

Vision 2005:
Contract Policing in Carver County
Project Recommendations

Prepared by:

Sheriff's Contract Committee (SCC)

City of Carver
City of Chanhassen
City of Cologne
City of Hamburg
Township of Laketown
City of Mayer
City of New Germany
City of Norwood Young America
City of Victoria
City of Waconia
City of Watertown
County of Carver

Table of Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Contract Policing History
 - a. The Past
 - b. The Present
- III. Recommendation 1 – Defining County Wide Services (Base Level)
 - a. Duties of the County, the Cities, the Townships
 - b. County Wide Law Enforcement Services
 - c. Overlapping Services
- IV. Recommendation 2 – Defining Contract Services
 - a. Contract Police Services
- V. Recommendation 3 – Recovering the Contracting Costs
 - a. Paying for Public Safety Services
 - b. The Formula
- VI. Recommendation 4 – Providing Full Service Policing
 - a. Identifying the Services
 - b. Menu of Services
- VII. Recommendation 5 – City of Chaska Settlement
 - a. Resolution of the Court Injunction
- VIII. 2005 – The Future of Law Enforcement Contracting
 - a. Best Practices in Community Policing
 - i. “Having a Say” - Local Control & Identity
 - ii. Defining Local Policing Models
 - iii. Community Work Plans
- IX. Appendixes

I. Introduction

The Office of Sheriff was established in Carver County in 1855. To say the Office is unique in comparison to other Sheriff's Offices is to recognize the dreams of our past Sheriffs' and local government leaders. Countywide leadership in creating our contract policing model is one of the most unique features of our mission. Today, our challenge is to sustain these services, in times of great county growth and stronger demands of accountability for governmental spending. If the Sheriff's Office chooses to be a service provider the contracting model must be reviewed and enhanced or risk the experiences of other Sheriffs', that being the loss of providing policing services to local communities.

This project is really a study of 38 years of evolution. It was designed to review our current contracting model, to evaluate its effectiveness in meeting local concerns of the contract communities, and make recommendations for improving and/or enhancing the contract police model.

This model of policing has had studies done, court challenges initiated and public criticism voiced over what services the Sheriff must provide and those that are contractual in nature. The current project has worked hard to answer some of the most difficult questions of all; what are county wide/base level police services and what are contract level police services?

In an effort to answer these questions, the county and sheriff contracted with outside consultants, met with county, township, city officials and office employees, past and present, to define what services the Sheriff provides. The examination and recommendations that follow are the culmination of 11 months of diligent work and laborious struggle by the members of the Sheriff's Contracting Community (SCC) in an attempt to define something that has no quick reference or historical guide. These recommendations outline the process and create a vision for contract law enforcement services in the year 2005 and beyond.

By no means does this examination represent a complete guide to understanding how best to police a county, city or township. The dream of a Sheriff 38 years ago was to offer an alternative to cities and townships in providing public safety services. The goals were to be cost efficient and effective in providing these services. Today, these goals are still our vision, understanding the need to be accountable to the people who fund local government, our taxpayers.

II. History of Contract Policing

The Past

Since 1966 the Sheriff's Office has provided contract policing to our communities and townships in the county. By 1969, 11 cities (Norwood Young America were two separate cities at the time) and 11 townships were contracting for some level of policing. Why did they do this? It was to meet the cities statutory obligations, and to improve the patrol services of the Sheriff in the townships of the county. Through this model the sheriff provided hourly patrol response services to cover the local needs of the community and improve the coverage in the townships.

In 1972 Sheriff Melchert and the County Board consulted with Springsted Incorporated, Municipal Consultants to conduct "an evaluation of law enforcement in Carver County." From this study came the recommendation of a "single department" concept of offering law enforcement services to Carver County residents. The report stated that "we feel these responsibilities (law enforcement) have been met successfully. However, as the County continues to expand in an urbanized manner, these responsibilities will increase and some changes in personnel policies and management priorities will require prompt attention." (See Appendix A)

In 1976 the City of Chaska raised concerns the funding formula for contract policing was not adequately capturing the cost of providing contract services. It was argued the county was not fully recovering the cost of contract policing which resulted in a property tax subsidy to those communities that participated in the program. An agreement was reached in which the county was to properly charge any community, whether township or city, with the actual costs of providing law enforcement services. It was at this time the Wright County Sheriff's model of cost recovery was adopted. Without exception, this model has been used every year with some minor adjustments.

