



# Memorandum

**TO: HONORABLE MAYOR  
AND CITY COUNCIL**

**FROM:** Robert L. Davis  
Albert Balagso  
Jane Light

**SUBJECT: SEE BELOW**

**DATE:** July 21, 2009

Approved

*Deana Subra*

Date

*7/21/09*

**SUBJECT: CITYWIDE SERVICE DELIVERY MODEL FOR COMMUNITY  
POLICING CENTERS (CPCs)**

## RECOMMENDATION

Approval of a revised service delivery model for the San Jose Police Department's (Department) Community Policing Centers (CPCs) and/or CPC services.

## OUTCOME

Acceptance of this report will establish a revised service delivery model and framework for services provided at the CPCs, which reflect the current CPCs status and options to maintain or expand future service delivery.

## BACKGROUND

In 1999, the City Council recognized the need to be more responsive and available to the residents of the City for both major and minor concerns. In a response to that need, the City Council approved a program to establish four Community Policing Centers to more readily provide police services to the community in each of the four geographic Police Divisions.

The CPCs were designed to be a place where residents could drop in to file a police report or obtain information on police matters or other City services. By locating a CPC in each Police geographic Division, the concept was for community members to have quick access to police services and information in their neighborhoods. The CPC would also provide a location to hold meetings for members of the Department, community, business leaders, and other City departments. Additionally, the CPC service design was to provide officers with a location to write reports, obtain supplies, gain access to various police-specific databases to maximize time in the Police Division, and to reduce travel time to the Police Administration Building (PAB) for these activities.

## HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

**Subject:** Citywide Service Delivery Model for Community Policing Centers (CPCs)

July 21, 2009

Page 2

The City Council approved the following selection criteria goals for selecting the location of each CPC:

1. Comfortable, local and accessible services to residents and other City departments
  - Preferably in a shopping center or public facility
  - High public traffic
  - Highly visible with the ability to place signage
2. A place where residents could drop in to make reports or obtain information on police matters or other City services
  - Area location that would benefit the greatest number of residents in each Division
3. A location to hold community or City department meetings
  - Affordable
  - Approximately 1,500 square feet
  - Securable with front and rear access
  - Adequate/convenient parking
  - Close to major intersections and highways
4. Provides officers with a location within their divisions to write reports, obtain supplies, gain access to various police-specific databases
  - Reasonable travel time from the PAB

The original staffing plan at each of the CPCs called for the facilities to be open five hours a day, Monday through Friday (25 staff hours per week), utilizing a sworn officer. The police officer was drawn from normal beat functions within the CPC Division and replaced by an overlap officer when possible. Beat integrity was given priority without going below minimum staffing for the Division. The Police Captain assigned to a Division would oversee the operations of the CPC located in their respective Division. Volunteer Opportunities and Leadership Training (VOLT) volunteers were also proposed to be used to provide information to residents. Within the CPC, brochures would be available from other City departments and public agencies to advertise additional City resources and provide general information services.

### ANALYSIS

On December 11, 2008, the City Manager, upon Council's request in the June 2008 Budget message, brought an analysis of the cost per service and utilization of the CPCs to the Public Safety, Finance, & Strategic Support Committee (PSFSSC). In January 2009, the City Council accepted staff's PSFSSC report and, as a separate item on the City Council agenda, staff was directed to provide a revised service delivery model for the CPCs.

