancy on the part of officers to perform activities, preferring instead to “remain available for response.” Additionally, it is also very likely, especially during the nighttime hours, the number of incidents reasonably requiring police officer attention in Kensington are very low or not occurring.

Current Kensington police operations and the effective use of uncommitted or proactive time do not consistently reflect a planned approach with respect to problem-oriented policing (POP). As a result, Kensington is, for the most part, performing public safety in a service vacuum, without a coherent strategy to resolve perceived problems in the community.

To better address these community problems, Kensington should fully execute a problem-oriented policing (POP) approach designed to take full advantage of POP tools and community assistance. According to the Department of Justice’s abstract on problem-oriented policing, “(POP) is a way of thinking about policing that stresses the importance of the end product rather than the means. ***It overlaps with Community-oriented Policing in that the community is often involved in defining the problems and identifying interventions (emphasis added).***” The problem-oriented programmatic philosophy is further summarized in the following abstract by the *Department of Justice*.¹²

Problem-Oriented Policing – Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs Summary

Problem-oriented policing is a department-wide strategy aimed at solving persistent community problems. Police identify, analyze, and respond to the underlying circumstances that create incidents. The theory behind it is that underlying conditions create problems. Thus, officers use the information gathered in their responses to incidents, together with information obtained from other sources, to get

¹² Community and Problem-oriented Policing Abstract, USDOJ, October 2010, pg. 4-5.

a clearer picture of the problem. The traditional conceptual model of problem solving, known as SARA, follows these four steps:

Scan. Identify problems and prioritize them incorporating community input.

Analyze. Study information about offenders, victims, and crime locations.

Respond. Implement strategies that address the chronic character of priority problems by thinking “outside the box” of traditional police enforcement tactics and using new resources that were developed by the city to support problem-solving efforts.

Assess. Evaluate the effectiveness of the strategy through self-assessments to determine how well the plan has been carried out and what good has been accomplished.

This process provides for a fresh uninhibited search for alternative responses. Some examples of alternative solutions include:

- Target hardening (i.e., reducing opportunities)
- Changes in government services
- Provision of reliable information to residents
- Specialized training for police officers
- Use of community resources
- Increased regulation
- Changes in city ordinances or zoning

In summary, the process represents a new way of looking at the police function. It is a way of thinking about policing that stresses the importance of the end product rather than the means. ***It overlaps with Community-oriented Policing in that the community is often involved in defining the problems and identifying interventions.***

POP efforts needs to focus more on the process of targeting problems in the community and making assigned staff accountable for results as discussed in the abstract above. It ideally involves the Kensington community in becoming part of the solution by helping identify problems of local interest. The community needs to be brought into the planning, identification and problem-solving aspects of this process. Their involvement in a strategic planning or other process is essential. Proactive efforts should be widely publicized on the Kensington District’s website to keep the involved citizenry informed.

6 Summary of Service Delivery Issues

The following bullets provide a summary of key law enforcement issues experienced by the Kensington community.

- Current and authorized field staffing levels are not consistent with best-practices,

as operating solo as well as without regular direct supervision carries risk.

- Lack of supervision is a significant issue and also not a best practice.
- Minimal staffing also exacerbates the ability to conduct supporting functions well, including training, records keeping, internal affairs, criminal investigations, etc.
- Recruitment and retention will remain a challenge in Kensington due to several factors that include compensation and an operational environment that is not considered “challenging” to many potential recruits and laterals.
- Proactive time is at a high level in Kensington, even at existing staffing levels, to perform considerable self-initiated activity and have rapid response times. However, this capacity is not well utilized.
- Access to and use of better equipment should be considered a priority.
- Leadership, management and oversight issues exist in which the interim Police Chief, part time General Manager and Board are unable to focus on their respective strategic, managerial, oversight and policy roles, instead focusing on details associated with day-to-day operations.

These service issues should be resolved consistent with best practices for a small policing agency. These practices, or future service delivery standards, are developed in the following chapter and can be used to establish a framework of operation for either an in-house or contract-for-service police agency.

