



**Law Enforcement and Deterrence Subcommittee
Increasing Police Presence Workgroup
01/24/08**

This packet contains handouts that were distributed at the Law Enforcement and Deterrence Subcommittee's Increasing Police Presence Workgroup meeting on January 24, 2008 and includes the following items:

- Memo from Lannie Russell (chair) to Workgroup
- JSO operational audit
- JSO calculation of patrol staffing requirements

MEMORANDUM

TO: Police Presence Subcommittee

FROM: Lanny Russell, Chair

DATE: February 14, 2008

Re: Potential Report Topics for Police Presence Subcommittee

1. Adding Officers to the Force

- a. Workload Analysis (*instead of per capita comparisons*) – See Attachment 1
- b. Evaluate cost per officer added (wages and benefits) and the annual cost escalators – See Attachment 2
- c. Proactive policing percentage ratios (40% vs. 45% vs. 50%) – how does that drive staffing? – See Attachment 3
- d. Funding for new officers
 - i. Matrix Audit -- See Attachment 4
 - ii. Historical analysis of JSO budget to be sent to committee members by February 21
 - iii. Corrections budget analysis to be sent to committee members by March 6
- e. Force multipliers, including CSOs
- f. Innovative staffing practices
- g. Federal/State support – money and personnel

2. Technology, Training and Innovation

- a. Innovative investments to improve crime fighting
- b. COMPSTAT vs. CRIMES – what is it and how does it work? How is it used in other cities? – Mick Hallett to provide a contact for the committee to hear from
- c. Training and hiring at all levels of the force
- d. What programs are working in the JSO that need added scale (i.e., the JSO/SAO partnership in prosecuting defendants in high-crime areas should be expanded)

3. Community Policing

- a. What are the differing definitions and what do we want in Jacksonville? -- Mick Hallett to provide a contact for the committee to hear from
- b. Community-based partnerships that are additive to JSO's efforts – Frank Mackesy to provide a contact for the committee to hear from
- c. Concerns of downtown merchants and property owners – Terry Lorince (DVI) invited to February 28 meeting
- d. Community-based force multipliers

Attachment

1

2. DEPARTMENT OF PATROL AND ENFORCEMENT

This chapter presents the project team's analysis of functions within the Patrol and Enforcement Department. Divisions covered within this section include:

- Patrol Division East
- Patrol Division West
- Community Affairs Division

Each division of the Patrol and Enforcement Department is discussed in the sections that follow.

1. ORGANIZATION OF THE PATROL DIVISIONS

The largest component of the Patrol and Enforcement Department is comprised of the Patrol East and Patrol West Divisions. Each of these Divisions is managed by a Chief who oversees three patrol zones each. Each Patrol zone is also managed by an Assistant Chief. The breakdown of the two divisions is shown below:

- Patrol East Division
 - Zone 1
 - Zone 2
 - Zone 3
 - DUI Unit
 - Crime Free Multi-Housing Unit
- Patrol West Division
 - Zone 4
 - Zone 5

- Zone 6

Note that specialized units such as traffic and the DUI squad are discussed after the two patrol divisions in a consolidated section, which focuses on selective enforcement issues.

2. THE JSO MAKES EFFECTIVE USE OF CRIME ANALYSIS AND WORKLOAD DATA TO DEPLOY PERSONNEL. HOWEVER, THE CURRENT APPROACH CAN BE MODIFIED TO MORE ACCURATELY IDENTIFY AREAS OF NEED.

The Jacksonville Sheriff's Office utilizes a number of best practices in identifying crime trends and adjusting patrol and enforcement operations to address emerging trends and issues. The points, below, describe the JSO's current approach to using crime analysis to deploy personnel and modify operations:

- **The JSO holds bi-weekly crime analysis meetings with all Division Commanders** to discuss crime issues, identify potential trends, and develop operational plans to combat these problems. The "crimes " are also utilized to develop materials for monthly Sheriff's Advisory Council (ShAdCo) meetings in each of the 6 patrol zones. This approach provides Zone Commanders with the analytical tools to focus on key crime issues in their areas.
- **The JSO utilizes crime analysts to evaluate patrol unit utilization** in each of the Patrol zones to identify workload and capacity issues and to direct new recruits and resources to those areas of need. The JSO prepares a "units fielded analysis" to analyze patrol officer utilization during each hour of the day, by patrol zone, for each quarter and annually. This type of analysis is not common in most law enforcement agencies and demonstrates a high level of professionalism within the JSO.
- **The JSO makes crime analysis available to all field personnel** so that they can identify crime trends and have access to incident reports. Providing this information is critical to empowering patrol officers to make informed decisions and be proactive in combating community problems.

While there are a number of current practices that the project team would consider 'best practices' for law enforcement agencies, there are opportunities for improvement. The next section discusses these issues.

(1) The Current Approach to Allocating Personnel Incorporates Officer Generated Workloads.

As indicated in the previous section, the Jacksonville Sheriff's Office utilizes an analytical model to deploy patrol personnel. The primary purpose of this model, called the "Units Fielded Analysis", is to evaluate the utilization of patrol in each of the six patrol zones. A number of factors are used in this analysis including:

- The total number of patrol units/officers available each hour of each day by patrol zone.
- The total number of patrol units/officers busy (and total time) responding to dispatched calls for service each hour of the day by patrol zone.
- The total number of patrol units/officers busy (and total time) responding to officer initiated activities by hour and patrol zone.
- The total number of patrol units/officers busy (and total time) out of service for other reasons including: meals, at station, special assignments, vehicle maintenance, court, roll call, at academy/training, "busy," "check off," at the firing range, on a traffic assignment, at "other locations, and "all other."

The fielded units analysis calculates the average number of patrol units / officers busy during each hour in each of the patrol zones. A target of 20% of units available at any given time is utilized to evaluate patrol officer capacity. If patrol zones are well below the target, these areas are considered for additional personnel.

A potential problem with this approach is that the availability of patrol at any given moment is tied to operational decisions about how personnel are utilized. For example, some patrol zones may utilize patrol more often for special assignments, traffic assignments, or spend more time on vehicle maintenance or at the firing range, than others. This could inflate the number needed in these areas.

(2) An Alternative Approach Utilizes Community Generated Workloads and Service Level Targets.