This section of the report discusses the current CPC service delivery approach and proposes a framework for how CPC services can be modernized in response to current demands for service; and how the City should proceed with piloting a revised service delivery model. Specifically, this analysis covers the following topics:

- A. Service Delivery Considerations and City Council Priorities
- B. Current CPC Service Delivery Model

**HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL**

**Subject:** Citywide Service Delivery Model for Community Policing Centers (CPCs)

July 21, 2009

Page 3

C. Current Service Activity & Cost Per Service

D. Modernized CPC Service Delivery Model

***A. Service Delivery Considerations and City Council Priorities***

Since the original report to the PSFSSC in December 2008, the City's fiscal environment has worsened and any desire to maintain or expand City services needs to undergo a cost-benefit evaluation. Additionally, the City Council has emphasized the priority of adding patrol officers to the workforce and studying how to achieve greater sworn officer efficiencies. These two issues resulted in the following service delivery considerations:

- Current service delivery model (structural efficiencies and inefficiencies)
- Cost per service
- Overall demand for service and type of services
- Reducing the amount of administrative functions performed by sworn staff
- Increased redeployment of officers to patrol functions.

With the above in mind, and upon consideration of the December PSFSSC report, the current CPC service delivery model presents an opportunity to pilot alternative service delivery models that accomplish the CPC goals while applying innovative approaches for delivering service.

***B. Current CPC Service Delivery Model***

During the Administration's effort to document the current CPC service delivery model, it became clear that there is an absence of a uniform service model for CPCs including the services offered, and staffing and operating hours. While there is a general core set of services available at each CPC, each vary from the services originally envisioned and physical space.

The geographic locations of the three existing CPCs were based on fiscal constraints and real estate availability. Location selection criteria proved challenging due to the inability to find property for purchase, coupled with exorbitant real estate purchase prices. These limitations resulted in a model based solely on the availability of suitable real estate located in each Police Division; the physical site also varies for each CPC. Below is a discussion of how each of the CPCs meets the current goals and a discussion of the location criteria.

***Southern Division CPC: Low-Cost Lease Model***

The Southern Division CPC, located adjacent to the Westfield Mall at 947 Blossom Hill Road, was the first CPC to be established. Upon relocation and a remodel, this CPC is now located in the parking garage structure of a shopping mall centrally located in the Southern Division. The CPC provides front counter services from the Department and receives high visibility because of its accessibility for residents. The owners of this property provided the City with a 1,900 square

**HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL**

**Subject:** Citywide Service Delivery Model for Community Policing Centers (CPCs)

July 21, 2009

Page 4

foot facility at the ongoing lease cost of \$1.00 per year. Tenant improvements were made without public safety bond funds.

Listed below is an evaluation of the Southern Division CPC compared with the original service framework/goals:

**Table 1: Southern Division CPC, Evaluation Compared with Original CPC Service Framework/Goals**

<b>Service Framework/Goal</b>	<b>Status (Yes, No, or Partial)</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Comfortable, local and accessible services to residents and other City departments	Partial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Accessible to residents</li><li>▪ Not accessible to other City departments due to space constraints</li><li>▪ Highly visible with ability to place signage</li></ul>
A place where residents could drop in to make reports or obtain information on police matters or other City services	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Residents can drop in while at Westfield Mall and obtain information about police matters/services when it is open/staffed</li><li>▪ Resources are in place to provide information on police matters when opened, but a more comprehensive program for providing information on other City services could be developed</li></ul>
A location to hold community or City department meetings	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ No community meeting space</li><li>▪ There is a small conference room for police officers to gather (approximately 4-6 people), but space constraints do not allow for broader/bigger department meetings</li><li>▪ Adequate/convenient parking is available</li><li>▪ Affordable</li></ul>
Provides officers with a location within their divisions to write reports, obtain supplies, gain access to various police-specific databases	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Workspace for police officers to write reports and obtain supplies</li><li>▪ Police-specific databases are available to officers</li></ul>

Resident usage is highest at this CPC, which can be attributed to its location and the distance to the PAB. The CPC service type most provided is General Information (See discussion in next section). As previously mentioned in the December 2008 PSFSSC report, this CPC and the associated staffing needs would be further evaluated when the Police Substation opens.