4. Standards for Small Agency Police Service Delivery

There is a wealth of literature in public safety regarding how to operate a law enforcement agency with much information dedicated specifically to operations of a small police department. Throughout our professional history we have specifically devised dozens of best-practices in law enforcement applicable to large and small agencies. We continue to expand our best practice efforts as we discover new methods for conducting business and other law enforcement professionals' research efforts expand. As the policing landscape changes, so must the way law enforcement must be approached. To that end, the following standards for Kensington police service delivery are provided.

1 Framing Standards of Service Delivery

Over the last several decades the Matrix Consulting Group has developed a strategic approach to evaluating law enforcement agencies effectiveness in providing high quality service to their communities. Some of these best practices and evaluation points include effective recruiting and hiring practices, quality leadership, training, appropriate field supervision, transparency, accountability, connection with the community and an effective disciplinary system. Some of these key components of effective policing were also published in the 'President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing' in May 2015. There are six principles that were defined in this strategic document:

- Building Trust and Legitimacy
- Policy and Oversight
- Community Policing and Crime Reduction

- Training and Education
- Technology and Social Media
- Officer Safety and Wellness

Where practical and where these “six pillars” fit well with the project team’s best practice approaches, we will juxtapose such goals against the noted practice.

(1) Best Practices in Staffing.

The following matrices provide best practice staffing standards for Kensington law enforcement service delivery.

Matrix Best Practice Standard	Kensington Change(s) Required	21 st Century Pillars
For officer safety, ensure minimum staffing level of two (2) patrol personnel on each shift.	Will require increased staffing contingent and use of overtime.	Officer Safety and Wellness
Field units operate with an appropriate mix of supervisory and line positions.	Field supervision is critical. This will require hiring/promotion of corporals and/or sergeants resulting in a 1:1 supervision to staff ratio. This ratio is unavoidable in an independently operated small policing agency.	Policy and Oversight
First-line supervisors are consistently in the field to provide direct oversight and mentorship of line personnel.	In Kensington these staff would spend much of their time in the field operating as a supervisor, back-up patrol unit, and primary responder, when needed.	Policy and Oversight
Supervisors (Sergeants) routinely respond to calls for service to assist and also evaluate field performance and work of Officers.	Again, supervisors need to spend much of their time in the field operating as a supervisor, back-up patrol unit, and primary responder, when needed.	Building Trust and Legitimacy

Matrix Best Practice Standard	Kensington Change(s) Required	21 st Century Pillars
Patrol Officers conduct thorough investigations of the calls and incidents they are assigned and write thorough reports to allow investigative follow-up of the reported crimes.	In a small agency with sufficient proactive time, officers and supervisors conduct investigative efforts without support of dedicated detectives. Preliminary investigative efforts would be performed by officers with sergeants performing more comprehensive detective efforts where warranted.	Community Policing and Crime Reduction
Recruitment is performed continuously, and attracts candidates matching the profile of a desirable community-oriented officer for the Kensington citizenry.	To best effectuate this, targeted recruitment should be performed on contract with a larger police agency which as the capacity to focus on such dedicated efforts.	Training and Education
Recruitment offers attractive incentives in order to get the best candidates in a competitive field.	Given “lack of challenge” in Kensington vis-à-vis crime-fighting, other incentives must be provided such as very competitive salary and/or signing bonuses.	Training and Education
Retention is encouraged to avoid unnecessary turnover and maintain consistency in operations.	Continuation of existing practices that encourage tenure (increased vacation, longevity pay, etc.) should be embraced.	Training and Education
Transparency is fostered through policy, training, supervision and reporting.	In Kensington, the ability to function as a holistic department is compromised by the lack of staff and by the inability of a chief to function above the operational level.	Building Trust and Legitimacy

These best practice standards in staffing should be strongly considered in order to ensure the most effective, efficient and safe police service delivery in Kensington.

(2) Best Practices in Operations.

The following matrices provide best practice operational standards for Kensington law enforcement service delivery.