In 1984 the City of Chaska again raised concerns about the cost recovery of providing contract services. The county board requested a review of the contracting system by the State Auditor's Office. From this report the county was to determine contract policing costs and hours of service based on the demand for services. Because of the broad nature of services the Sheriff provides the county board and sheriff were to "make a management decision" about what were base level services and those that were municipal contract police services. The report stated, "The hours of service purchased could vary by a city depending on the population, the types of business in the city, the city's area, and its crime environment." (See Appendix B)

In 1987, as a result of legal action the county and city reached a stipulated agreement that resulted in an Order for Judgment and permanent injunction being issued by the court. In the agreement it states; "This order recognized the sheriff renders two types of service: base level service and municipal police service under contract. They also recognize the difficulty of putting definitions in words and the partial overlap." (See Appendix C)

In 2001 the police contracting system was studied internally. The findings of this study indicated:

1. The contract hours had not kept pace with the growth in population or calls for service.
2. The contract formula had not been updated with current scheduling or human resource costs.
3. The hourly formula recommended no additional hours, beyond one hour, to townships even if they grew larger than cities in population and calls for service.
4. There was no detailed definition of base or contract level police services.
5. There was no cost accounting system in place to document the number of calls and the time spent on the contract calls.

Based on this information a recommendation was made by the sheriff to the County Board in early 2002 to request an external review of the police contracting model. Maximus, Inc completed this study in November 2002.

The Present

Through the Maximus consultant's study it was documented that as of 2000 the Sheriff's Office was under staffed by 2.1 or 9.0 employees, depending on which staffing model was used. The study forecasted by 2010 staffing shortfalls of 19 employees on a population forecast or 34.5 employees on a crime rate forecast. These forecasts were built on an estimate based on the statistics provided by the Sheriff's Office and benchmarks established by the work Maximus has done with similar management studies.

In March 2003 the contract communities and Sheriff's Office staff began meeting to work on this project. The committee reviewed the recommendations of the Maximus study, the court stipulation, the order for judgment, the state auditor's report, and City of Chaska letter sent in March of 2003. The committee examined this information in order to understand the issues and create this modern vision for contract police services.

The Sheriff's Contracting Committee (SCC) has spent hours examining the statutory duties of the county, sheriff, cities and townships in providing public safety services. It has also labored over defining the services the sheriff's office is required to provide, those that overlap, and those that can be defined as contract level services. Based on the work of the committee, specific recommendations are being offered to the County Board, City of Chaska, Township Boards, and City Councils for improvements and enhancement to the contract policing model.

III. Recommendation 1

The discussion of what law enforcement services every resident and every community receives with their county general taxes must begin with defining the statutory powers of each governmental unit to police their respective community.

Duties of the County

The Office of Sheriff is an elected office created by the state legislature. The definition of the duties of the Sheriff are defined in statute 387.03

The sheriff shall keep and preserve the peace of his county, for which purpose he may call to his aid such persons or power of his county as he deems necessary. He shall also pursue and apprehend all felons, execute all process, writs, precepts; and orders issued or made by lawful authority and to him delivered, attend upon the terms of the district court, and perform all of the duties pertaining to his office, including searching and dragging for drowned bodies and searching and looking for lost persons and when authorized by the board of the county commissioners of his county he may purchase boats and other equipment including the hiring of airplanes for such purposes.

Duties of a City

Once created, a city has the responsibility to manage the affairs of their community. Minnesota statute defines the powers of a city in several Chapters. Chapters 412 and 436 specifically deal with city powers to manage their affairs. They state:

412.111 Departments, Board

“The council may create departments and advisory boards and appoint officers, employees, and agents for the city as deemed necessary for the proper management and operation of city affairs....”