**Western Division CPC: *City Facility, Multi-Service Delivery Model***

The Western Division CPC, located at 3707 Williams Road, runs on a multi-service delivery model by providing shared services with staff from the Parks, Recreation and Neighborhood Services (PRNS) Department and the Strong Neighborhoods Initiative (SNI). The project cost for establishing this facility totaled about \$3.9 million (e.g., \$2.1 million for construction; \$740,000 for land acquisition; \$848,000 for project delivery and \$209,000 for contingency). This project was developed with a multitude of funding sources, such as: Council District Construction and Conveyance Tax funds; Parks Bond funds; and, Public Safety funds.

**HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL**

**Subject:** Citywide Service Delivery Model for Community Policing Centers (CPCs)

July 21, 2009

Page 5

While the use of the facility by local neighborhood groups is high due to the shared services offered from the PRNS Department and SNI, specific police-related utilization of the Western CPC services is lower when compared to the Southern CPC service activity and its most frequent service type is providing General Information. It should be noted, the partial fiscal year 2008-2009 data available is not sufficient to draw conclusive observations. The CPC provides a visible sign of police presence in a neighborhood that has previously experienced gang issues. The Western Division CPC offers a wider range of City services to residents than the Southern or Central (Alviso) CPCs.

Listed below is an evaluation of the Western Division CPC compared to the original service framework/goals:

**Table 2: Western Division CPC, Evaluation Compared to Original CPC Service Framework/Goals**

<b>Service Framework/Goal</b>	<b>Status (Yes, No, or Partial)</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Comfortable, local and accessible services to residents and other City departments	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Accessible, spacious and comfortable for residents</li><li>▪ Other City departments (PRNS and SNI) provide direct services from site</li><li>▪ High public traffic, ability to place signage, etc.</li></ul>
A place where residents could drop in at their convenience to make reports or obtain information on police matters or other City services	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Residents can drop in to obtain information about police matters/services when open/staffed by SJPD</li><li>▪ Ability to seek referral/reference information regarding City services from PRNS front-counter during regular business hours</li></ul>
A location to hold community or City department meetings	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Highly desirable community/department meeting space for large gatherings, including kitchen space</li><li>▪ Affordable, City owns site</li><li>▪ Adequate/convenient parking</li></ul>
Provides officers with a location within their divisions to write reports, obtain supplies, gain access to various police-specific databases	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Police-specific databases are available to officers</li></ul>

**Central Division CPC: *City Facility, Single-Service Delivery Model***

The Central Division CPC, located at 1060 Taylor Street in Alviso, primarily provides over the counter information services. The Central CPC is a refurbished home that previously served as Alviso's City Hall. Project funding for the restoration of this CPC, totaling \$323,282, was funded by Public Safety Bond funds. Since the building was City owned, no funds were needed to acquire the property. While the location may be beneficial for the residents of Alviso, its location is not practical for residents within the entire Central Division. The same police services are provided at the main PAB located in the center of the Division, which is more accessible than the

**HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL**

**Subject:** Citywide Service Delivery Model for Community Policing Centers (CPCs)

July 21, 2009

Page 6

Central Division CPC. This CPC is the least used and its highest service provided is General Information.

Listed below is an evaluation of the Central Division CPC compared to the original service framework/goals, which is followed by additional commentary:

**Table 3: Central Division CPC, Evaluation Compared to Original CPC Service Framework/Goals**

<b>Service Framework/Goal</b>	<b>Status (Yes, No, or Partial)</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Comfortable, local and accessible services to residents and other City departments	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Remote location in Alviso, no high public traffic</li><li>▪ Not convenient for other City departments to access or utilize, nor is space available</li></ul>
A place where residents could drop in to make reports or obtain information on police matters or other City services	Partial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Based on location, the majority of use is limited to Alviso residents (not in an area location that would benefit the greatest number of residents)</li><li>▪ Resources are in place to provide information on police matters when opened, but a more comprehensive program for providing information on other City services could be developed</li></ul>
A location to hold community or City department meetings	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ No community meeting space</li><li>▪ There is a small space for police officers to gather (approximately 6-8 people), not sufficient for larger community meetings</li><li>▪ Adequate/convenient parking</li></ul>
Provides officers with a location within their division to write reports, obtain supplies, gain access to various police-specific databases	Partial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ The PAB, which is more central in this Division, offers the same capabilities</li><li>▪ Police-specific databases are available to officers</li></ul>