Matrix Best Practice Standard	Kensington Change(s) Required	21 st Century Pillars
Proactive patrol time is in the range of 40% to 50% after subtracting time handling calls for service and administrative tasks.	Kensington has significantly more proactive time now than these benchmarks and will have expanded proactive time at necessary staffing levels.	Community Policing and Crime Reduction
Officers' use of proactive time is directed based on, intelligence-led policing initiatives, problem-oriented policing plans, or other formal work direction.	Currently these efforts are not accomplished with any consistency and strategic approaches involving community input must be undertaken to devise appropriate problem-oriented and community-oriented policing approaches.	Community Policing and Crime Reduction
Officers are consistently held accountable for the use of proactive time on their beats and in their shifts.	This requires appropriate levels of supervision and leadership from the Chief.	Policy and Oversight
High levels of professional training are funded and provided on a consistent basis.	Appropriate perishable skills, continuing education and advanced education is necessary to properly train and facilitate retention of staff. This should include 40 hours of training per year/staff.	Training and Education
Officers have the tools they need to be effective in the delivery of public safety services.	Kensington lacks many of the tools which are commonplace today in law enforcement (e.g., less than lethal force, body worn cameras, as well as effective information systems).	Officer Safety and Wellness Building Trust and Legitimacy
The organization has developed a strategic approach to problem and community-oriented policing through appropriate partnerships with the community.	There is presently no strategic approach to problem-oriented policing or community-oriented policing in Kensington. This will require an investment in time to devise a strategic use of policing resources in Kensington in large part driven by community expectation to include citizens, school, business representatives and other stakeholders.	Community Policing and Crime Reduction

Matrix Best Practice Standard	Kensington Change(s) Required	21 st Century Pillars
Strategies are directly linked to performance objectives and outcomes and these are reported upon regularly.	There is no formal performance management program in Kensington or reporting of key performance indicators or performance measures to the Board. This should be resolved so the Board can be transparently informed on exceptional performance and emerging problems.	Community Policing and Crime Reduction
Clear lines of authority and responsibility are designed to facilitate management, communication, and accountability.	Better differentiation needs to occur among the roles of the Chief, General Manager, and Board members. This would, in part, be facilitated by addressing the interim status of police leadership.	Policy and oversight
Leadership knowledge, skills and abilities are expected of all staff, particularly at supervisor and management levels.	Leadership has been lacking with a master sergeant who has not received adequate training to be a chief of police; the lack of a full-time District general manager also impacts service oversight and the roles of the Board. Appropriate training and a chief who is functioning more as a chief more of the time.	Policy and oversight

These best practice standards in operations should be strongly considered in order to ensure the most effective, efficient and safe police service delivery in Kensington. Within the scope of work for this study, these targets for effective policing should be applied both to improve in house operations or to consider alternative service delivery systems.

5. Recommendations for Improving Kensington's Police Services

There are several recommendations that result from the analysis of the police services environment in Kensington. As described through this report, these fall into staffing related areas and operational areas of service. These recommendations are provided in the following sections.

1 Staffing Recommendations

The following staff-related recommendations are designed to address the various issues noted throughout this report. The recommendations change the organizational profile, eliminating the detective position, but retaining a total of 11 staff positions. Staffing is predicated on deploying all staff, excluding the Chief and Police Services Specialist, on a team-based 12-hour shift schedule.

Recommendation: Develop an organizational structure consisting of one (1) chief, four (4) sergeants, one (1) corporal, (4) four officers and one (1) police services specialist for a total of 11 staff positions. This staffing complement results in two on duty, with one being a supervisor.

Recommendation: The corporal position, providing line support and back-up supervision to sergeants, should be rotated for coverage purposes and receive compensatory pay when rotated off their baseline "Day Shift" assignment.

Recommendation: Deploy all sergeants and officers/corporal on the team-based 12-hour shift schedule.

Recommendation: Eliminate the detective position and assign all investigative efforts to the patrol sergeants and officers.

Recommendation: Fill the vacant reserve position. The Chief should attempt to double the size of the reserve program to four (4) officers while retaining the minimum 20 hours of service per month.

Recommendation: The Chief should develop a Volunteers program for local seniors

wishing to support the Kensington community through Vacation Watch, administrative support, and other related efforts.

2 Operational-Related Recommendations

Similar to the above, the following recommendations are designed to address the various operational issues noted. Most are self-explanatory with the exception of a reference document—*IACP's Building Police-Community Partnerships in Small Towns*—which can be reviewed online with other relevant publications for small police department.¹³

The following recommendations are made with respect to continued operations of an in-house Kensington police operation.

