



# **Comprehensive Staffing Needs Projection**

## **Eugene Police Department**



### **Final Report**

**Submitted by:  
Magellan Research Corporation**

**April 2007**

## **Table of Contents**

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Current Level of Police Service in Eugene</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Service Levels Defined</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Modeling Efforts</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Sworn and Civilian Staffing Needs</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Patrol Staffing Needs</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Investigations Division Staffing Needs</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Community Policing Support Team Staffing Needs</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Data and Records Section Staffing Needs</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Campus Team Staffing Needs</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>School Resource Team Staffing Needs</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Command Staff Personnel</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Summary of Staffing Needs</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Appendix A</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Appendix B</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Appendix C</b>	<b>38</b>

## **Introduction**

In April 2006, the Eugene Police Department (EPD) contracted with Magellan Research Corporation for a comprehensive staffing study of the department. Various methodologies were employed during the study including interviews with supervisors and command staff, focus groups with agency personnel, analysis of existing departmental data, and collection of original data. The specific methodology employed while studying each unit will be discussed later in this report. Magellan Research Corporation was tasked with developing staffing needs projections based upon two levels of service: basic service level and typical community policing model level. Command staff and agency personnel assisted Magellan Research Corporation staff in defining the two levels of service based upon the needs of the community.

## **Current Level of Police Service in Eugene**

Oregon has the lowest number of police officers per capita in the United States and Eugene and Lane County have fewer police than most parts of Oregon. The existing level of police service provided to the citizens of Eugene is very low due to significant understaffing in the Eugene Police Department in comparison to other municipal law enforcement agencies in the United States. When Eugene is compared to the cities participating in the International City/County Managers Association (ICMA) Center for Performance Measurement (CPM) program, police services in the City of Eugene fall in the bottom tier of cities on several basic measures. Compared to a typical CPM city, the EPD has:

- Significantly higher property crime;
- Dispatches an officer to far fewer calls for service from the public;
- Dispatches far fewer calls as top priority;
- Takes much longer to respond to calls for service;
- Is much less likely to assign serious property crime reports to a detective;
- Is less likely to cite drivers for moving traffic violations; and
- Must spend more on overtime to provide police services to the public (see table below).

<b>Measure</b>	<b>EPD FY06</b>	<b>ICMA Median FY05</b>
Part I property crimes reported per 1,000 capita	77	39
Dispatched calls for service per 1,000 capita	301	570
Calls dispatched as top priority per 1,000 capita	19	68
Officer response time to top priority calls (minutes)	8.1	6.2
Percent of Part I property crime reports assigned to detectives	5%	39%
Moving violation traffic citations per 1,000 capita	86	107
Percent overtime expenditures for sworn officers	7.5%	6.7%

Unfortunately, these differences have worsened since 2000 and this level of police service should be completely unsatisfactory to the citizens of Eugene. Most assuredly, someone moving to Eugene from nearly anywhere else in the United States will find a much lower level of police service and higher property crime in Eugene. However, the above is not a reflection of the work habits of Eugene police officers. On a per officer or per crime basis, the performance of EPD is exceptionally high by any measure. In addition, the above is not a reflection on the officer assignment practices of Eugene PD. Other departments have significant numbers of sworn personnel performing functions that could be performed by civilian personnel. In these instances, civilian personnel can be hired so the sworn personnel can be reassigned to patrol, investigations, and other divisions within the department. However, this is not an option for the Eugene Police Department. According to the 2005 FBI Crime in the United States report, EPD has a higher portion of civilian employees than 96 percent of all municipal police departments with between 150 and 450 FTE. Therefore, increased civilianization is not a viable option for EPD to pursue.

### **Service Levels Defined**

As previously stated, Magellan Research Corporation was tasked with developing staffing needs projections based upon two levels of service: basic service level and typical community policing model level. It is important to define these terms.