412.671 Creation of departments; divisions and bureaus

“The council may create such departments, divisions and bureaus for the administration of the affairs of the city as may seem necessary, and from time to time may alter their powers and organizations...”

436.05 Police service to city, town by sheriff

“Any home rule charter or statutory city, town or the sheriff of any county may contract for the furnishing of police service to any other home rule charter or statutory city or town...”

Duties of a Town (Township)

Townships have powers similar to Cities in regulating the affairs of their township. Minnesota statute defines the duties of a town (township) in several chapters. Specifically chapters 365, 366 and 367 define certain regulatory provisions:

- 365.10 What electors may do at annual town meetings
Regulate animals at large, establish pounds, repair roads and bridges, build community halls, control dogs and cats, suppress vice and immorality, prevent crime, protect public and private property, and adopt ordinances.
- 365.18 Board levy for police, fire gear, and protection
“A town board may annually levy the tax it decides is necessary for police and fire protection and apparatus, and to operate and keep up the apparatus...”
- 366.01 Town board powers listed; formal name
“The supervisors shall have charge of all town affairs not committed to other officers by law....”
- 367.401 Law enforcement officers; appointment; constables
“The town, by majority vote at its annual meeting, may decide to authorize the town board to form a law enforcement agency and appoint law enforcement officers...”

County Wide Police Services

The SCC first reviewed services the Sheriff’s Office provides. The committee formed recommendations for county wide general law enforcement services. (See Attachment 1) These services were divided by the division or function within the Sheriff’s Office. Some of the services are statutory, such as civil process others are policy decisions made by the County Board of Commissioners, such as supporting the 9-1-1 emergency dispatching system for all communities and townships in the county, others are “overlapping” as discussed in the Order for Judgment and the Maximus study. Even though the overlapping calls or services were identified in the county wide analysis, it would be impossible to include all of them as contract services. Thus, the county and contract community will have to evaluate the overlapping services to determine if it will be provided county wide or be contracted for.

Next, the SCC evaluated the types of patrol services, activity and calls the Sheriff’s Office responds to. The committee evaluated all calls for services over a 9 month period from November 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003 to determine whether the service, activity or call would fall under the statutory duties of the Sheriff or would be considered a non-mandated service, activity or call thus a contract level service. The SCC found the Sheriff provided more county wide services responding to emergencies and keeping the peace than responding to contract level calls. (See Attachment 2) The committee also reviewed 2003 calls for service to determine if there was a statistical relationship to the 9 month analysis. (See Attachment 3) It was noted the analysis was consistent between the two study periods.

This suggests the Sheriff Office is adequately addressing the concern of taxpayers in one city subsidizing policing in another.

The limitation of this type of analysis was recognized in the 1987 order for judgment and in the 2002 Maximus study. The Sheriff's duties are broad in nature and can be widely interpreted. It is also recognized many calls are answered by multiple deputies but the record management system only documents one deputy assigned to report the call and the amount of time spent. It was further recognized the time deputies spend on report writing should be captured as a work load measure for determining adequate staffing. To properly account for all responding personnel and their time on the call would require significant improvements to the software and to call procedures. It would turn "cops into accountants" and take them away from their primary mission of keeping the peace. Also Sheriff's Office staff would have to be adequately trained or retrained to understand and implement practices to interpret each call for service. The labor time alone would result in the addition of staff to support this type of detailed analysis.

Overlapping Services

The most difficult types of calls to categorize in the SCC study are calls which "could" be considered overlapping. They are calls that until the deputy investigates them, it is not clear if the call would be a general county wide call or a contract call. An example may offer clarity in how difficult it has been to build a detailed analysis of the work law enforcement performs.