**Foothill Division CPC**

A Foothill CPC was originally located at the Tropicana Shopping Center, located on King and Story Streets. The Foothill CPC was closed for the renovation of the Shopping Center. Upon the Shopping Center's reopening, once renovations were completed, a low-cost lease could no longer be achieved and, as a result, the Foothill CPC did not reopen.

**Best Practices/Benchmarking**

To inform the Administration's understanding of the current service delivery model for the purpose of developing a more modernized service delivery model, the City conducted some benchmarking of community services offered by other police departments throughout California. Because the CPC model is unique to San Jose, a direct comparison was not performed. Instead, the Administration became informed on how other police departments provided services within

**HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL**

**Subject:** Citywide Service Delivery Model for Community Policing Centers (CPCs)

July 21, 2009

Page 7

their communities. For information about these benchmarking efforts, please view Attachment A. In general, there are many approaches for offering expanded police services within the community. Below are some observations about the current trends:

- In the current fiscal environment, some police departments have eliminated or reduced this service to preserve other police service priorities, specifically police patrol duties
- Some services were provided through using retired police officers, civilian staff, and/or volunteers
- Substations provided CPC functions
- Non-profit/public partnerships support service delivery model
- Funded by non-general fund sources and private donations
- Some facilities cater towards providing bi-lingual services to specific communities

The above evaluations of the current three CPCs and the benchmarking/best practices information provides insight toward informing a revised service delivery model within the context of the issues outlined in Section A of this report. In general, it appears the CPC service framework/goals are better achieved when provided from a multi-service delivery approach where other resources are available and services are accessible to residents. This is further observed upon review of the revised service delivery model.

***C. Current Service Activity & Cost Per Service***

Listed below is an expanded discussion of the data provided earlier this year. Data for fiscal year 2008-2009 was not collected in a uniform method that would enable a year-to-year evaluation per service category; hence, this assessment is based on information provided by staff, operating service hours, and the limited existing data captured throughout this year by each CPC.

The following table provides information on the different activity levels at each CPC and cost for services for fiscal year 2007-2008:

**HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL****Subject:** Citywide Service Delivery Model for Community Policing Centers (CPCs)

July 21, 2009

Page 8

**Table 4: CPC Service Activity and Cost Per Service**

Type of Service	Southern Division CPC	Central Division CPC	Western Division CPC *
Traffic Citation Sign-Off	183	15	10
Vehicle Identification Number (VIN) Verification	0	3	0
Police Report Filing	83	15	14
<b>Provide General Information</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>43</b>
Custody Exchange	1	0	0
Reporting of Crime in Progress	0	8	0
Fingerprinting	1	0	1
Found Property	6	0	0
Provide Assistance to Other Agencies	0	10	0
Megan's Law	0	2	0
Other	52	0	0
<b>Total Activities Provided</b>	<b>583</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>Total Staffing Hours</b>	689	936	216
<b>Operating Cost</b> (Non-Personal and Personal)	\$55,630	\$66,270	\$34,626
<b>Average Cost/Service</b>	<b>\$95.42</b>	<b>\$561.61</b>	<b>\$532.70</b>
	Total Operating Cost:		\$156,526
<b>Average Cost/Service</b>	Total Services:		766
	Total Average Cost/Services:		<b>\$204</b>

\*Data provided reflect FY07/08 statistics except for Western Division CPC, which are from October 2007 through June 2008.

The CPC utilization analysis provided by the Department demonstrated that in addition to CPCs being underutilized by the public, an overwhelming majority of the service activity consisted of providing General Information. In this instance, General Information is defined by any questions (police or non-police related) asked in-person at the CPC. While offering General Information to the public is an essential service, the cost of providing this information, particularly by a sworn police officer proves to be a very costly service delivery model that conflicts with other police service priorities.