#### **Basic Service Level**

The basic service level approaches the level of policing typically found in other communities. This begins with a commonly used response time standard of five minutes for the time it takes a patrol officer to arrive at a call for service regarding in-progress violence or life safety hazards. In addition, rapid police response to some types of calls is critical to prevent bad situations from becoming much worse. This standard would require EPD to dispatch a larger number of calls as top priority and to substantially reduce average response times. While a large number of CPM cities have been achieving this level of performance, response times for EPD have been getting worse over the last several years and fewer calls have been dispatched as top priority. Today, the average response time of EPD officers to top priority calls is two minutes longer than in FY 2000. The basic service level also includes some usable patrol time for minimum proactive activities as defined and prioritized by a community policing approach.

The basic service level for criminal investigations is more modest because of the limited prosecution and court capacity within Lane County. The District Attorney's Office was staffed with 29 Deputy District Attorneys in the Criminal Division and 11 full-time investigators 25 years ago. The workload has more than doubled since then, and the county population has increased by over 60,000, but the District Attorney's Office has lost 7 Deputy District Attorneys and all but 1 of the 11 criminal investigator positions have been eliminated. This puts additional burden on the workload of EPD detectives

since they are required to provide investigative support to the District Attorney's Office that would typically be provided by DA Office investigators in other counties in the United States. With that said, the basic service level goals set for the three investigative units studied are about half that in a typical community for property and financial crimes.

The increased service level of patrol and investigations will have a ripple effect throughout the department, affecting the workload of other divisions within the police department. For example, the increase in patrol and investigations service levels will result in a larger volume of records for the Data and Records Section of EPD to process. In addition, comparable improvements in the response times for calls involving in progress property crimes, serious safety hazards (priority 2) and other types of calls (priority three) would occur for both patrol officers as well as community service officers assigned to the Bethel Public Safety Station.

### **Typical Community Policing Model Level**

The highest level of police service, referred to as the typical community policing model level, will provide the same level of service as found in a typical American community (similar to Eugene) as best as can be measured using available performance data. In addition to the basic services described above, patrol officers would be able to spend an additional 20 percent of their time conducting community policing activities. A commonly used service standard for community policing activities requires that 40 percent of patrol officers' duty time be unobligated or twice the level provided in this study. It should be noted that no similar time allocation has been included for formal problem oriented, proactive policing by the detective units. In addition, people reporting serious crimes should be just as likely to have a follow-up investigation of their report as found in a typical American community. This will require a very substantial increase in the number of felony property and financial crime cases assigned to detectives. Again these changes will produce an increased volume of records for the Data and Records Section of EPD to process.

### **Modeling Efforts**

After the initial interviews and focus groups, command staff of the EPD agreed that the following units would be the focus of the study because they can be quantitatively assessed and, in most instances, mathematical models can be developed to determine staffing needs:

- Patrol
  
- Investigations Division
  - Financial Crimes Unit
  - Property Crimes Unit
  - Violent Crimes Unit

- Community Policing Support Team
- Data and Records Section
  - Records Unit
  - Operations Analysis Unit
- University of Oregon Campus Team
- School Resource Team

This staffing study included half of the staff positions authorized by the Eugene Police budget for FY2007. The remaining staff were not studied for one of several reasons. First, since an operational assessment, including staffing study, of the Communications Section was recently completed by an independent consultant, Magellan Research Corporation was *not* tasked with assessing the staffing needs of this section. Second, with a few exceptions such as patrol, supervisors were not directly studied. Staffing needs projections are generally not made on the number of sergeants, lieutenants, captains, and civilian supervisors needed in the department although some comments regarding the staffing of command staff positions are discussed later in this report. The number of supervisors, especially middle managers and command staff, is typically left to the discretion of the Chief of Police. Third, some units in the department have few personnel. In most instances, mathematical modeling is vulnerable to significant error when units with few personnel are studied. Therefore, decisions on staffing levels in small units are left to policy decisions made by the Chief of Police. Fourth, some units are not conducive to quantitative assessment and mathematical modeling because of the nature of the work performed in these units. For example, it is impractical to mathematically determine the level of staff needed for the Vice Narcotics Unit because the activity of this unit is mostly proactive and the number of cases worked in this unit is largely defined by the amount of staff. When assessing investigation staffing levels, mathematical modeling is most appropriate on reactive units. Staffing levels in proactive units such as the Vice Narcotics Unit is again a policy decision, and should be left to the discretion of the Chief of Police. The same applies to other units in EPD such as the Internal Affairs Unit, the K- 9 Unit, and the Traffic Enforcement Unit.