An alternative approach, recommended by the project team, would focus only on community generated workloads, proactivity targets and officer availability. This approach would include examining the following data elements:

- The number of patrol units available each day, by hour, and zone. This number should be adjusted for leave, roll call, training, and other administrative time. However, targets should be set for how much time should be dedicated to these activities.
- The total amount of time spent handling community generated calls for service. Only those calls that originate from the dispatch center would be considered in this analysis. Officer initiated activities would not be included. The total time spent on scene, for each unit involved, as well as time spent writing an incident report, handling an arrest and booking, and other follow up investigation should be included.
- The net available time can then be determined for each patrol zone for each hour of the day.

Using this approach, the JSO can evaluate the total amount of proactive time available in each patrol zone during each hour of the day. The project team believes that this approach is more appropriate for deploying personnel since factors, which are under the control of the JSO are not utilized (i.e., administrative time, self-initiated time, training, etc.). The following section expands upon this approach.

3. THE MATRIX CONSULTING GROUP TAKES AN ANALYTICAL APPROACH TO EVALUATING PATROL AVAILABILITY AND PATROL STAFFING

While it would be useful to identify a 'golden rule' of law enforcement staffing needs, the utilization of comparative measures does not provide for an appropriate evaluation of field staffing needs, nor should it be used as a primary basis for a local government to measure the effectiveness of law enforcement services. The Matrix

Consulting Group does not use a "per capita" or "per 1,000" ratio as an analytical tool in assessing field staffing needs, for the following reasons:

- Ratios do not consider the seriousness of the workload levels of the jurisdictions being compared. For example, the crime rate should be considered in any comparative analysis of workloads, specifically, the number of serious crimes in a community (e.g., murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, motor vehicle theft, and larceny).
- Ratios do not consider a jurisdiction's approach to alternative service delivery or "differential law enforcement response." The use of civilian personnel, or lack thereof, to handle community-generated calls for service and other workloads has great potential to impact the staffing levels of sworn personnel. The level or amount of civilians (i.e., community service, telephone reporting, online services, etc.) can be used to maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of sworn personnel handling higher priority calls in a community. These resources are not calculated in staffing ratios.
- Ratios do not consider the differences in service levels selected or capabilities, which a jurisdiction may have for their law enforcement services (e.g., community-oriented or problem-solving oriented, a reactive versus proactive philosophy, the utilization of City or County-wide resources in solving problems, etc.). All of which add to the inability to compare the necessary number of field patrol personnel.
- Ratios do not consider other differences which have an impact on regular patrol staffing needs such as existence of special enforcement / support units (such as JSO's Aviation Unit, COPS unit, Mounted Unit, K-9, etc.) as well as operational approaches (e.g., the use of field citations versus arrests, manual versus automated and field reporting systems, and whether patrol officers are expected to follow-up on certain investigations).
- Ratios do not take into account geographical differences (i.e., square miles of a service area) and other response impediments, which can impact patrol staffing needs.

For these reasons, the project team does not use "per capita" or "per 1,000 residents" ratios as a way for our clients to measure effectiveness in providing law enforcement services, or as a determinant in developing staffing needs. The project team's analysis of the JSO considered the need for a balance of community-generated

workloads and the availability of proactive time to generate activities. The following subsections describe this analytical process.

(1) The Analysis of Field Patrol Resource Requirements Should Be Based on Actual Workloads Handled and Appropriate Targets of Proactivity.

The Matrix Consulting Group utilizes a method in which the number of field personnel required is based on an analysis of the unique workloads and service level expectations of a community. In order to evaluate these resources and staffing issues, the project team conducted a data collection and analytical effort focusing on the following:

- Determining community generated workloads in the detail necessary to understand the work volume and the time required to handle it.
- Targeting an amount of time beyond community generated, or "reactive" workload, which can be utilized to be proactive in a directed kind of way (i.e., special enforcement of high-crime areas, etc.).
- The field resources used to handle calls for service and proactive workloads based on officer availability levels (after taking into account personnel time for vacation, sick, etc.).
- Deployment and scheduling utilized by the Jacksonville Sheriff's Office.

Field law enforcement services represent one of the areas of law enforcement operations in which staffing and service levels can be clearly quantified. Several factors determine the level of patrol staffing required in a community, including:

- The community generated call for service demand by time of day and day of week.
- How are units utilized and deployed. The East and West Patrol Divisions have 917 field personnel authorized (including special enforcement units) who are responsible for responding to community-generated calls for service in six patrol zones. These personnel work a staggered 11.42 hour staffing plan and are assigned to one of six shifts: 0500 to 1625, 0700 to 1825, 0900 to 2025, 1330 to 0055, 1530 to 0255, and 1830 to 0555 (Zone 6 only has 5 start times).

- How calls for service are managed by a law enforcement agency. Many departments throughout the United States “manage” calls for service in a number of ways. What these methods of handling calls for service have in common is that they free up time of trained professional officers from handling lower priority calls (i.e., routine calls) so that more of their available time can be spent on calls requiring a higher level of expertise and training.
- The level of service desired by communities varies, for example, the amount of “proactive” time, or “uncommitted” time a community desires. This is another factor impacting required patrol staffing levels. This involves time not spent handling community-generated calls for service and “proactive” time for which an officer is available for preventive patrol, self-initiated activity (i.e. observations including suspicious pedestrians or vehicles, etc.), special or directive patrol, and other approaches for addressing crime problems, quality of life issues, etc.

The project team employed a model based on these decision points in evaluating officer field staffing for the Jacksonville Sheriff's Office, in terms of workload, service levels, and overall operations. The following section identifies and discusses the various characteristics and elements of the field staffing model, and how proactive time is calculated.

(2) Workload and Data Elements Utilized in Patrol Staffing Model

Officers dedicate time to responding and handling community-generated calls for service, as well as related activities, including reports (particularly the more serious reports not completed during the initial handling of the call for service), arrests / bookings, back-up assistance, etc., as well as the associated times for these elements, as identified in the following table. These elements are all utilized to calculate total field commitments (i.e., proactive time) in our model, as follows:

Reactive Factor in Calculation of Proactive Time	Summary Discussion
Calls for Service	Based on actual data obtained from the JSO CAD System for 2006. Total calls for service were 524,555 (excludes all officer-initiated activity). The project team estimated 2007 calls for service by adding a growth factor of 2.42%. Population growth was estimated using an average growth factor developed from the City of Jacksonville Planning and Development Office.