Based on findings gathered from the fiscal year 2007-2008 statistics, the data shows underutilization and high cost per service (ranging from approximately \$95 - \$562/cost per service). In response, during fiscal year 2008-2009, the Department reduced the hours at the CPCs in order to keep police officers out on the streets, thereby providing police services during the highest service demand period. Data collected during fiscal year 2008-2009 showed the average business hours at each CPC were approximately 8-10 hours per week.

**In a fiscal environment where cost for service is considered critical, and knowing the utilization of service has decreased, staff recognizes that the current cost per service is not sustainable, nor justified when evaluated against the fiscal and City Council priorities discussed in Section A.**

**HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL**

**Subject:** Citywide Service Delivery Model for Community Policing Centers (CPCs)

July 21, 2009

Page 9

***D. Modernized CPC Service Delivery Model***

Staff is recommending the following criteria be used in moving toward a modernized CPC service delivery approach. CPCs should achieve/maintain:

- **High Resident/Pedestrian Exposure:** Geographically located in highly exposed area with proximity to pedestrian traffic and accessible to residents
- **Strategic Geographic Locations:** Not driven by Police Division boundaries, rather by where City resources are best applied
- **City Facility, Multi-Service Delivery:** A combination of City services concurrently delivered from one location
- **Community Meeting Space:** A comfortable and accessible space for residents
- **24/7 Police Officer Work Space:** Space within an existing building for officers to write reports, obtain supplies, gain access to various police-specific databases
- **Virtual CPC Presence:** Libraries and Community Centers can make available basic information available using CPC services and provide some of the General Information currently provided. Additionally, if CPCs are integrated into Community Centers, the Center could provide signage of the targeted hours that a sworn police officer *may be* available, but staff would be trained to explain the conditions for which staffing may not be available (e.g., respond to calls for service, other policing priorities, etc.). This approach would augment the current hours available to provide some of the General Information provided by CPCs (e.g., 8 – 10 hours/week), takes advantage of other City services that have high exposure to residents during regular business hours, and would be at a much lower cost than a sworn officer providing General Information services.
- **Leveraging Operating Costs:** Utilizing front-counter staff to provide reference/referral of CPC services, mainly General Information services, will mitigate facility maintenance costs by moving away from a single-service delivery model; and, provide advertised hours of availability of a sworn police officer to enable targeted resident drop-in.

As previously mentioned, a majority of current CPC service delivery is providing “General Information” to the public. While this service aligns well with the intention of CPCs, this service can be provided at a much lower cost to the City by using non-sworn staff available in community centers, libraries, or where other front-counter City staff is located to provide the response to these questions. In cases where the General Information cannot be provided, the non-sworn staff would provide the targeted hours of when a police officer may be available at a specific site to provide this information or, alternatively, how to obtain the information from the “SJPd.org” website or through the PAB or Police Substation (when opened). While the original CPC model called for the CPC to provide resource information of other City services, it is proposed that other City services (with front counter services) provide CPC resource information, given that the highest service provided is General Information.

## **HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL**

**Subject:** Citywide Service Delivery Model for Community Policing Centers (CPCs)

July 21, 2009

Page 10

This approach would allow a police officer to be deployed to the Division and utilize his/her time for sworn duties. This approach would require coordination between the staff providing the General Information and the police officer assigned to the CPC. This simple change in approach reduces the cost for CPC services and achieves the City Council's goal of a better deployment of police officers. It also addresses the current gap in service at CPCs that occurred when the Department reduced operating hours at CPCs in order to address staffing shortages.