For most of the sections and divisions assessed in this study, a mathematical staffing model was created in order to project staffing needs for the basic and typical community policing model levels. Before staffing projections were made, substantial effort was expended to validate the models as a reflection of current actual staffing levels in EPD. As discussed later in this report, actual staffing levels can vary considerably from authorized staffing levels especially for patrol. In most cases, three years of data were averaged to produce most of the values used for modeling. The exceptions are case assignment data in investigations which is based on seven months plus some records and community service officer data which was gathered during the study. Although initial validation efforts were successful in most instances, challenges occurred with a few of the models especially the model created for the Financial Crimes Unit. In general, it is difficult to accurately model small units. In addition, there is a wide variability of labor

required per case in the Financial Crimes Unit which is much higher than in the property and violent crimes unit. Furthermore, the data collection period in the Financial Crimes Unit was six weeks which makes it very difficult to reliably estimate annual staffing requirements from a short term sample of cases in a small unit. Therefore, reasonable adjustments were required to reflect current staffing levels in this unit.

The remainder of the report will focus on the staffing needs of the divisions/units/teams assessed in this study.

## **Sworn and Civilian Staffing Needs**

Many Eugeniens have lived in other communities in America. This study identifies the staffing needed to provide a level of police service typically provided in other communities in the United States. Some form of community policing is typical in American police agencies today. A proactive problem solving approach to policing has been a goal of Eugene police chiefs, city managers, budget committees, and city councils since the early 1990s. This study quantifies the staffing needed to accomplish a significant portion of this goal.

## **Patrol Staffing Needs**

The primary issue addressed in the patrol staffing needs section of this study focuses on the question: How many sworn police officers should be assigned to patrol in the Eugene Police Department? The methodology employed to answer this question was the use of the Model for the Allocation of Patrol Personnel (MAPP). MAPP is an allocation model created by Justice Research Consultants, LLC, and has been successfully employed in other cities and jurisdictions to accurately project the number of officers required in patrol, utilizing variable service level schemes or performance objectives.

The Model for the Allocation of Patrol Personnel (MAPP) is designed to determine the number of officers that need to be assigned to patrol based on established performance objectives. The model first determines the number of officers needed to answer calls for service. The model then builds upon that number to ensure that enough officers are assigned to patrol so that performance objectives can be met. There are five performance objectives for patrol used in this model. They include:

- **Ability to meet response time goals for Priority 1 and 2 calls** – It is crucial for officers to be able to respond rapidly to a Priority 1 call. Priority 1 calls involve in-progress violent crimes and immediate life-safety danger. In addition, it is also important for officers to respond quickly to Priority 2 calls to ensure the situation does not escalate into a more serious situation. Priority 2 calls involve in-progress serious property crimes and significant safety hazards. Therefore, the model takes into account the number of officers that need to be assigned to patrol in order to meet the department's response time goals for Priority 1 and 2 calls.

- **Ability to meet response time goals for Priority 3 calls** – All other calls not categorized as Priority 1 or 2 are Priority 3. It is also important for officers to be able to respond to Priority 3 calls in a reasonable amount of time primarily for citizen satisfaction purposes and to prevent any escalation that may occur. Therefore, the model also takes into account the number of officers that need to be assigned to patrol in order to meet the department’s response time goal for Priority 3 calls.
- **Having an officer available to immediately respond to a Priority 1 call** – The department must have officers available who can immediately respond to a Priority 1 call for service. If all on-duty officers are busy on other calls for service and activities, then the responses to Priority 1 calls will be delayed. Therefore, a performance objective is set in the MAPP model for the percentage of Priority 1 calls for which there should be at least one officer available to respond. This model then takes that percentage into account in determining the number of officers that need to be assigned to patrol.
- **Visibility of officers** – The public, as they carry out their daily activities, likes to see police officers. They also like to see police officers in their neighborhoods. It is important for the police to be visible to citizens in order to make citizens feel safe and to deter potential criminal activity. Therefore, this model sets visibility objectives for patrol and determines how many officers need to be assigned to patrol to meet these objectives. This performance objective is weighted the least in the allocation model created for EPD.
- **Officer Self-Initiated and Administrative Time** - This model also takes into account additional performance objectives that are set by agency personnel. First, officers are expected to spend a certain percentage of their on-duty time performing self-initiated activities such as enforcing traffic violations, stopping suspicious persons, and patrolling locations known for criminal activity. In addition, a portion of self-initiated officer activity is not discretionary such as the occurrence of an accident or fight in front of an officer. Second, officers spend a certain percentage of their time on administrative activities as well such as meal breaks and tending to their patrol vehicles. The model accounts for these additional activities performed by officers when determining the number of officers that need to be assigned to patrol.