Reactive Factor in Calculation of Proactive Time	Summary Discussion																
<p>Call Handling Time</p>	<p>The project team targets 30 to 40 minutes for an average handling time for all calls for service, including emergency, priority, and routine. Time, which is significantly more than the target range of 30-40 minutes, indicates patrol officers may not be timely in processing calls for service, while handling time significantly lower than this target indicates, officers may not be providing an appropriate amount of attention on calls.</p> <p>The project team estimated overall call-handling time at approximately 39 minutes. In addition, the average handling time by patrol zone was determined to account for variations in call severity (higher priority calls and more serious crimes) and handling time. The table, below, shows average handling time by patrol zone:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="889 741 1170 1066"> <thead> <tr> <th>Area</th> <th>Avg. Handling (Minutes)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Zone 1</td> <td>35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zone 2</td> <td>37</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zone 3</td> <td>38</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zone 4</td> <td>43</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zone 5</td> <td>39</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zone 6</td> <td>41</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>39</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Area	Avg. Handling (Minutes)	Zone 1	35	Zone 2	37	Zone 3	38	Zone 4	43	Zone 5	39	Zone 6	41	Total	39
Area	Avg. Handling (Minutes)																
Zone 1	35																
Zone 2	37																
Zone 3	38																
Zone 4	43																
Zone 5	39																
Zone 6	41																
Total	39																
<p>Back-Up Frequency / Number of Units per Call</p>	<p>Actual back-up rate was calculated based on response data indicating 1.60 patrol units responding, on average, to each call for service. This equates to a back-up unit rate of 0.6 (after considering the primary unit response).</p> <p>For the patrol staffing analysis, the project team utilized a target of 0.6 back-up units – this is the range of between 0.4 to 0.6 back-up units per call for service, which is typically seen by this project team for other law enforcement agencies. The project team also determined the back-up rate for each of the patrol zones to determine variations in total reactive time. The table, below, shows the average back-up rate by patrol zone:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="883 1493 1164 1791"> <thead> <tr> <th>Area</th> <th>Backup Rate</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Zone 1</td> <td>1.73</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zone 2</td> <td>1.60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zone 3</td> <td>1.53</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zone 4</td> <td>1.54</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zone 5</td> <td>1.68</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zone 6</td> <td>1.63</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>1.60</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Area	Backup Rate	Zone 1	1.73	Zone 2	1.60	Zone 3	1.53	Zone 4	1.54	Zone 5	1.68	Zone 6	1.63	Total	1.60
Area	Backup Rate																
Zone 1	1.73																
Zone 2	1.60																
Zone 3	1.53																
Zone 4	1.54																
Zone 5	1.68																
Zone 6	1.63																
Total	1.60																
<p>Duration of Time on Scene by Back-Up</p>	<p>Target of 75% of the initial handling unit's handling time. This is an assumption utilized by the project team.</p>																

Reactive Factor in Calculation of Proactive Time	Summary Discussion
Number of Reports	<p>Based on actual data, the total number of reports written by the JSO during 2006 was 115,478. This includes arrests and associated reports for community-generated calls for service. Note that this figure is different than the total number of reports since it only includes reports written on community generated calls.</p> <p>This figure was adjusted by the estimated growth rate for 2007 of 2.42%. The adjusted figure utilized by the project team was 118,273.</p>
Time to Complete a Report	<p>Target of 45 minutes average for completing incident reports for all calls for service.</p>
Number of Arrests / Bookings	<p>Based on the actual number of arrests made by JSO during 2006, this number was 49,266. This figure was also adjusted by 2.42% for 2007. The adjusted figure utilized by the project team was 50,561.</p>
Time to Complete an Arrest / Booking	<p>Current estimate of 1.0 hour for an officer to be involved in the booking of a prisoner.</p>
Proactivity Target	<p>The project team's analysis of field staffing needs utilizes alternative levels of proactive capability – ranging from 40% to 50% of a patrol officer's time. The staffing impacts of alternative levels of proactivity are described in a later section.</p>
Available Time of Patrol Officers on Duty	<p>This is based on leave data obtained from the JSO's Personnel Department showing the number of leave hours taken by JSO staff for various categories.</p> <p>During 2006, the average officer was not available approximately 312 hours. This is based on data collected from JSO Human Resources for October 2005 to April 2006. The project team used these data to extrapolate an average for officer availability. This equates to an availability of 85% (or 1,768 available hours divided by 2,080).</p> <p>In addition to leave data, the project team also makes a provision for time lost during shift, which includes time for meals, briefings, debriefings, court, vehicle checks, etc. This is estimated to be an additional 227 hours per officer per year (1.5 hours per shift for meals, administration, briefings, vehicle maintenance, court, and other duties).</p> <p>Thus leaving a total of 1,501 hours available for reactive and proactive field patrol time.</p>

The next section discusses proactive time targets for use in the staffing model.

(3) The Officer Field Staffing Requirement Analysis Developed for the JSO Balances Responsiveness to Community Generated Calls for Service While Providing Proactive Policing.

The project team developed its analysis of officer staffing needs and deployment based on the principle that both reactive (call handling) and proactive abilities need to be factored into the assessment. The concept of proactivity is very important in law enforcement – if field personnel are committed to calls a large portion of the time, they have little capability to impact the root causes of crime, to anticipate crime in selected situations, or to work with citizens. Further, field personnel with little uncommitted time find it difficult to produce the response times at community expected levels.

Law enforcement agencies which have a community policing philosophy should generally be utilizing proactive time targets within the 40% to 50% range. Proactive time below 40% does not provide time in sufficient blocks to be useable, while being above the 50% level is typically not affordable nor efficient, especially for larger organizations. The following table provides a brief discussion of the various proactive time targets in our patrol officer-staffing model:

40% Proactive Time	45% Proactive Time	50% Proactive Time
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Below this level, proactive time begins to come in blocks that are too small to be useful for problem-oriented policing, and the ability to quickly respond to calls for service diminishes. • Officers are providing the minimum level of effective service and should be able to engage in a wide range of preventive activities, including directed patrol, responding to non-criminal quality of life complaints, engaging in traffic and other activities. • Ability to engage in community meetings and other time consuming efforts. • This level requires active involvement of supervisors. More of the officer's time is dictated by the necessity of handling calls for service than in higher target situations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proactive time at this level provides a high level of service for the community, and provides an effective and efficient balance of reactive and proactive workload. • At this level, officers are providing a high level of service and should be able to address the proactive needs of the community, without having to deal with having too high or too low of proactive time available. • At this level as well, supervisors are to be held accountable for their officers' utilization, and for the results in the community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above this level, proactive time comes in blocks that are difficult to utilize in routine shift circumstances. • Proactive time of more than 50% is an inefficient and ineffective use of time, and it is difficult to manage personnel whose time is so heavily weighted in this way. • At this level, officers provide a very high level of service and should be able to engage in a full range of proactive activities (e.g., traffic, special enforcement and directed patrol). • This level of proactivity requires a commitment to actively manage the use of this time, for supervisors to be held accountable for their utilization and for the results in the community.