Additionally, a multi-service delivery approach within a City facility addresses several goals. First, there are no site acquisition or construction costs with establishing a CPC. The only costs would be minimal tenant improvements and the Department's information technology communications connectivity to create an area specific for police officers. Second, as mentioned above, this approach takes advantage of front-counter staff available to provide General Information to residents visiting the facility. Third, depending upon the location, the facility would have comfortable meeting space for residents and other City staff. Fourth, a multi-service delivery approach in our community centers ensures the CPC will have exposure to a broad range of community members. Fifth, this approach further supports community-policing goals that will be continued from informal, positive interactions between police officers and residents. Lastly, the Department would better serve the public with patrol officers responding directly to residential and/or business locations.

### **Applying the Revised Service Delivery Model**

In an effort to apply the revised CPC service delivery model criteria, the following observations and recommendations are presented:

**Southern Division CPC:** The Southern Division CPC evaluation is on hold pending the opening of the Police Substation. This evaluation will largely consist of whether to continue to operate a CPC at this location, or consolidate services into the new South Police Substation. The revised service delivery model approach provides the framework to examine this CPC upon the opening of the Police Substation. Additionally, given the low cost lease option, the cost-benefit analysis of providing these services out of a popular mall will be considered. Under these circumstances, it is recommended the operating hours remain the same for now.

**Western Division CPC:** This CPC meets the current and modernized service delivery model and is the basis for which this approach was developed. Additional service adjustments can be made to refine this service delivery model, e.g., using PRNS front-counter staff to provide a greater degree of General Information. It is recommended that no staffing or operating hour changes are proposed at this time, and that staff continue to explore training for PRNS staff providing staff support at the front counter of this facility.

**Central Division CPC:** When applying the new service delivery model criteria to the Central CPC, we found the service delivery model cannot be accomplished nor further maximized because the larger need for these services is outside of the Alviso geographic area. While

## **HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL**

**Subject:** Citywide Service Delivery Model for Community Policing Centers (CPCs)

July 21, 2009

Page 11

initially this CPC was identified as a prime geographic location because of its distance from the main PAB, analysis has demonstrated that services are not being utilized. Under these circumstances, it is recommended a further reduction of operating hours be considered. It should also be noted that with the recent opening of the Roosevelt Community Center, there is greater police presence from this site (given its central location) and that police officers use this site for CPC-like purposes (e.g., report writing, use of facility for light paperwork, computer access, etc.). This recent development further supports the revised CPC service delivery model.

**Foothill Division CPC:** While the Foothill Division previously had a CPC location, this Division currently does not have any CPC services. Under the revised service delivery model criteria, staff could work to identify ideal locations within the Foothill Division and develop a phased implementation approach within existing services (or reduced services upon further budget reductions). In determining which locations would be the most advantageous, staff would consider the following as potential locations: Mayfair Community Center, Dr. Roberto Cruz Alum Rock Branch Library, Alum Rock Youth Center, and Emma Prusch Farm Park.

The Administration could work with PRNS and the Police Department to cross-train front-counter staff at existing community centers and libraries, identify potential space, and begin to assess the best location(s) to site police officers for targeted hours, when available. Consistent with the other Division's CPC staffing approach, the Department could target providing 8-10 hours/week at a potential location for the purposes of providing police presence.

### **FISCAL CONSIDERATIONS/ POLICY ALIGNMENT**

The CPC utilization data collected provides insight on the cost per service and nature of service delivery. This information has proven to be extremely helpful when evaluating how to revise the current CPC service delivery model and strongly indicates that the current service delivery model is not affordable, nor sustainable, in this fiscal environment. A revised service delivery model should be based on a modernized approach that takes advantage of civilian staff providing the majority of General Information services. This simple change will achieve a lower cost per service and, in fact, will expand the CPC services.

The alternative service delivery model was developed based on how to respond to the demand for service with existing staff and facilities. It also is innovative in that there is agreement from the Parks, Recreation and Neighborhood Service and Library Departments to integrate some level of service into their day-to-day business.