Recommendation: Explore supporting contract services with another police department for Records, Property and Evidence, Internal Affairs investigations, and Recruitment (excluding background) services.

Recommendation: Ensure all sworn personnel obtain, at minimum, 24-hours every two years of Continuing Professional Training (CPT) and 12-hours of Perishable Skills training for a total of 36-hours every two years. Endeavor to provide voluntary training of an additional 22-hours per sworn per year for career/skill/leadership enhancement, resulting in an average of 40-hours annually for in-service training.

Recommendation: Over the next year, provide the Chief with management training and mentorship.

Recommendation: Strongly consider adopting use of Tasers and Body-worn cameras consistent with best practices.

Recommendation: Explore with Albany PD the average 6.08-minute dispatch 'queue' time, impacting overall response time, and endeavor to cut this queue time by 50% over the next year.

Recommendation: Devise more comprehensive recruitment strategies to expedite new officer hires.

¹³ <http://www.theiacp.org/BigIdeas>

Recommendation: The Police Chief, in concert with the General Manager and the Board, should develop a Kensington Policing Strategic Plan consistent with the approach detailed in the *IACP Building Police-Community Partnerships in Small Towns*.

Recommendation: The Strategic Plan should contain, at minimum, 1) community and internal survey; 2) community planning retreat, and 3) design and development of the Strategic Plan.

Recommendation: As part of the strategic planning effort, devise a specific Community-oriented Action Plan developed to identify services, programs and related community-focused efforts to conduct during proactive policing activities.

Recommendation: As part of the Community-oriented Action Plan effort, develop a performance management program with relevant output and outcome measures designed to report upon key metrics important to the Kensington community.

Recommendation: Metrics that should be considered include: 1) response time; 2) formal complaint and accolade tracking; 3) annual training hours obtained; 4) neighborhood watch meetings conducted; 5) non-injury, injury and fatal traffic accidents; 6) traffic and parking citations and traffic warnings completed; 7) business and home security checks performed; 8) sergeant follow-up contacts made on officer performance; 9) special events supported; and 10) case clearance rate.

Recommendation: Relevant performance metrics should be updated quarterly and reported on the Kensington website similar to the 'old' Activity Log and Monthly Report.

3 Summary

The estimated cost for implementing these recommendations, to include staffing and operational changes, is approximately \$1.25 million annually.

Many management and operational recommendations are made in this report to improve Kensington's standards of police service delivery with an in-house police operation. This operational and cost analysis would ultimately be compared to those of contracting in the feasibility phase of the project.

Attachment A – Profile of Kensington’s Police Services

1. Introduction

This document provides a description or “profile” of the organization of the Police Services provided by the Kensington Police Protection and Community Services District, referred to internally as the Kensington Police Department (KPD). This document outlines the major tasks and responsibilities of the various work groups within the Department. This profile is descriptive only, while some particularly relevant data is provided, it does not contain detailed analysis or recommendations (these will be provided in the draft and final report).

Data contained in the profile were developed based on the work conducted by the project team to date, including:

- Interviews with district staff in the Police Department.
- Collection of various data describing organization and staffing patterns, workloads and service levels, etc. Our data collection efforts continue.
- Review of various documents and reports which the KPD has forwarded to the project team.

This descriptive profile does not attempt to recapitulate all organizational and operational facets of the Police Department. For example, duties and responsibilities and tasks performed are not at the job description level. Rather, the profile reflects a summary of our understanding of the organization, which is foundational for issues identification and analysis as part of the study. The structure of this descriptive profile is as follows:

- Generalized services provided for key KPD functional areas.

- Authorized staffing levels by functional area, along with current staffing levels.
- Functional organizational charts, where appropriate, showing organizational structure.



This profile will be reviewed for accuracy and completeness by KPD staff. Once finalized, it will serve as a factual basis for the project team's understanding of the KPD organization, staffing, and operations.