It is important to note that the use of special enforcement units has an impact on proactive time needs in Patrol. The JSO makes use of several proactive enforcement units including Bike Patrol, Foot Patrol, Mounted Patrol, K-9, COPS squads, Showdown Squad, Auto Burglary Task Force, and Crime Free Multi Housing Unit. The table, below, shows the current distribution of police officers by assignment:

JSO PO Assignments by Patrol Zone

Assignment	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Total
Patrol	76	122	124	151	132	68	673
Bike	9						9
COPS	6	11	5		9		31
Traffic	2	8	11	8	7	6	42
Walking	10						10
Task Force	2		7				9
Showdown					8		8
Desk		1		3	3	2	9
Total Pos	105	142	147	162	159	76	791
% Assigned to Patrol	72%	86%	84%	93%	83%	89%	85%
% Assigned to Special	28%	14%	16%	7%	17%	11%	15%

As shown above, an average of 15% of total Police Officer positions in patrol are utilized for special assignments. The use of special assignments also varies significantly from Zone to Zone, from 28% in Zone 1, to 7% in Zone 4.

Many medium to large sized agencies have made the decision to dedicate resources to deal with issues that require consistent and specialized enforcement that is difficult for patrol officers to perform. For example, conducting gang surveillance or preparing vehicle theft traps requires significant time not typically available within patrol. In addition, most larger communities utilize dedicated personnel for traffic enforcement. While the use of dedicated proactive enforcement units is appropriate for a large jurisdiction like Jacksonville, the allocation of these resources should be considered when establishing proactive time targets. As a result of the dedication and availability of special enforcement units in the City's overall policing effort, the project team recommends a target of 40% proactive time for Jacksonville.

The following points introduce and summarize several key factors that should be kept in mind when reviewing the analysis of proactive time:

- Effective local law enforcement requires a field patrol force which is designed and managed to be flexible in providing both reactive and proactive response to law enforcement issues in the community.
- This requires that the JSO balance personnel, resources and time to handle both of these types of law enforcement. Approximately 60% of the time, on average, an officer in the community should devote to handling all the elements of reactive patrol. The remaining 40% should be spent providing proactive patrol.
- The time which each officer should have dedicated to proactive patrol needs to be structured and should not be approached in a random way. Random patrol does not effectively address the issues facing any community; patrol should include efforts to address specific problems in predetermined ways.
- Any effective proactive approach to patrol requires that information be managed formally and utilized to evaluate deployment and crime prevention/suppression strategies. In addition, attempts to address problems should be evaluated formally – this is to ensure that an approach has been effective. This requires active participation by both sworn personnel and support staff to identify crimes, trends, and measure the effectiveness of prevention mitigation efforts.

These analytical elements represent the essential ingredients of effective, efficient, and contemporary law enforcement service.

(4) The Project Team Also Considered the Need to Provide Targeted Service Levels in Low Workload, Rural Areas.

In addition to evaluating proactive time levels within each of the patrol zones in the City of Jacksonville, the project team considered the unique need of providing a basic level of service to low workload, rural areas of the City. The City of Jacksonville encompasses a large geographic area (approximately 757 square miles). Given the size of some of the patrol sub-sectors serviced by the JSO, the project team evaluated the need for Officers in those areas that would need few officers from a workload perspective, but would require additional resources to provide minimum response times to emergency calls for service.

The table, below, shows those more rural areas that were considered for additional resources given geography, workload, and current response times:

Subsector	Avg. P1 Response
L-3	14.24
L-1	9.32
O-1	8.82
L-2	8.64
O-2	8.26
H-1	8.24
Q-2	7.91
H-3	7.90
I-1	7.85
J-3	7.50
K-3	7.43
Q-3	7.35
K-1	7.29
P-2	7.21
G-3	7.10
E-3	7.08
P-3	7.05
F-2	7.01
F-3	7.00
H-2	6.96
E-1	6.81
I-3	6.77
I-2	6.72
N-2	6.72
F-1	6.64
N-3	6.62
G-1	6.15
K-2	6.12
N-1	6.06
J-2	6.01
J-1	5.97
O-3	5.96
D-2	5.93
M-1	5.77
G-2	5.76
A-1	5.73
D-1	5.67
Q-1	5.57
M-3	5.44
M-2	5.35
D-3	5.24
E-2	5.01
B-2	5.00
P-1	4.92
C-3	4.55

Subsector	Avg. P1 Response
C-2	4.14
B-1	4.01
B-3	3.94
A-2	3.89
C-1	3.87
A-3	3.58
Total	6.28

As shown above, there are several sub-sectors where the average response time to priority 1 calls was greater than 7 minutes. This is relatively high for an emergency call for service. As a result, the project team focused on those areas with high response times as well as large geographical areas to evaluate additional staffing needs. The table, below, shows those areas with above average response times, large geographic areas, and which would receive relatively few officers based on workload:

Zone	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 5	Zone 6	Zone 6	Zone 6	Zone 6
Sub Sector	H-3	L-2	L-3	O-1	O-2	P-2	P-3	Q-2	Q-3
Sq. Miles	54.40	44.84	47.83	62.38	37.37	35.01	42.51	63.31	66.61
Reactive Time	10,021.26	4,409.61	1,671.66	2,978.35	6,827.41	8,916.37	3,811.69	8,274.86	8,896.44
Shift Length	11.42	11.42	11.42	11.42	11.42	11.42	11.42	11.42	11.42
Effective # shifts per day: 24 / shift length	2.10	2.10	2.10	2.10	2.10	2.10	2.10	2.10	2.10
Avg daily # of on-duty officers for reactive activities	2.40	1.06	0.40	0.71	1.64	2.14	0.91	1.99	2.13
Avg daily # of on-duty officers/shift for reactive activities	1.14	0.50	0.19	0.34	0.78	1.02	0.44	0.94	1.02