The City has been able to locate the existing CPCs through a low cost lease for the Southern Division CPC and use of general obligation bonds in the case of the Western and Central CPCs. In December 2008, staff stated that they would work with the City Attorney's Office to assess how to make changes to the CPC service delivery model consistent with the applicable bond measures. Staff's recommendation is to keep the two CPCs that were renovated and remodeled with Bond funds in operation, although with reduced hours in the case of the Central Division

**HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL**

**Subject:** Citywide Service Delivery Model for Community Policing Centers (CPCs)

July 21, 2009

Page 12

CPC. However, if either the Western CPC or Central CPC were to be closed and then sold during the term of the applicable bonds, it has been determined that the sale proceeds could only be used for a qualifying bond project. The qualifying bond project would not need to be a replacement CPC.

Development of a Foothill Division CPC would require that staff work to identify the best location, based on the revised service delivery criteria, and implement the Department's service needs to provide CPC service. The Public Safety Bond funds are general obligation bonds and may only be used for the purchase or improvement of real property. The development of a Foothill Division CPC would require furniture and equipment purchases and training expenditures that would not be eligible for payment from the Public Safety Bond funds. These estimated costs are set forth below:

**Table 5: CPC Estimated Costs**

<b>Service/Need</b>	<b>Estimated Cost</b>
Workspace/Cubicles (\$5,000/cubicle)	\$5,000-\$20,000
Police Department, IT Secure Server Communications Connectivity (assumes four workspaces)	\$15,000
Equipment (e.g., computers, phones, etc.) (\$5,000/workspace)	\$5,000-\$20,000
CPC Department Cross Training and Expenses (e.g., signage, etc.)	\$15,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$40,000-\$70,000</b>

\*Note: Estimated costs assume expenses for 1-4 workstations

The above table refers to estimated costs for the development of a Foothill CPC based on the revised CPC service delivery model. In order to apply this revised service delivery model, implementation would require training resources (for Library and PRNS staff), improved signage, and development of CPC information brochures. Given the lack of start-up resources available to quickly implement this approach, staff is proposing to implement this revised service delivery model within existing staff capacity, amongst other priorities, and over time.

**COORDINATION**

This memorandum has been coordinated with the City Manager's Budget Office, and the City Attorney's Office.

  
ROBERT L. DAVIS  
Chief of Police

  
ALBERT BALAGSO  
Director, Parks, Recreation &  
Neighborhood Services

  
JANE LIGHT  
Director, Library

For questions, please contact Capt. Phan Ngo at 277-4728 or Lt. Tom Sims at 277-5200.

Attachment (A): Benchmarking/Best Practices

**HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL**

**Subject:** Citywide Service Delivery Model for Community Policing Centers (CPCs)

July 21, 2009

Page 13

**ATTACHMENT A**

***Best Practices/Benchmarking***

Staff explored various California cities to understand better how community policing services were provided from a CPC-like perspective. It appears the City of San Jose is unique in providing CPC services. Listed below is a brief summary of what staff's benchmarking discovered, along with recent trends in service:

**Oakland:** The City of Oakland currently maintains an inconsistent service delivery model for their CPC-like functions. The City of Oakland's Police Department (OPD) has one substation, the Eastmont Precinct, which provides all the functions of a CPC. This precinct, located on the backside of the Eastmont Mall, offers all of the typical services that a precinct provides, in addition to over-the-counter services. For instance, citizens can file reports and citizen complaints. This precinct, which accounts for over 1/3 of all OPD activities, has a staff that consists of one intake individual and approximately 150 officers.

This example models more of the future Police Substation model and is, generally, not comparable; however, the OPD developed an alternative service delivery model to mirror the personal connection with officers that CPCs provide to the community. To accomplish this, OPD developed a list of "problem solving officers." These officers serve as contacts for specific issues. A list of these officers and their areas of expertise are available online for any community member to contact. Many years ago, OPD did have a regular Community Policing Unit, but it was eliminated through budget cuts.