The base MAPP was modified to fit the needs of the Eugene Police Department. The data used in the development of the MAPP were obtained from EPD personnel. EPD personnel defined the two services levels previously mentioned and applied those service levels to patrol. Some of the values for the variables used in the model are based on policy decisions made by EPD command staff.

The MAPP was used to develop staffing projections for each of the two service levels. The model and staffing projections only apply to first responders to calls for service and does not apply to the Bike Patrol Team, West University Neighborhood Foot Patrol Team, University of Oregon Campus Team, School Resource Team, K-9 Unit, and Community Service Officers. Staffing needs of the Campus Team, School Resource Team, and Community Service Officers will be discussed later in this report. Of the



remaining teams, only the K-9 Unit consistently responds to calls for service but they are rarely the primary responder on a call. It is very time consuming to identify the calls in which a K-9 unit responded. Therefore, EPD executive personnel have recommended that three officers be subtracted from the patrol strength projected by the MAPP to account for the K-9 unit in the staff projections.

The data used in the model were obtained from several sources. First, the values for some variables are based on an analysis of data performed by EPD personnel. These variables are highlighted in green in Table 1. Second, the values for some variables are based on policy decisions made by the command staff of the department. These variables are highlighted in yellow in Table 1. Third, since estimates of average patrol and response speeds were not available from the department, the average patrol and response speeds for other jurisdictions that have used similar allocation models were used.

### **Eugene Results from Model for the Allocation of Patrol Personnel -- MAPP**

The current level of service provided to the citizens of Eugene by patrol officers includes answering 3,300 Priority 1 calls, 22,700 Priority 2 calls, and 14,200 Priority 3 calls for service each year. Officers respond to Priority 1 calls in 5.1 minutes after being dispatched, Priority 2 calls in 12 minutes, and Priority 3 calls in 30 minutes. In addition, it is estimated that officers are immediately available to respond to a Priority 1 call for service 85% of the time. Furthermore, officers spend an average of 17% of their shift (10.5 minutes per hour) on self-initiated activity.

#### **Basic Service Level**

With the Basic Service Level, patrol officers will be able to respond to more calls for service than they currently are and more calls for service will be coded as Priority 1 calls which will allow for rapid response. The response time goals for Priority 1, 2, and 3 calls have been reduced from current levels in the Basic Service Level model to ensure rapid response to calls for service and increased community satisfaction and protection. In addition, the percentage of time at least one officer will be available to respond to a Priority 1 call has been increased to 95% in the Basic Service Level model. Based on the MAPP, it is estimated that 103 officers are needed to achieve a basic service level to the citizens of the City of Eugene. With the subtraction of three officers for the K-9 Unit, 100 officers should be assigned to patrol as first responders to calls for service to achieve a basic service level. In addition, with a preferred ratio of 1 field supervisor for every 6.5 patrol officers, it is recommended that 16 field supervisors are needed under the Basic Service Level model. The ratio of 1 field supervisor for every 6.5 patrol officers is based on the average for similar size cities as presented in "Police Use of Force: Official Reports, Citizen Complaints, and Legal Consequences, 1991-1992" published by the Police Foundation in 1994.