2. The Kensington Police Protection and Community Services District

Kensington Police Protection and Community Services District (KPPCSD) is a unincorporated community of approximately 5,364 full time residents located covering one square mile in the East Bay north of Berkeley, in Contra Costa County California. As an unincorporated area, Kensington is relatively unique in that it has local jurisdiction over its police, parks and sanitation services through the establishment of two Community Service Districts (CSDs) as allowed by California law. In 1953 the citizens of Kensington dissolved the original Police Protection District established in the mid-1940s, in favor of the current District (KPPCSD), which provides police, parks, and sanitation services to the community. Fire services are overseen by the Kensington Fire District, with services being provided under contract by the neighboring city of El Cerrito. The District is governed by a five (5) member board of Directors that is elected by the community, in accordance with the State law.

Kensington has a very low crime rate, with very few violent crimes being committed. The following table illustrates Part I crimes as reported from years 2011 to 2015, as reported annually to the FBI in their Uniform Crime Report.

Kensington Part I Crime Trends

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	
Violent Crime	3	4	5	2	1	
Criminal Homicide	1	1	0	0	0	
Rape	0	0	0	0	0	
Robbery	1	3	0	0	0	
Aggravated Assault	1	0	5	1	1	
Property crime	93	85	85	46	86	
Burglary	28	30	36	16	21	
Larceny-Theft	51	45	35	25	52	
Motor Vehicle Theft	14	10	14	5	13	
Arson	-	-	-	-	-	
Part I Crimes Per 1,000	16.3					
5YR Violent Crime						▼ -67%
5YR Property Crime						▼ -8%

As the table shows overall Kensington is a very safe community with both violent and property crime rates trending downward.

The following sections of this profile explore Kensington Police service’s budget, staffing and organizational structure, and staff roles and responsibilities.

2. Budget

The following tables show the Districts' police related revenues and expense budgets for the last three fiscal years as provided to the project team. (Note Parks and Sanitation related revenues and expenditures are not included, as they are not a part of this study.)

1. Revenues

The following table outlines the projected and estimated revenues as from fiscal years 2016 through 2018.

Police Service Revenues			
Ordinary Income/Expense	Est. Actual¹⁴ 2015/2016	Est. Actual 2016/2017	Projected 2017/2018
400 · Police Activities Revenue			
401 · Levy Tax	\$1,573,495.81	\$1,685,128.58	\$1,752,000.00
402 · Special Tax-Police	\$681,690.00	\$681,630.00	\$680,000.00
403 · Misc. Tax-Police	\$69.50	\$70.88	\$0.00
404 · Measure G Supplemental Tax Rev	\$514,175.88	\$527,989.12	\$547,995.00
409 · Asset seizure forfeit/WEST NET	\$18,525.71	\$143,777.00	\$0.00
410 · Police Fees/Service Charges	\$3,370.00	\$3,368.90	\$1,500.00
411 · Kensington Hilltop Srvcs Reimb	\$28,475.00	\$19,468.00	\$20,051.00
412 · Special Assignment Revenue	\$12,237.19	\$0.00	\$0.00
413 · Crossing Guard Reimbursement	\$10,515.00	\$7,434.00	\$11,623.00
414 · POST Reimbursement	\$5,761.84	\$1,053.59	\$0.00
415 · Grants-Police	\$100,000.00	\$119,534.65	\$0.00
416 · Interest-Police	\$4,421.52	\$7,633.29	\$2,500.00
418 · Misc. Police Income	\$11,772.73	\$17,640.05	\$11,500.00
419 · Supplemental W/C Reimb (4850)	\$29,345.06	\$94,252.49	\$11,033.00
Total Police Related Revenue	\$2,993,864.24	\$3,308,980.55	\$3,038,202.00

As the table shows FY2018 projected revenues represent an overall increase of 1%, however, it should be noted that estimated actual police revenues from the two prior

¹⁴ Prior year revenue figures are considered “estimated actuals” by the KPPCSD until audited.

years exceeded projections by 5.7% and 0.01% respectively. Also of note, Measure G, Supplemental Police Tax Revenue, comprises about 18% of total revenue for Police Services.

2. Expenses

The following table shows the Districts police-related expense budget classification categories from FY 2016 through present, as well as the three-year overall change in expenditures.