You are a dispatcher working the Friday over night shift Memorial Day Weekend. The night has been very busy. An alarm company calls in and says they have a home burglary alarm in the City of Waconia. The dispatcher takes the alarm information and hangs up with the alarm company. She/He turns to the other dispatcher working and says "now what do I do with the call?" Should I send the two deputies being paid for by the City or do I send the county general patrol deputy in the district because we are uncertain if this is a contract policing call or a county general call all taxpayers pay for. What if someone is breaking into the house right now? What if it is just "another" faulty burglar alarm going off, "just like all the rest of them!" She makes a frustrated remark to her coworker, "I wish the Sheriff would just tell us what we are supposed to do!" The dispatcher heads for the shelf where the 3 ring binders are kept for each city and township so she/he can check what services the City is paying for. "Where is that manual with the list of calls each township or city are paying for?" she/he asks of her partner. Let me see, alarm response... Oh yea, since it is a burglar alarm the Sheriff does not need to respond unless they are paying for contract police services. It is now 10 minutes since the alarm company called. The dispatcher determines we have a contract with the City and they have agreed to pay for this call so she/he dispatches the local deputies.

Even though this is a hypothetical situation it occurred one thousand seven hundred and ninety (1790) times in 2003. From law enforcement's experience the vast majority (up to 90%) are false alarms. When the SCC examined this type of call, the Sheriff's statutory duty to keep the peace and respond to emergencies, the Order for Judgment with the City

of Chaska, and the statutory powers of the cities, it was determined alarm response falls into both a base level service and a contract level service. If the alarm was a hold up alarm at the local bank that was pushed by a teller would this not be a county wide service every resident would fund through their tax dollars because of the threat to public safety? What about the home burglary alarm that has gone off 4 times a month since the homeowner installed it? Is that an emergency? Does that require every taxpayer to pay for the police response?

This is just one example of detailed work the SCC performed in order to develop a model of contracting that will satisfy all the stakeholders in this project. (See Attachment 4) The impacts managing a contract policing system with this level of documentation and accountability are staggering. The services performed by law enforcement are difficult to quantify and categorize. Instead, statutory language gives counties, cities and townships the authority to levy for police services in order to “manage the affairs” of their local communities.

Overlapping services have been very difficult to make policy decisions on in this study. The amount of time and work that would be necessary to create a contracting model to track these types of calls and categorize them would be significant. It is the recommendations of the SCC that patrol calls of this nature would be handled by the county wide general deputies on a priority basis. When a community decides to enhance their local policing through contracting these overlapping patrol calls would be factored into the police coverage plan for the community.

It should be noted some of the overlapping activities, such as administrative and support services type activities are already included in the cost recovery formula. These services are listed as overlapping because the Sheriff’s Office also needs these activities in order to perform the county wide general services.

County Wide Patrol Services

The Sheriff provides county wide patrol services. This service is at the heart of the discussion of county wide general policing and contract policing services. The committee chose to use the 2000 census to determine the number of deputies available for county general patrol. In 2000 there were 34 deputies assigned to the patrol division. Supervisors are included in this number, except for the Chanhassen Sergeant, who is funded 100% with local dollars. By subtracting out the 18 deputies funded through contract policing that left 16 deputies funded through county general tax revenues.

To determine future county wide patrol services the SCC is recommending the county adopt a minimum ratio. The Sheriff, through the budget process, could make higher recommendations based on the demand for services and changes in the crime environment of the county.

As 2005 approaches the Sheriff will define the county wide general patrol districts and the numbers of deputies needed to provide 24/7/365 response to every citizen of the county. General patrol districts will cover all county wide (base level) and overlapping patrol calls for service under the statutory authority of the Sheriff to “keep and preserve

the peace and to pursue and apprehend all felons.” The exception will be those calls that have been defined solely as contract calls for service. This does not presume there will be a timely response to these types of calls. The Sheriff’s Office will have limited resources to respond to the calls creating the need to define the types of calls and the priorities they will receive for response.