***Basic Service Level Recommendation - 100 patrol officers  
16 field supervisors***

### Typical Community Policing Model Level

In order to develop the second version of the MAPP, only a few variables were modified from the Basic Service Level model. The patrol interval performance objective was lowered for both highways and residential roadways to increase the visibility of patrol officers. The largest modification was in the amount of self-initiated time afforded patrol officers. In the previous service level, officers were given 10.5 minutes per hour to perform self-initiated activities (17% of the shift). Providing officers with ample time to perform self-initiated activities allows them to be proactive in ferreting out disorder and preventing crime in the community. In order to provide officers with more time to perform such activities, the Typical Community Policing Model Level includes 20.5 minutes per hour for self-initiated activity which is almost double the previous model (34% of the shift). Based on the MAPP, it is estimated that 163 officers are needed to provide this level of service to the citizens of the City of Eugene. With the subtraction of three officers for the K-9 Unit, 160 officers should be assigned to patrol as first responders to calls for service to achieve a typical community policing model level of service. In addition, with a preferred ratio of 1 field supervisor for every 6.5 patrol officers, it is recommended that 25 field supervisors are needed for this level of service.

***Basic Plus Proactive Service Level Recommendation – 160 patrol officers  
25 field supervisors***

**Table 1 – Patrol Staffing Needs Projection**

<b>Patrol Officer Model</b>		<b>Basic Service Level</b>	<b>Typical Community Policing Model Level</b>
<b>Unit Response Variables</b>			
Total number of Priority 1 CFS (primary unit responses only)		4,300	4,300
Total number of Priority 2 CFS (primary unit responses only)		8,200	8,200
Total number of Priority 3 CFS (primary unit responses only)		29,900	29,900
Total number of back-up unit responses to Priority 1 CFS		4,300	4,300
Total number of back-up unit responses to Priority 2 CFS		8,200	8,200
Total number of back-up unit responses to Priority 3 CFS		14,300	14,300
Average service time ( <i>fraction of an hour</i> ) per Priority 1 CFS ( <i>primary unit only</i> )		0.88	0.88
Average service time ( <i>fraction of an hour</i> ) per Priority 2 CFS ( <i>primary unit only</i> )		0.72	0.72
Average service time ( <i>fraction of an hour</i> ) per Priority 3 CFS ( <i>primary unit only</i> )		0.63	0.63
Average service time ( <i>fraction of an hour</i> ) per back-up response to Priority 1 CFS		1.78	1.78
Average service time ( <i>fraction of an hour</i> ) per back-up response to Priority 2 CFS		0.97	0.97
Average service time ( <i>fraction of an hour</i> ) per back-up response to Priority 3 CFS		0.65	0.65
<b>Performance Objectives</b>			
Patrol interval performance objective ( <i>hours</i> ), highway/arterial roadways		N.A.	4.0
Patrol interval performance objective ( <i>hours</i> ), collector/residential roadways		N.A.	48
Performance objective for response time to Priority 1 calls ( <i>minutes</i> )		5.0	5.0
Performance objective for response time to Priority 2 calls ( <i>minutes</i> )		8.0	8.0
Performance objective for response time to Priority 3 calls ( <i>minutes</i> )		20.0	20.0
Performance objective for % of Priority 1 calls for which there will be at least one officer available		95%	98%
<b>Patrol Visibility Variables</b>			
Average patrol speed ( <i>mph</i> ), highway/arterial roadways		N.A.	24.00
Average patrol speed ( <i>mph</i> ), collector/residential roadways		N.A.	15.00
<b>Response Time Variables</b>			
Average response speed ( <i>mph</i> ) for emergency activities		35.0	35.0
Average response speed ( <i>mph</i> ) for non-emergency activities		18.0	18.0
<b>Immediate Availability Variables</b>			
Percentage of calls for service that cannot be preempted		65%	65%
Percentage of administrative activities that cannot be preempted		25%	25%
Percentage of self-initiated activities that cannot be preempted		60%	40%