As shown in the table, in the sub-sectors identified as rural, approximately 1 or fewer officers are needed per shift for reactive workloads only – calls for service, back-up, arrests, and reports. Also note that each of these subsectors is over 30 square miles and 4 are larger than 50 square miles. In order to incorporate additional staffing needed

to provide a targeted response time in these areas, the project team utilized the following factors and assumptions:

- The largest sectors with the highest average response time to priority 1 calls were utilized.
- The total reactive workload was utilized to calculate "base" staffing needs.
- As in the previous analysis, a target of 40% proactive time was utilized.
- An average response time of 7 minutes to priority 1 calls for service was targeted in these areas. The number of additional officers needed to meet this response time was calculated based on an average emergency response speed of 45 miles per hour.
- The project team also considered the need to provide a minimum level of staffing to the City of Baldwin where law enforcement services are now provided by the JSO. The City is remote from other areas of Jacksonville and is bisected by rail lines. As a result, special consideration was made for this area.
- The number of additional officers needed each day was adjusted by the estimated percentage of proactive time "pre-emptable" or time which can be interrupted to immediately respond to an emergency call. The project team assumed that 50% of proactive activities could be preempted. The additional personnel needed for emergency response was adjusted by this figure.
- The daily number of personnel was adjusted by a shift factor of 2.78 (11.42 x 365 days / 1,501 hours of net availability).

This analysis will be shown for each of the patrol zones in addition to the proactive time analysis discussed in the previous sections.

(5) The Project Team Recommends a Patrol Staffing Model That Considers Jacksonville's Actual Experience and Policy Decisions About Proactive Service Levels.

Using actual workloads and the amount of field patrol staffing for the Jacksonville Sheriff's Office, the project team recommends our approach, which is characterized by the following key factors:

- Officer field staffing should be examined both in terms of the ability of current staff to provide for effective law enforcement services (i.e., proactive time

available to engage in practices to prevent crime, provide timely response to calls for service, increase public perceptions of safety, etc.) as well as the time to effectively and efficiently handle the workload generated by the community (i.e., reactive time generated by a call for service).

- Public policy is made by selecting a level of proactive time, which is deemed to be "appropriate" for the City, given its unique approach to law enforcement. In the case of Jacksonville, a 40% proactive time target should be utilized, enabling patrol to engage in a variety of targeted preventive activities, provide for officer safety, respond to calls for service in a more timely way (particularly for the lower priority calls for service), as well as address the community generated calls for service in the City. Utilizing these targets also recognizes that the JSO has made a decision to commit proactive time to specialized enforcement activities.
- The JSO and the City should also develop a policy for providing service to the rural areas. The project team recommends that a target of 7 minutes of average response time to emergency calls for service be utilized, as demonstrated in this report.

The following table provides a summary of the key elements of the staffing model, as well as a brief discussion of each:

Element of the Matrix Consulting Group's Patrol Staffing Model	Summary Discussion
Reactive Workload	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intended to be established by policy as 60% of an Officer's net available time. • This calculation takes administrative time (i.e., briefings, vehicle maintenance, etc.) out before this calculation is made. • This portion of workload is based on actual calls for service workload – the committed time (for all units) related to all elements of patrol workload. Note that officer-initiated workload should not be counted as a call for service. Calls for service are those that are generated by the community, which the JSO must respond to. In addition, the JSO should ensure that non-call for service CAD entries should be screened when determining this number.
Proactive Time Available	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeted at 40% of total time (i.e., the time not reacting to community generated calls for service) – as determined as a policy decision by the JSO and the City of Jacksonville.
Targeted Response Time to Rural Areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeted at 7 minutes average response time to emergency calls for service to low workload, large geographical areas that would be underserved based on workload and proactive time standards alone.

Element of the Matrix Consulting Group's Patrol Staffing Model	Summary Discussion
Administrative Time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On-shift time, which typically makes an officer unavailable to respond to calls for service and is counted as unavailable time (i.e., court, training, briefing and vehicle maintenance time). • However, JSO will respond to all emergency calls for service during their respective shift time (including during any lunch or briefing time).
Staff Availability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approach which considers staff availability after use of leave (e.g. vacation, sick, funeral, disability, etc.).
Turnover	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides for sufficient officer coverage during vacancies due to turnover. The project team used an estimate of 7% each year. • Accounting for turnover ensures consistent coverage during the time when new officers are recruited, trained, and evaluated before becoming available for patrol work.
Long-term Disability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides for sufficient officer coverage for personnel who are injured on the job and cannot return to work for a significant period of time or cannot perform the regular duties of a patrol officer due to injuries. • The project team estimated long-term disability at 5% per year.

This approach provides managers and policy makers with an easily understood measure of the capability of the patrol force for providing directed and proactive law enforcement (it is the time left over once calls for service have been handled). The following sections represent the results of the project team's analysis of proactive capability and staffing needs for the Jacksonville Sheriff's Office.

4. ANALYSIS OF OVERALL PROACTIVE TIME LEVELS WITHIN THE CITY OF JACKSONVILLE SHOWS THAT THE JSO IS CURRENTLY UNDERSTAFFED.

This section presents the project team's analysis of overall proactive time levels given the current assignment of personnel to patrol functions, shift schedule and officer deployment, and estimated workloads for 2007. In considering this analysis, the following points should be made:

- The assignment of officers by shift, reflects assignments as of July 2007.

JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA
Sheriff's Office Operational Audit

- Officers assigned to the field-training program are not counted as being available for duty. Also note that there are currently 94 Police Officer Recruits either in the academy or field training program. The addition of these officers will have a significant impact on overall proactive time levels.
- The JSO has approximately 40 civilian Community Service Officer positions just funded but vacant. Currently CSO's are utilized to handle traffic accidents and public service requests.

The first table, below, shows the overall assignment of personnel to patrol functions within the JSO. Note that the table shows the average scheduled deployment based on current shift assignments and rotation.