IV. Recommendation 2

Contract Policing Services

Community leaders, through their constituents, decide when the Sheriff's general county wide services are not adequate coverage to satisfy the local demand for public safety services. What factors do citizens and local leaders look at when making these decisions? How long does it take a deputy to answer a call in town? How many deputies work our area of the county? Do we get a say in how our community is policed? Can we choose when our services are provided? Do we get to have a marked squad that easily identifies our local police? Do we get any say who works our community? How big does our city or township have to get before we need our own police department? (Attachment 6 provides a list of the most common factors used to determine how much policing is adequate.)

The SCC has made a recommendation on services the Sheriff's Office provides that would be considered contract services. (See Attachment 5) The committee has discussed what would happen with a call that is not funded by the local authority. The governmental unit will have to make a policy decision to “**fund it**,” pay a “**fee for it**,” or “**forget it**.” This means the county board and township boards, or city councils will need to make a policy decision as to how the call will be handled. After 5 years of meetings and forthright attempts at trying to implement the base level and contract level services it is the Sheriff's recommendation that several modification be made to the definition of base level and contract level services. These recommendations will not diminish the basic premise in the dispute between the City of Chaska, County Board and Sheriff from 1987. That agreement set forth the following:

Base Level Services

1. **Enforce State Statutes and County Ordinances**
2. **Respond to calls for service as resources and call loads allow**
 - a. **Refer Local Ordinances to the appropriate city or township official.**
3. **Receive reports and investigate crimes as resources allow.**

Contract Police Services

The following is a list of the services the SCC recommended as contract policing services. If a township or city does not choose to police their own community they will be covered by the Sheriff's Office county wide general patrol deputies. The services which would require a contract to provide a response are:

Local Control/Local Identity

1. **“Town Deputy” model establishes a police identity with the jurisdiction**
2. **Local officials participate in liaison deputy selection**
3. **Dedicated deputies are familiar with local citizens and local concerns**
4. **Liaison Deputy works with city officials to develop a police work plan to meet the current needs and anticipate the future needs of the community**

Traffic Safety Education

1. Preventative patrol on local roads
2. Traffic control/Special events (i.e. Community Celebrations, Parades, etc)
3. Traffic surveys and Radar Displays
4. Target hardening for problem areas

Communication/Coordination

1. Dedicated deputies identify and resolve issues before they become bigger concerns (i.e. problem oriented policing)
2. Liaison Deputy assists in resource allocation and coordination of policing matters for local events
3. Liaison Deputy is available to attend city and township meetings and maintain direct/regular contact with the city/township employees to enhance inter-agency communications and coordination

Call Response and Enforcement

1. Dedicated deputies gives the community a quicker response to calls for service
2. Dedicated deputies gives the community a quicker follow up on crimes
3. Local Ordinance Enforcement
4. Vacation House and Business Checks

Administrative Services

1. Development of annual police contract, detailing costs and obligations
2. Development of annual police service plan
3. Development and distribution of monthly activity reports
4. Development and web posting of quarterly reports
5. Coordination of citizen feedback surveys
6. Development and analysis of crime trends
7. Statistical analysis to identify problem areas and target specific activities
8. State aid refund
9. Processing and disbursement of alarm response fees
10. Receipt of percentage of citation fees
11. Participation in the Sheriff's Contract Committee (SCC)

Community Outreach

1. Crime prevention services
2. Development of neighborhood watch programs
3. "Town Deputy" attendance at local events (i.e. National Night Out)
4. School Based Programs (Restorative Practices, Anti-Drug, SRO)

V. Recommendation 3

Recovering the Contracting Costs

The current funding formula was adopted by the county in 1976. It was first applied by pencil and paper each year. In 1987 the formula was copied to an excel spreadsheet and reproduced electronically each year. The first formal review of this formula was in 1984 by the State Auditors office. Several recommendations were made regarding improving the documentation of actual cost recovery. These recommendations were attached to the 1987 Order for Judgment and permanent injunction.

In 2002 Maximus reviewed the formula and made recommendations for updating the spreadsheet formula to meet current practices. The Sheriff's staff made some necessary adjustments and submitted them to the SCC. The adjustments included adding more staff time to the administrative costs, changing the shift relief factor for determining staffing, adding records staff time, removing the Chief Deputy from the formula, adding patrol scheduling time and developing fixed costs for the vehicle and equipment expenses.