Police Service Expenditures

Classification	2015/2016 ¹⁵ Est. Actual	2016/2017 Est. Actual	2017/2018 Budget	3 Year Change
Police Salaries & Benefits	\$2,044,405.13	\$2,167,006.88	\$2,166,057.39	+\$121,652.26
Police Expenses	\$250,700.02	\$246,213.30	\$412,811.28	+\$162,111.26
Police Building Lease	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$35,468.00	+\$35,467.00
Operating Expense Total	\$2,295,106.15	\$2,413,212.18	\$2,614,336.67	+\$319,230.52
Capital Outlay – Police Related	\$44,823.31	\$30,532.28	\$4,000.00	-\$40,823.31
Budget Grand Total	\$2,339,929.46	\$2,443,753.46	\$2,618,336.67	+\$278,407.21


As the table illustrates, overall police related expenditures have increased by approximately \$278,400, with the largest portion of that increase being found in non-salary related expenses. Budgeted salary costs increase by 6% over the three-year period, though are essentially flat between FY2017 and FY2018.

¹⁵ Prior year expense figures are considered “estimated actuals” by the KPPCSD until audited.

3. Organizational Structure

The following is an organizational chart of Kensington Police services by major function.

Kensington Police Services Organizational Chart



4. Deployment and Staffing

The Kensington Police services are responsible for providing general law enforcement services and investigative functions within the District. Traditionally the Department has consisted of ten (10) sworn Officers, which included the Chief of Police / General Manager and one (1) Police Services Specialist. Recently the roles of the Chief of Police and General Manager have been separated into two distinct positions, and the total number of sworn police department personnel was reduced by one to nine (9).

The following sections describe the roles and major tasks for the various positions within Kensington's Police Services.

1. Management and Administration

Administration provides overall direction, guidance and leadership for Police services. The Chief has responsibility for every area of the organization and ensures that all employees perform their jobs in accordance with the overall mission of Police services and in accordance to the established values. Management and administration is comprised of the Chief, one (1) Master Sergeant, one (1) Police Service Specialist.

Note that the total number of sworn positions shown in the following tables indicate a total of ten (10) available job *classifications*, however as noted earlier the total number of authorized sworn Police Service positions has been reduced to nine (9).

The following table provides the personnel and major tasks of staff for functions under Administration.

Unit/Division	Curr	Auth	Position	Unit Description
Chief's Office	1	1	Chief	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides the overall leadership, management, and administration of the Department. • Provides direct Supervision of the Patrol Sergeants. • Reviews and approves policies and procedures, goals and objectives. • Performs routine administrative functions in the day to day management of the Department, including shift scheduling and overtime approval. • Attends community meetings and events on behalf of the Department and District. • The Chief of Police primarily works week days beginning at 10:00am.
	0	1	Master Sergeant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Master Sergeant reports to the Chief of Police, and provides mid-level management of Department operations and personnel. • Directly supervises the patrol Sergeants, and Police Aide, assisting with special projects and conducting investigations as needed.
	1	1	Police Service Specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports to the Chief of Police. • Provides numerous support functions for the Department including: property and evidence management, and records processing. • Acts as the Training Coordinator, scheduling and tracking training hours for Department personnel and ensuring compliance with California POST requirements. • Also produces various reports from CAD and UCR data as requested by the Chief.

2. Operations

Traditionally Patrol Operations are subdivided into two patrol squads or “Teams”, Team 1 and Team 2, which are responsible for providing patrol services and investigative functions throughout the District. Each Patrol Team is supervised by a Sergeant, with Team 1 consisting of two (2) Officers and one (1) Detective, and Team 2 consisting of three (3) Officers. However, due to recent staffing shortages the actual deployment of personnel has been modified. Kensington uses the Reserve Officer program to accelerate the recruitment, and training process for the filling of vacancies, and currently has two (2) Reserve Officers who are assigned to work with a full-time Officer for a minimum of 20-hours per month.

The following table provides current filled and authorized staffing positions for the Operations. It is important to note that current, or actual position totals include those that are temporarily reassigned, on light duty, working out of class, or on administrative leave. Authorized staffing levels include all positions that are currently funded, and are either vacant or currently filled.

Unit/Division	Curr	Auth	Position	Unit Description
Operations	1	2	Sergeant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sergeants report to the Chief of Police. • Sergeants function as first-line supervisors, and are responsible for providing direction and prioritization for the use of proactive time in the field. • Sergeants review reports and assist the Detective with more involved investigations.
	1	1	Detective/Corporal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Detective reports to the Team 1 Sergeant. • The Detective conducts more detailed investigations of crimes, especially those that are more time intensive.