Average Patrol Officer Deployment (Non-Special Assignment)

Hour	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	Sunday
0000	194	194	194	194	194	194	194
0100	132	132	132	132	132	132	132
0200	129	129	129	129	129	129	129
0300	93	93	93	93	93	93	93
0400	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
0500	117	117	117	117	117	117	117
0600	57	57	57	57	57	57	57
0700	91	91	91	91	91	91	91
0800	91	91	91	91	91	91	91
0900	133	133	133	133	133	133	133
1000	133	133	133	133	133	133	133
1100	133	133	133	133	133	133	133
1200	133	133	133	133	133	133	133
1300	173	173	173	173	173	173	173
1400	205	205	205	205	205	205	205
1500	222	222	222	222	222	222	222
1600	229	229	229	229	229	229	229
1700	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
1800	214	214	214	214	214	214	214
1900	246	246	246	246	246	246	246
2000	221	221	221	221	221	221	221
2100	204	204	204	204	204	204	204
2200	204	204	204	204	204	204	204
2300	204	204	204	204	204	204	204

The following points highlight the information above:

- As shown above, the JSO deploys the largest number of officers during the 1400 to 2000 hours of the day.

JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA
Sheriff's Office Operational Audit

- The number of officers deployed begins to decline after midnight when the total number drops from 200 to 90 during the 0400 hours. The first watch begins in many zones at 0500 and is reflected in the table as the number of officers increases to 124.

The next table, below, compares the number of actual deployed officers (schedule minus leaves, training, and administrative time), compared to estimated workloads for 2007.

Hour	Estimated 2007 CFS	Primary Handling	Other Reactive	Total Reactive	Available Officer Hours	Lost Time	Net Available	% Proactive
00	18,622	12,291	10,911	23,202	70,643	19,639	51,004.04	55%
01	14,916	9,845	8,740	18,585	48,180	13,394	34,785.96	47%
02	12,713	8,391	7,449	15,840	47,131	13,102	34,028.31	53%
03	10,184	6,721	5,967	12,688	33,884	9,420	24,464.37	48%
04	7,832	5,169	4,589	9,758	32,668	9,082	23,585.94	59%
05	7,378	4,870	4,323	9,193	42,599	11,842	30,756.15	70%
06	11,060	7,300	6,480	13,780	20,927	5,818	15,109.05	9%
07	17,410	11,491	10,201	21,692	33,033	9,183	23,849.47	9%
08	20,714	13,672	12,137	25,809	33,033	9,183	23,849.47	-8%
09	21,213	14,001	12,429	26,430	48,545	13,496	35,049.49	25%
10	22,926	15,131	13,433	28,564	48,545	13,496	35,049.49	19%
11	24,673	16,284	14,456	30,741	48,545	13,496	35,049.49	12%
12	25,737	16,987	15,080	32,066	48,545	13,496	35,049.49	9%
13	26,179	17,278	15,339	32,616	63,054	17,529	45,524.81	28%
14	28,070	18,526	16,447	34,973	74,643	20,751	53,891.89	35%
15	30,136	19,890	17,657	37,547	80,939	22,501	58,437.78	36%
16	32,022	21,134	18,762	39,896	83,737	23,279	60,458.17	34%
17	33,417	22,055	19,579	41,634	72,970	20,286	52,684.04	21%
18	33,325	21,995	19,526	41,521	78,156	21,727	56,428.36	26%
19	30,927	20,412	18,121	38,532	89,790	24,962	64,828.38	41%
20	29,690	19,595	17,396	36,991	80,741	22,446	58,295.03	37%
21	28,610	18,883	16,763	35,646	74,278	20,649	53,628.36	34%
22	26,462	17,465	15,505	32,970	74,278	20,649	53,628.36	39%
23	23,032	15,201	13,495	28,696	74,278	20,649	53,628.36	46%
Total	537,249	354,584	314,784	669,369	1,403,136	390,072	1,013,064.22	34%

The following points highlight the information in the table, above:

- The overall level of proactive time within the JSO is currently 34%. This means that 66% of available patrol officer time is spent handling community-generated calls for service, arrests, and reports. This is below the 40% target recommended by the project team.

- Proactive time levels vary significantly throughout the day. During the hour of 0800, proactive time levels reach -8%. This means that workload is greater than available officer hours. This results in extended call "queuing" time or holding of 911 calls for service. It also impacts the ability of officers to take breaks for meals, preventive maintenance, and other duties. Note that proactive time is highest during the hours of midnight, 0200, and 0500. This is fairly common since midnight and late shifts are typically staffed to accommodate peak workloads. However, calls for service drop off significantly during the early morning hours.

The initial analysis indicates that the JSO is below recommended proactive time targets on an overall basis. The following sections evaluate patrol officer staffing needs by Division and zone.

5. ANALYSIS OF THE PATROL EAST DIVISION

As indicated previously, the Patrol East Division includes Patrol Zones 1, 2, and 3 as well as the DUI squad. Each of the following sections evaluates proactive time and overall staffing needs within each of these patrol zones.

(1) Patrol Zone 1

Zone 1 is the downtown area of Jacksonville and has a population of approximately 43,569 people covering 12.17 square miles. The current number of personnel assigned to this area is shown below:

Position	No.
Assistant Chief	1
Lieutenant	7
Sergeant	18
Patrol Officer	76
Bike Officer	9
COPS Officer	6
Springfield Task Force	2
Traffic Officer	2
Walking Officer	10
CSO	2
Clerical Aide III	1
Total	134

Attachment

2

Cost of 20 Officers

<u>Month</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>FY 2008-2009</u>	<u>FY 2009-2010</u>	<u>FY 2010-2011</u>
Oct 2008	Salaries	757,850	864,676	937,560
20 Officers	Special Pay	24,000	24,000	24,000
12 Months	Pension	251,052	285,354	308,757
	Group Health	70,560	101,606	109,735
	Group Life	2,459	3,741	4,056
	Med tax	11,337	12,886	13,943
	Dental	2,700	3,654	3,710
	Vehicles	432,580	-	-
	Fuel & Maint	8,000	98,880	101,846
	Radios & Laptops	236,660	-	-
	Uniforms & Equipment	80,000	87,756	90,389
	Total	<u>1,877,198</u>	<u>1,482,553</u>	<u>1,593,995</u>