There has been much debate in previous studies about the need to have contract services provided by an hourly formula. The Police Operations study of 1977 stated:

“charging by the hours of patrol or hours of on call should be abandoned. It is meaningless and confusing and creates scheduling problems.” (See Appendix C)

The 1984 State Auditor's report states:

“The contracting cities and the County have also been concerned about the method of charging the cost of contract services to the contracting cities. The County originally charged a per hour rate and then changed to a per capita rate. Thus, current charges depend on the population of the city. The County Sheriff's Department, however, converts the total bills for a city into hours of service using an internally estimated per hour rate. These hours of service for a city are then used for scheduling the patrol cars. The contracting cities try to verify that they are getting the actual hours of service that they are entitled to. As long as contract services exist, the County needs the per hour rate of contract service in order to budget the required manpower and to schedule the service for each contracting city.” (See Appendix B)

In examining other contracting models different funding formulas are used. Consistent among all of them is detailed cost accounting of the personnel expense, vehicle and equipment expense and administrative overhead. More advanced contracting models use a “menu of service” style of contracting. They have listed all the services the Sheriff's Office has available for contracting and detail the cost of each service so a particular community can chose the types of service and the level at which they wish to contract for the services.

The SCC has recommended the adoption of the menu of service model for determining types of local police services. The list of services is outlined in recommendation 4.

VI. Recommendation 4

Menu of Services

The SCC project has identified the services contract communities may fund through the contract policing model. These services are designed to enhance, improve, or expand public safety services to the citizens of the community (township or city). The community and Sheriff will identify the need for these services and a plan for implementation and coordination of the program or service. The services available for additional funding are:

1. Patrol Response Units
2. Traffic Safety Units
3. Corporal
4. Sergeant
5. Lieutenant
6. Criminal Investigation
7. Narcotics Investigation
8. Crime Prevention / Neighborhood Watch
9. Community Service Officer/Animal Control (CSO)
10. K-9
11. Recreation Services (Water/Snowmobile/Park Patrol)
12. School Resource Deputy
13. Record Clerk

The menu can be found listed on Attachment 8.

VII. Recommendation 5

City of Chaska Settlement

In March 2003 Chaska City Administrator Dave Pokorney sent a letter to the Sheriff outlining the concerns the City had with the recovering of costs from contract policing. The city states in the letter it may be necessary to modify the details of the stipulation agreement. Administrator Pokorney also states the city will be flexible and support changes in the system, provided they meet the general intent of the 1987 agreement and are fair.

Through the review process the SCC has conducted a detailed evaluation of the City of Chaska concerns. The committee spent considerable time in discussing the issues of the stipulation agreement and the permanent injunction. It is the recommendation of the committee that the improvements and enhancements being recommended are consistent with the 1987 agreement and will treat each community fairly. Further the SCC recommends the County and City modify the stipulation agreement and remove the permanent injunction.

VIII. 2005 – The Future of Law Enforcement Contracting

Best Practices in Community Policing

Having a Say in Local Policing

For a many years contract communities have been asking for better accountability in the contract policing model formula. The City of Chanhassen was one of the first cities calling for improvement to their local policing plan. Over the past 5 years the cities and Sheriff's Office have reviewed many models of contract policing in the state and nation. From the review it is clear many Sheriffs have wrestled with the issues of local control and local identity. As a community grows and the ability to fund a local police department becomes more feasible the need for a more local presence becomes very important. When community leaders can fund police services locally they have a say in who polices them, when they are policed and how they are policed. Many cities understand the limitation of receiving services using the Sheriff's model. They know they have little say in the delivery of the service(s). In states and counties where Sheriff's Offices have been responsive to the local community needs the model has become very successful. Successful from the tax payer perspective, successful in having a local police presence, and successful in having a say in the level and types of services the community needs and is willing to fund.