In addition to the Eastmont Precinct, the OPD has a Chinatown Resource Center (CRC) that serves all of the functions of a CPC. This highly utilized Center serves the Asian community in and around Chinatown and is open during regular business hours. At the CRC, citizens can acquire translation services, file bi-lingual police reports, and obtain bi-lingual information on police, legal and community services. The staff consists of one police officer and two volunteers. In addition, the police officer assigned to the CRC also oversees foot patrol in the Chinatown area. The CRC was a result of a public/non-profit partnership between the Asian Advisory Committee on Crime (AACC). The AACC sponsors the equipment and materials and the OPD provides the police officer. The building was donated by a private individual.

**Long Beach:** The City of Long Beach has three Community Policing Centers. Of these three locations, two are considered highly utilized. The City recently closed the underutilized facility due to budget concerns.

The City of Long Beach's Neighborhood Services Bureau oversees these CPC facilities. Because the Neighborhood Services Bureau is Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funded, CPCs are located in areas that are exposed to higher blight and crime. At the facilities, citizens can file police/crime reports; receive fingerprinting services, and acquire direct access through the contact of police units. The staff consists of retired police officers and volunteers. At any given time, there is one retired officer and a group of volunteers providing approximately 33 hours a week of service.

## HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

**Subject:** Citywide Service Delivery Model for Community Policing Centers (CPCs)

July 21, 2009

Page 14

The City of Long Beach states there is large benefit in having a retired police officer in the facility because retired officers have the knowledge in how to advise citizens, community members tend to feel more comfortable confiding to a retired officer who is not in uniform, and retired officers have existing established relationships with on-duty officers in the surrounding area. The facilities also have a room that can be used for neighborhood purposes. Some have an advisory board that dictate the type of services delivered. In fiscal year 2007-2008, there were 3,000 walk-in visitors on average to each of the facilities.

**San Diego:** San Diego has 13 “storefronts” within their respective nine divisions. These storefronts, located in areas that typically attract high levels of pedestrian traffic, are staffed with volunteers to provide general information about police services to the public. Depending on the location, services can be custom-tailored to also include assistance with crime reports, fix-it tickets and fingerprinting services. For instance, the Multi-Cultural Storefront in the Mid-Town Division offers bi-lingual information on crime prevention and bi-lingual assistance for submitting crime reports. Sworn police officers do occasionally visit selected locations in order to complete reports; however, there are no pre-advertised police officer hours at any of the storefronts.

**Los Angeles:** The Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) does not have a CPC, but rather has a Baldwin Hill Park substation in the Baldwin Hill Park Mall that provides many of the functions that CPCs typically provide. The substation is located within this mall because the local community required LAPD presence in the mall as a stipulation of it being built. At the precinct, citizens can file crime reports. The police officers also help to supplement mall security. The staff consists of six on-duty police officers.

**Anaheim:** The Anaheim Police Department’s (APD) policing strategy consists of their Central Division serving as the APD headquarters, while the East and West District stations serve as CPC-like facilities. The East District station, located directly next to a daycare facility, only takes in reports. The West District station, located next to a library, provides most of the services that the Central Division provides, with the exception of Livescan fingerprinting capabilities. These Divisions are staffed either by part-time police officers that are typically assigned to light duty or police cadets that staff the front counters.

**San Francisco:** The City and County of San Francisco does not have community policing centers. Their policing model consists of nine police stations and one park police station throughout the City and County that serves as full-functioning police stations.

**Sacramento:** The Sacramento Police Department has a headquarters (Public Safety Center) and previously had three other CPC-like facilities. The North Command William J. Kinney Police Facility, Central Command Richards Police Facility and the South Command Joseph E. Rooney Police Facility were originally set-up to provide all the services that the headquarters currently makes available. In more recent years, the services provided decreased, leaving these facilities to only offer assistance with citations and home or business surveys. These facilities were staffed by two civilian employees from the records division. However, due to the current fiscal environment, these three facilities have become solely dedicated for internal Police Department activities since the fall of 2008, offering no public front counter visibility/assistance.