**Table 1 – Patrol Staffing Needs Projection  
(cont.)**

<b>Patrol Officer Model</b>	<b>Basic Service Level</b>	<b>Typical Community Policing Model Level</b>
<b>Additional Variables</b>		
<i>Weights: (Total of all four weights must equal 100%)</i>		
Weight for patrol visibility objective	0%	5%
Weight for response time to priority 1 calls objective	30%	30%
Weight for response time to priority 2 calls objective	20%	20%
Weight for response time to priority 3 calls objective	10%	5%
Weight for immediate availability to priority 1 calls objective	40%	40%
Self-initiated time in minutes per hour per officer	10.5	20.5
Administrative time in minutes per hour per officer	13.0	13.0
Unrecoverable patrol time in minutes per hour per officer*	5	5
Percentage of time patrol units are staffed with two officers	2%	2%
Average percentage time for <u>all</u> leave, <u>call-outs</u> , and <u>training</u> **	29%	29%
Average number of officers to be supervised by each field supervisor	6.5	6.5
Percentage of field supervisor on-duty time spent on patrol activities	0%	0%
<b>Total Number of Patrol Officers Needed</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>163</b>
<b>Total Number of Field Supervisors Needed</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>25</b>

\*Unrecoverable time includes all additional time not covered in the allocation models. For patrol, it is recognized the some patrol time is not expended on calls for service, administrative activities, self-initiated activities as well as on efforts to meet performance objectives such as visibility and response time. In other words, the time period is too short to increase visibility, to perform a self-initiated activity, or conduct an administrative activity. This includes short periods of time between the clearing of one call and the receiving of another. This time is unrecoverable because it cannot be used to meet the performance objectives set. Patrol has the most unrecoverable time (5 minutes per hour) because of the nature of the work performed by patrol. A small amount of unrecoverable time (1 minute per hour) has also been included in the other models in this report.

\*\*The average percentage of time for all leave, call-outs, and training is frequently referred to as a leave rate. The leave rate includes such factors as vacation time, comp time, sick leave, training, holidays, personal days, military service, provisions of the Family and Medical Leave Act, light-duty assignments required for injured personnel, time away from the position while on special assignment, jury duty, worker’s compensation time off, administrative leave, and call-outs. All these categories do not apply to all personnel in EPD. Therefore, the leave rate varies for each model discussed in this report.

## **Investigations Division Staffing Needs**

A disposition-based staffing model was developed for the Financial Crimes Unit, Property Crimes Unit, and Violent Crimes Unit of EPD. Since records do not exist on the amount of time it takes to investigate a case, original data was collected in order to develop the staffing models. Data was collected on two main types of activities performed by investigators: case-related activity and other activity.

### **Case-Related Activity**

In order to assess case-related activity, investigators kept detailed time logs on each case assigned to them from July 24 through August 18, 2006. Investigators continued to fill out the time logs on the cases assigned during the study period through September 3, 2006. Therefore, time was collected for a six week period on cases assigned during a one month period. The data collection period lasted six weeks to provide investigators time to work on cases assigned in the middle part of August. The time logs and data collection instruments were reviewed by each unit supervisor as well as the Lieutenant and Captain assigned to the Investigations Division prior to the beginning of the data collection period. Their recommended changes were made to the time logs and instruments prior to the beginning of the data collection period. The data collection instruments are included in Appendix A. For each case assigned during the data collection period, investigators identified how many minutes were spent on each activity while investigating the assigned cases. In addition, for each case assigned, detectives filled out a sheet which identified the offense investigated, case enhancers, and disposition type (see Appendix A). The case-related activity was analyzed for each unit studied. The data collection on case-related activity provided two variables for the models below: average time needed to clear a case by arrest and average time needed to suspend or unfind a case.

### **Other Activity**

Other activity includes activities performed by investigators that do not involve cases directly assigned to them. These activities include general computer work (email, statistics, database entries) not related to a particular case, assisting another detective on a case, and meetings, to name a few. It also includes all time assisting outside agencies such as the District Attorney's Office and Department of Human Services. The list of other activities performed by investigators is included in Appendix A. From July 24-September 3, 2006, each detective filled out the Other Activity Sheet on a daily basis. The other activity was analyzed for each unit studied. The data collection on other activity provided one variable for the models below: other activity in minutes per hour per detective.

### **Cases Assigned**

Besides accurate estimates on case-related and other activity performed by investigators, it was also critical to determine accurate estimates of the number of cases

currently assigned to each unit on an annual basis. In addition, it was necessary to project the number of cases that should be assigned to each unit for each of the service levels. Two approaches were used by EPD personnel to identify increased service levels: professional judgment of EPD Investigations Unit supervisors and comparative benchmarking. For the latter, case assignment data for city police departments was gathered by EPD personnel from the International City/County Management Association's (ICMA) Center for Performance Measurement.