Attachment

3

Calculation of Patrol Staffing Requirements

A) As shown in Matrix Nov 07 draft report	Reactive Factors	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Total All Zones
1. COMMUNITY GENERATED WORKLOADS								
CFS 2006		60,878	98,499	114,878	118,584	92,443	39,265	524,547
Inflator % used for growth	2.42%	62,351	100,883	117,658	121,454	94,680	40,215	537,241
Handling Time factor (Pg. 26 of Rpt)		34.670	37.297	37.881	43.179	38.665	41.351	
Handling Time		36,029	62,710	74,283	87,404	61,013	27,716	349,156
Back Up rate (Pg. 26 of Rpt)	0.6	0.7338	0.5966	0.5271	0.5351	0.6839	0.6266	
Estimated % of Back Up Units based on Initial Units	0.75							
Handling Time for Back Up Units		0.55	0.45	0.40	0.40	0.51	0.47	
Total Time for Back Up Unit CFS Handling		19,828	28,060	29,366	35,077	31,295	13,025	156,652
Number of Reports (2006)		13,402	21,684	25,290	26,106	20,351	8,644	115,477
Inflator % used for growth	2.42%	13,726	22,209	25,902	26,738	20,844	8,853	118,272
Target Average for Writing Reports	45							
Total Time for Report Writing		10,295	16,657	19,427	20,053	15,633	6,640	88,704
Number of CFS Arrests/Bookings (2006)		5,729	9,269	10,811	11,160	8,700	3,695	49,364
Inflator % used for growth	2.42%	5,868	9,493	11,073	11,430	8,911	3,784	50,559
Time to Process CFS Arrests (hours, est)	1							
Total Time for CFS Arrests/Bookings		5,868	9,493	11,073	11,430	8,911	3,784	50,559
TOTAL TIME TO HANDLE COMMUNITY GENERATED WORKLOADS								
		72,019	116,920	134,149	153,965	116,852	51,165	645,070
2. TIME FOR PREVENTATIVE PATROL AND OFFICER INITIATED ACTIVITY								
Target Percentage Available time	40%	48,013	77,947	89,432	102,643	77,902	34,110	430,047
3. TOTAL TIME REQUIRED FOR REACTIVE AND PROACTIVE ACTIVITIES								
		120,032	194,867	223,581	256,608	194,754	85,275	1,075,117
4. PER OFFICER AVAILABILITY								
Scheduled Hours	2080							
Leave Time hours	312							
Avg In-Service / Away Training hours	40							
Hours lost per shift	1.5							
Net shifts after leave time	151							
Net hours lost on shift (Lunch, briefings, etc.)	227							
Net hours worked each year	1501							
5. # OFFICERS REQUIRED TO HANDLE WORKLOADS								
Target Percentage Available time	40%							
# Officers		80	130	149	171	130	57	717
6. # OFFICERS REQUIRED WITH TURNOVER								
Officer Turnover		6	9	10	12	9	4	50
# Officers required with turnover	7.00%	86	139	159	183	139	61	767
7. # OFFICERS REQUIRED WITH TURNOVER and LONG TERM DISABILITY								
Disabled officers	5.00%	4	7	7	9	7	3	37
Tot # officers required with Turnover and LTD		90	146	167	192	146	64	805
8. ADJ FOR RURAL AREAS (P. 81)								
Tot# officers required with Turnover, LTD, and adjustment for rural areas		90	146	170	202	158	75	841
# Officer Currently Assigned (P. 30)		76	122	124	150	132	68	672
Net addition (reduction) of officers		14	24	46	52	26	7	169
Recruits (in training) assigned to Patrol								94
Total number of additional officers required with Turnover, LTD, Adjustment for Rural Areas and net of Recruits								75

Adjustment for CSO response (54)
 Net number of additional officers required at 40% proactivity 21

Calculation of Patrol Staffing Requirements

	Reactive Factors	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Total All Zones
B) 45% proactivity rate								
1. COMMUNITY GENERATED WORKLOADS								
CFS 2006		60,878	98,499	114,878	118,584	92,443	39,265	524,547
Inflator % used for growth	2.42%	62,351	100,883	117,658	121,454	94,680	40,215	537,241
Handling Time factor (Pg. 26 of Rpt)		34.670	37.297	37.881	43.179	38.665	41.351	
Handling Time		36,029	62,710	74,283	87,404	61,013	27,716	349,156
Back Up rate (Pg. 26 of Rpt)	0.6	0.7338	0.5966	0.5271	0.5351	0.6839	0.6266	
Estimated % of Back Up Units based on Initial Units	0.75							
Handling Time for Back Up Units		0.55	0.45	0.40	0.40	0.51	0.47	
Total Time for Back Up Unit CFS Handling		19,828	28,060	29,366	35,077	31,295	13,025	156,652
Number of Reports (2006)		13,402	21,684	25,290	26,106	20,351	8,644	115,477
Inflator % used for growth	2.42%	13,726	22,209	25,902	26,738	20,844	8,853	118,272
Target Average for Writing Reports	45							
Total Time for Report Writing		10,295	16,657	19,427	20,053	15,633	6,640	88,704
Number of CFS Arrests/Bookings (2006)		5,729	9,269	10,811	11,160	8,700	3,695	49,364
Inflator % used for growth	2.42%	5,868	9,493	11,073	11,430	8,911	3,784	50,559
Time to Process CFS Arrests (hours, est)	1							
Total Time for CFS Arrests/Bookings		5,868	9,493	11,073	11,430	8,911	3,784	50,559
TOTAL TIME TO HANDLE COMMUNITY GENERATED WORKLOADS		72,019	116,920	134,149	153,965	116,852	51,165	645,070
2. TIME FOR PREVENTATIVE PATROL AND OFFICER INITIATED ACTIVITY								
Target Percentage Available time	45%	58,925	95,662	109,758	125,971	95,606	41,862	527,785
3. TOTAL TIME REQUIRED FOR REACTIVE AND PROACTIVE ACTIVITIES		130,944	212,582	243,907	279,936	212,459	93,027	1,172,855
4. PER OFFICER AVAILABILITY								
Scheduled Hours	2080							
Leave Time hours	312							
Avg In-Service / Away Training hours	40							
Hours lost per shift	1.5							
Net shifts after leave time	151							
Net hours lost on shift (Lunch, briefings, etc.)	227							
Net hours worked each year	1501							
5. # OFFICERS REQUIRED TO HANDLE WORKLOADS								
Target Percentage Available time	45%							
# Officers		87	142	162	186	142	62	781
6. # OFFICERS REQUIRED WITH TURNOVER								
Officer Turnover		6	10	11	13	10	4	54
# Officers required with turnover	7.00%	93	152	173	199	152	66	835
7. # OFFICERS REQUIRED WITH TURNOVER and LONG TERM DISABILITY								
Disabled officers	5.00%	4	7	8	9	7	3	38
Tot # officers required with Turnover and LTD		97	159	182	208	159	69	874
8. ADJ FOR RURAL AREAS (P. 81)				3	10	12	11	36
Tot# officers required with Turnover, LTD, and adjustment for rural areas		97	159	185	218	171	80	910
# Officer Currently Assigned (P. 30)		76	122	124	150	132	68	672
Net addition (reduction) of officers		21	37	61	68	39	12	238
Recruits (in training) assigned to Patrol								94
Total number of additional officers required with Turnover, LTD, Adjustment for Rural Areas and net of Recruits								144