Over time, there have been several cities in the county that have looked at providing their policing locally or asking the Sheriff's Office for improvement to the contract policing. In most cases, the cities have experienced continuous growth in their communities. This growth has resulted in more public demand for service and more opportunities to consider funding their local government services, including policing. Through the city's own initiatives they have examined the need for their own police departments. In one case, Norwood Young America, the city surveyed their community to determine the public opinion in providing their police services locally. The results of this survey indicated the desire to have improved local police services. The concern this survey raised was the cost of providing these services. The city council made a decision to work with the Sheriff's Office in building a policing plan that includes a dedicated patrol and a service work plan that identifies the policing priorities the city is interested in achieving.

The entire discussion of policing revolves around two basic principles. The communities desire for local control of their policing resources and local identity of those resources. The future of the Sheriff's Office contract policing system is dependent on the ability of the Office and it's employees to recognize the unique nature of the services they provide and to respect the communities desire to build policing models that address their local concerns. By enhancing this partnership, the cities and county achieve a very important concept of modern policing, best practices in community policing.

Defining Local Policing for Patrol Services

Contract communities will have several choices in planning for their local policing mission. These models offer them the opportunity to “start small” and grow as their local policing needs change. The following alternatives only describe funding patrol services:

Base Level Services

1. Enforce State Statutes and County Ordinances
2. Respond to calls for service as resources and call loads allow
 - a. Refer Local Ordinances to the appropriate city or township official.
3. Receive reports and investigate crimes as resources allow.

Contract Police Services

The following is a list of the services the SCC recommended as contract policing services. If a township or city does not choose to police their own community they will be covered by the Sheriff’s Office county wide general patrol deputies. The services which would require a contract to provide a response are:

Local Control/Local Identity

5. “Town Deputy” model establishes a police identity with the jurisdiction
6. Local officials participate in liaison deputy selection
7. Dedicated deputies are familiar with local citizens and local concerns
8. Liaison Deputy works with city officials to develop a police work plan to meet the current needs and anticipate the future needs of the community

Traffic Safety Education

5. Preventative patrol on local roads
6. Traffic control/Special events (i.e. Community Celebrations, Parades, etc)
7. Traffic surveys and Radar Displays
8. Target hardening for problem areas

Communication/Coordination

4. Dedicated deputies identify and resolve issues before they become bigger concerns (i.e. problem oriented policing)
5. Liaison Deputy assists in resource allocation and coordination of policing matters for local events
6. Liaison Deputy is available to attend city and township meetings and maintain direct/regular contact with the city/township employees to enhance inter-agency communications and coordination

Call Response and Enforcement

5. Dedicated deputies gives the community a quicker response to calls for service
6. Dedicated deputies gives the community a quicker follow up on crimes
7. Local Ordinance Enforcement
8. Vacation House and Business Checks

Administrative Services

12. Development of annual police contract, detailing costs and obligations
13. Development of annual police service plan
14. Development and distribution of monthly activity reports
15. Development and web posting of quarterly reports
16. Coordination of citizen feedback surveys
17. Development and analysis of crime trends
18. Statistical analysis to identify problem areas and target specific activities
19. State aid refund
20. Processing and disbursement of alarm response fees
21. Receipt of percentage of citation fees
22. Participation in the Sheriff's Contract Committee (SCC)

Community Outreach

5. Crime prevention services
6. Development of neighborhood watch programs
7. "Town Deputy" attendance at local events (i.e. National Night Out)
8. School Based Programs (Restorative Practices, Anti-Drug, SRO)

Creating Community Work Plans

The community will also have choices through a menu of service to enhance their local policing model over and above the patrol service plans listed above. These services are typical law enforcement functions most communities fund in order to manage a full service policing model locally. Each community will work closely with the Sheriff in building and creating a community work plan that best defines their needs and expectations within their local policing model. (See Attachment 9)

Every community leader will be challenged to define the adequate and necessary level of policing their citizens will expect and demand. By offering a police contracting model our community expectations can be easily managed and efficiently funded.