



Police Services Analysis – Phase 1 Draft Report

***Kensington Police Protection and Community
Services District, California***

matrix 
consulting group

Phase 1 Goals

- ◆ There are three basic goals of the Phase 1 study:
 - To develop an understanding of the unique values and needs of the Kensington residents from their police service.
 - To perform a management and operational assessment of the existing police services.
 - To develop service delivery standards that best meet Kensington's policing needs, regardless of the service provider.

Phase 1 Scope of Work

- ◆ The Phase 1 Scope of Work included:
 - Perform an independent and fact-based approach to analyze the District's police workloads and service levels.
 - Engage the community to help determine service delivery expectations (e.g. two 'Town Hall' meetings and online questionnaire).
 - Evaluate current police services and management and, consistent with best practices, determine staffing and operational approaches that can enhance service delivery.
 - Development of a draft (then final) Phase 1 Report.

Public Input Supported the Scope

- ◆ Results from the Town Halls, questionnaire and direct input guided our analysis of current police services and resulted in the following priorities for an in-house police operation:
 - Adequate staffing.
 - Improved traffic enforcement.
 - Improved training for officers.
 - Maintaining a high quality, professional police force.
 - Rapid response times.
 - Concerns were expressed about several issues in the community:
 - * Property crimes were most often mentioned.
 - * Other issues included traffic, drugs, school safety and 'quality of life' issues.

Service Environment Profile

- ◆ Major crime is very low – and down over the last five years.

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Violent Crime	4	5	2	1	3
Criminal Homicide	1	0	0	0	0
Rape	0	0	1	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%

- ◆ Kensington is a safe community as defined by crime levels – it is within the top 7% of safe communities in California.

Key Results of Phase 1 – Strengths

- ◆ Community questionnaire results are supportive of the facts about neighborhood safety:
 - The community feels safe – almost all (98%) respondents stated this.
 - 85% of questionnaire respondents rated their contacts with Kensington’s police as positive.
 - 78% defined police services as responsive to their needs.
- ◆ Response times are reasonable for a community with this topography and call composition (mostly low priority calls) – averaging approximately 14 minutes.
- ◆ Kensington has high overall proactive time available – averaging 81% overall. Proactivity is the key to effective community policing.

Proactive Abilities

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%

Key Results of the Phase 1 – Issues

- ◆ Kensington suffers from chronic shortages of staffing:
 - Currently at 7 of 9 authorized positions. Last full staffing was in 2015.
 - Most hours per week have only 1 officer deployed, often with no direct supervision. This has improved somewhat recently with the Chief now working one day on the weekend.
- ◆ Kensington police officers should improve their use of proactive time to be more involved in traffic enforcement, school safety, etc.
 - CAD data indicated approximately 4 proactive activities performed daily
 - Recent efforts have seen improvements in the use of this time
- ◆ Training and equipment are not at levels for an effective department.
- ◆ The 6-minute response ‘queue’ time at APD can be improved.
- ◆ Compensation is significantly lower than neighboring agencies.

Phase 1 Conclusions and Recommendations (1)

- ◆ The District needs 2 sworn staff on duty at all times – with one being a supervisor. This requires:
 - A Chief, 4 sergeants and a corporal (who can also function as a supervisor).
 - 4 police officers.
- ◆ Increase the size of the reserve program to 4 officers.
- ◆ Develop a volunteer program to assist with administration and problem identification.
- ◆ Improve training, providing 40-hours per year per sworn staff.
- ◆ Adopt best-practice approaches to equipping officers, including tasers and body-worn cameras.

Phase 1 Conclusions and Recommendations (2)

- ◆ Provide the Chief with dedicated management training and mentorship.
- ◆ Improve administrative support for police services – a full time administrative assistant needs to be retained.
- ◆ The Chief, General Manager, Board and the community should develop a strategic plan for police operations to include:
 - Devising approaches to improve recruitment and enhance retention (e.g., competitive compensation; small town policing marketing.).
 - Identify community-focused efforts to be used during proactive policing time.
 - Formalize roles for police services oversight for the Board, General Manager and Chief.
 - Develop key performance metrics to be reported upon regularly.

Phase 1 Costs

- ◆ Estimated additional costs for Phase 1 recommendations vary depending on strategic choices made by the Board:
 - \$1.025 million in additional annual costs if also offering more competitive compensation.
 - \$692,000 if implementing all recommendations with no salary changes.

Cost Categories	Annual Cost	Notes
Salary and Benefits	\$531,961	Additional recommended staff
Police Equipment	\$37,558	Leased tasers and body cameras
Enhanced Training	\$79,158	At benchmark levels, incl. management
Reserves	\$19,350	Increased reserve program
Additional Vehicle O&M	\$24,167	For additional staff
Total	\$692,194	
Increased Compensation	\$1,025,280	

Questions