Adjustment for CSO response (54)
 Net number of additional officers required at 45% proactivity 90

Calculation of Patrol Staffing Requirements

	Reactive Factors	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Total All Zones
C) 50% proactivity rate								
1.COMMUNITY GENERATED WORKLOADS								
CFS 2006		60,878	98,499	114,878	118,584	92,443	39,265	524,547
Inflator % used for growth	2.42%	62,351	100,883	117,658	121,454	94,680	40,215	537,241
Handling Time factor (Pg. 26 of Rpt)		34.670	37.297	37.881	43.179	38.665	41.351	
Handling Time		36,029	62,710	74,283	87,404	61,013	27,716	349,156
Back Up rate (Pg. 26 of Rpt)	0.6	0.7338	0.5966	0.5271	0.5351	0.6839	0.6266	
Estimated % of Back Up Units based on Initial Units	0.75							
Handling Time for Back Up Units		0.55	0.45	0.40	0.40	0.51	0.47	
Total Time for Back Up Unit CFS Handling		19,828	28,060	29,366	35,077	31,295	13,025	156,652
Number of Reports (2006)		13,402	21,684	25,290	26,106	20,351	8,644	115,477
Inflator % used for growth	2.42%	13,726	22,209	25,902	26,738	20,844	8,853	118,272
Target Average for Writing Reports	45							
Total Time for Report Writing		10,295	16,657	19,427	20,053	15,633	6,640	88,704
Number of CFS Arrests/Bookings (2006)		5,729	9,269	10,811	11,160	8,700	3,695	49,364
Inflator % used for growth	2.42%	5,868	9,493	11,073	11,430	8,911	3,784	50,559
Time to Process CFS Arrests (hours, est)	1							
Total Time for CFS Arrests/Bookings		5,868	9,493	11,073	11,430	8,911	3,784	50,559
TOTAL TIME TO HANDLE COMMUNITY GENERATED WORKLOADS		72,019	116,920	134,149	153,965	116,852	51,165	645,070
2. TIME FOR PREVENTATIVE PATROL AND OFFICER INITIATED ACTIVITY								
Target Percentage Available time	50%	72,019	116,920	134,149	153,965	116,852	51,165	645,070
3. TOTAL TIME REQUIRED FOR REACTIVE AND PROACTIVE ACTIVITIES								
		144,039	233,840	268,297	307,930	233,705	102,330	1,290,140
4. PER OFFICER AVAILABILITY								
Scheduled Hours	2080							
Leave Time hours	312							
Avg In-Service / Away Training hours	40							
Hours lost per shift	1.5							
Net shifts after leave time	151							
Net hours lost on shift (Lunch, briefings, etc.)	227							
Net hours worked each year	1501							
5. # OFFICERS REQUIRED TO HANDLE WORKLOADS								
Target Percentage Available time	50%							
# Officers		96	156	179	205	156	68	860
6. # OFFICERS REQUIRED WITH TURNOVER								
Officer Turnover		7	11	13	14	11	5	61
# Officers required with turnover	7.00%	103	167	192	219	167	73	921
7. # OFFICERS REQUIRED WITH TURNOVER and LONG TERM DISABILITY								
Disabled officers	5.00%	5	8	9	10	8	3	43
Tot # officers required with Turnover and LTD		108	175	202	229	175	76	965
8. ADJ FOR RURAL AREAS (P. 81)				3	10	12	11	36
Tot# officers required with Turnover, LTD, and adjustment for rural areas		108	175	205	239	187	87	1,001
# Officer Currently Assigned (P. 30)		76	122	124	150	132	68	672
Net addition (reduction) of officers		32	53	81	89	55	19	329
Recruits (in training) assigned to Patrol								94
Total number of additional officers required with Turnover, LTD, Adjustment for Rural Areas and net of Recruits								235

Adjustment for CSO response (54)
 Net number of additional officers required at 50% proactivity **181**

Attachment

4

SUMMARY OF MATRIX RECOMMENDATIONS plus Sheriff's request for 45% Proactivity level or 80 additional officers

	Estimated Cost/(Savings)		Police Positions	CO's	Civilian Positions	Total Positions	
	Per Matrix						
INVESTIGATIONS & HOMELAND SECURITY/NARCOTICS & VICE	\$ 3,889,337	\$ (3,434,485)	(4)	9	44	49	
CORRECTIONS	\$ 386,798	\$ (1,863,339)	0	75	35	110	
POLICE SERVICES	\$ 1,092,782	\$ (102,614)	(4)	0	61	57	
PERSONNEL & PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	\$ 559,659	\$ -	3	1	4	8	
OFFICE OF SHERIFF & UNDERSHERIFF	\$ -	\$ -	(1)			(1)	
Sub-total Matrix before Patrol	\$ 5,928,576	\$ (5,400,438)	(6)	85	144	223	
JSO Cost Analysis							
PATROL							
Matrix	\$ 1,120,000	\$ (352,522)	21			21	\$ 1,174,864
JSO (Proactivity @45%)	\$ 4,266,666		80			80	\$ 4,574,770
TOTAL PATROL	\$ 5,386,666	\$ (352,522)	101	0	0	101	\$ 5,749,634
TOTAL MATRIX	\$ 7,048,576	\$ (5,752,960)	15	85	144	244	
JSO (Proactivity @45%)	\$ 4,266,666		80			80	
TOTAL	\$ 11,315,242	\$ (5,752,960)	95	85	144	324	
							Annual 08/09 Cost (assumes hired 10/1/08)
							One-time Cost
							Total
							\$ 1,174,864
							\$ 789,222
							\$ 1,964,086
							\$ 4,574,770
							\$ 3,006,560
							\$ 7,581,330
							\$ 5,749,634
							\$ 3,795,782
							\$ 9,545,416