Unit/Division	Curr	Auth	Position	Unit Description
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Detective also reviews all other case reports, checking for solvability elements, and providing necessary feedback regarding investigative efforts by Officers. • The Detective position is currently splitting time between patrol and investigations.
	5	5	Patrol Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patrol Officers and Sergeants respond to emergency incidents and other calls for service, completing investigations and reports as needed. • Patrol Officers report to their assigned Sergeant, and work varying shifts providing 24-hour coverage of the District. • Officers and sergeants work voluntary and mandatory overtime as needed to meet minimum staffing levels. • Patrol Officers and Sergeants work a rotating 12-hour shift schedule consisting of 3-on, 3-off, 4-on, and 4-off. • Reserve Officers ride with their assigned full-time Officers, and work a minimum of 20-hours per month. • A fifth officer position was recently hired and coming off of FTO training at the time of this report.
	2	NA	Reserve Officer	

3. Shift Schedule

Patrol Officers follow a rotating 12-hour shift schedule consisting of 3-on, 3-off, 4-on, and 4-off pattern, with staff working opposite sides of the week to provide 24/7 shift coverage in the District. Every other Wednesday the Officers work an 8-hour shift, keeping the annual work hours to a typical 2,080. Officers are typically assigned to one of the two patrol Teams, reporting to their Team Sergeant, however at the time of the project teams visit all Officers reported to the one remaining Sergeant. The Patrol

Sergeant works a 4/10 shift schedule, with Saturday through Sundays off. The Detectives position typically works a 4/10 schedule and is staffed with a Corporal rank, however at the present time this position is working patrol shifts, while also performing investigative duties.

The following table provides an illustration of how the current shift schedule operates over a two-week period:

Illustration of the Patrol Shift Schedule

Team	Officer	Start	End	Week 1							Week 2								
				S	M	T	W	Th	F	Sa	S	M	T	W	Th	F	Sa		
1	Chief	1000	1800	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
	Sergeant -Vacant	1000	2000	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
	Detective	0800	1800	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
	Officer 1	1800	0600	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
2	Officer 2	1800	0600	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
	Sergeant	1200	2200	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
	Officer 3	0600	1800	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
	Officer 4	0600	1800	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
	Officer 5	1800	0600	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■

As the table above illustrates there are currently two (2) vacant positions. Note that the table representing the schedule above does not include the currently vacant Master Sergeants role.

4. Geographic Deployment

Kensington does not utilize formal patrol beats or zones, however when staffing allows for two Officers to be on shift at the same time the District is typically divided in half, with one Officer handling the East (upper) half of District, and the other covering the West (lower) half.

Attachment B – Results of the Community Questionnaire on Police Services

PURPOSE OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Matrix Consulting Group was retained to evaluate Police Services issues and alternatives in the Kensington Police Protection and Community Services District. As part of the study, anonymous electronic questionnaires were distributed to gather input from community members. The community questionnaire was publicized through announcements at KPPCSD Board meetings, on the District website, the NextDoor social media platform, and in the community newsletter, The Outlook. To further promote the questionnaire, the project team, in conjunction with the , sent postcards to every residence to make residents aware of it.


This report presents an analysis of key findings from the community questionnaire, organized by subject area. The analysis focuses on presenting key findings that assess community impressions, thoughts, and opinions of Kensington’s current Police Services.

There were 616 responses from the community. Given the size of Kensington the project team considers this to be a very high rate of return.

FINDINGS – RESPONDER CHARACTERISTICS

About the Community. Of the 616 community members that completed the questionnaire, 98% live in Kensington. Overall, 10% of respondents have lived in Kensington for fewer than 5 years but 90% have lived Kensington for more than 20 years. The table below shows the distribution of years of residence.

Number of Years Lived in Kensington




At 70%, most households that responded have two adults – 15% of respondents are in households with one adult and 10% have three adults. At 67%, most households that responded have no children.

FINDINGS – INTERACTIONS WITH KENSINGTON’S POLICE SERVICES

Interactions with Police Services. Over the last two years, 76% respondents have had contact with a Kensington Police Officer. Of those respondents who have had contact with Kensington Police, respondents cited Response to a Service Request as the most frequent type of contact, followed by a Community Meeting.

*Most Frequent Contact:
Response to
Service Request*



As shown in the chart above, the questionnaire allowed respondents to choose "Other" and provide a customized reason for contact with Kensington Police. Of the "Other" types of contacts, respondents stated the most frequent type of contact was also some kind of request for service.


Most respondents (86%) agree or strongly agree that police officers were professional in their interactions. This rating aligns with the open-ended responses collected in the survey's final question. While some respondents reported negative experiences with police officers, open-ended responses frequently complimented police on their service, their courteous and personal demeanor, and the value they add to the Kensington community.

Significance of Police Issues. The questionnaire asked respondents to rate the significance of issues related to policing. Respondents were asked to rate significance on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the least significant and 5 being the most significant.


***Most Significant Policing Issue:
Property Crimes***

Property Crimes were rated as the most significant issue with 84% of respondents rating its significant as 4 or 5.


Significance of Property Crimes




Traffic Enforcement was the second most significant issue for police with 55% of respondents rating the issues as 4 or 5.



Of the respondents who rated the significance of drug-related offenses issues, 46% rated these with low significance (rated 1 or 2) and 32% rated it as high (4 or 5).



Of the respondents who rated the significance of Quality of Life issues, such as noise dogs barking, 44% rated it with low significance (rated 1 or 2) and 37% rated it as high (4 or 5). At 32%, fewer respondents rated drug-related issues as important.



Only 31% percent of respondents rated “Other” as a significant issue.

Policing Issue Themes:
Neighborhood Safety and Police Visibility

Community issues included community policing, outreach, visibility, and care. Issues related to police included the value of a local, visible police force. However, some narrative comments identified cost and infrequent visibility as an issue. Safety issues included school, neighborhood, and emergencies.

FINDINGS – CURRENT POLICE SERVICES

Ratings of Current Police Services. The overwhelming majority of respondents feel safe in their neighborhood (98%). Most respondents agree that the Kensington Police Services are responsive to the law enforcement needs of the community (79%).

The majority agree that police services are highly regarded (65%) and that they have a positive view of police services (71%). However, about a quarter of respondents disagree with both of these statements indicating discontentment with the reputation and experience of police services.

There was also widespread opinions relating to whether Police Services proactively works with residents to address public safety issues – about a quarter of respondents disagree, while most agree that they do.

Respondents are also split on the frequency of police visibility – 56% agree that visibility is frequent, but 41% disagree.

The table, below, shows the distribution of all responses to these service questions. As the preceding summary has shown, even though there are divergences in some opinions, overwhelmingly these results are positive.

Current Police Services Ratings

	SA ¹⁶	A	D	SD
I feel safe walking in my neighborhood.	74%	24%	1%	1%
Police services are highly regarded in the community.	35%	30%	18%	10%
I have a positive view of the police services in Kensington.	40%	31%	15%	9%
The Kensington Police Department is responsive to the law enforcement needs of the community.	41%	38%	8%	5%
I frequently see police patrol vehicles in my neighborhood.	20%	36%	25%	16%
The Kensington Police Department proactively works with residents to address public safety issues (community policing).	25%	31%	15%	8%

PRINCIPAL INSIGHTS

Police interactions are positive. Most respondents indicated their interactions with police were positive. Respondents cite courteous and professional contacts and helpful service.

Some issues were raised. Although respondents generally have good impressions of police services, some respondents indicated they had negative experiences with police

¹⁶ SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree.

and / or were troubled by the negative news reports regarding police activities and management.

More visibility. Many respondents indicated that they do not frequently see police units and that they would like to see more units as a deterrent to crime and traffic concerns.

More traffic patrol. Related to increasing police visibility is increasing traffic enforcement. Respondents noted that they would be open to solutions to eliminate traffic concerns such as traffic calming measures.

Service Alternatives. Although the purpose of this questionnaire was to obtain feedback on current services many respondents took the opportunity to provide their views on service alternatives. Most respondents indicated that more information needs to be provided to residents regarding the impacts of outsourcing police services.