Investigations division supervisors were asked to estimate additional case assignments that could easily be justified to provide a small increase in the level of service provided by EPD. Currently, a large number of felony crime reports are not assigned to detectives because no additional detective time is available to spend on these cases. Only very high priority cases or those with the highest chance of success are being assigned for further follow-up. In particular, the majority of property and financial crime reports are suspended. The supervisors' estimates have been used to estimate the increased number of cases assigned if there were resources to provide a modest increase in service levels.

For the Violent Crimes Unit (VCU), the goal for a small increase in service includes additional follow-up for Department of Human Services juvenile referrals, domestic violence and formally assigning appropriate child runaway cases. Runaway cases will cause an increase in the number of cases formally assigned to detectives. The additional follow-up will increase the amount of detective labor spent on Outside Agency Assist for DHS referrals and on domestic violence cases previously closed by Patrol or VCU. For both the Property Crimes Unit (PCU) and Financial Crimes Unit (FCU), the goal was a small increase in the level of difficulty of the cases that would be assigned. In addition, it is recommended that the PCU employ common operational techniques (such as hot spot surveillance and sting operations) to increase their efficiency and effectiveness.

The comparative benchmarking approach utilized the three most recent years of UCR Part I violent and property crime case assignment data from ICMA for 18 cities. The cities chosen used a solvability criteria-based case assignment policy. Cities that automatically assign all serious crime reports to an investigator were excluded. The median rate of case assignment was calculated for Part I violent and property crimes (see below). The median was applied to Eugene's number of reported crimes to estimate how many cases should be assigned to detectives to achieve the same level of service as the median of these cities. Since all Investigations units handle more than Part I crimes, the use of Part I cases is somewhat limiting but still valuable.

Since most financial crimes are not included in UCR Part I property crimes, an internal benchmarking approach was used. With the dramatic increase in financial crime reported in Eugene, the case assignment rate has declined markedly. For financial crimes, the case assignment rates needed to achieve clearance rates for felony financial crimes of 45 percent have been estimated.

**UCR Part I Percent Cases Assigned to Detectives – EPD vs. Median of ICMA Cities**

	<b>EPD Percent Cases Assigned</b>	<b>Median ICMA City Percent Assigned</b>
Violent Crimes	38.3%	57.4%
Property Crimes	3.1%	16.7%

As the table below reveals, patrol units spend substantial labor on investigation and apprehension of suspects. The table depicts the number of cases handled by patrol units either through immediate apprehension of suspects while responding to a call for service or through assignment back to patrol for additional follow-up. It has not been possible using EPD’s case management system to identify the number of follow-up case investigations being conducted by patrol units that might be carried out by detectives if additional resources were available in Investigations units. The patrol labor consumed for these cases is contained either in the service time for calls for service or as criminal follow-up activity in officer initiated actions. Almost 10 percent of the labor that patrol units expend on officer initiated actions is spent doing criminal case follow-up. This amounts to four full-time-equivalent (FTE) persons of patrol labor.

Low staffing is not the only cause of below normal detective case assignment rates in EPD. The high number of case resolutions accomplished by patrol units limits the number of Part I violent crime cases available for assignment within VCU. This limit was used for calculating the number of possible cases that might be assigned if additional detectives were available.

**Current EPD Monthly Average UCR Part I or Felony Financial Crimes and Assignments**

	<b>Monthly Avg. Crime Reports</b>	<b>Avg. Cases Assigned to Detectives</b>	<b>Avg. Cases Closed by Patrol</b>
Part I Violent	39	15	22
Part I Property	777	24	151
Felony Financial	119	24	21

Using the number of serious crimes reported by the public to EPD and the benchmark percentage of cases that could be assigned, the following number of cases could be added to the current Investigations Unit case loads if additional staff were available.

**Proposed EPD Monthly Average Number of Additional Cases Assigned to Detectives**

<b>Type</b>	<b>Basic Service Level</b>	<b>Typical Community Policing Model Level</b>
Violent	8*	10
Property	41	106
Financial	38	70

\* Assigned UCR Part II Runaway Minor cases

When these are added to the current number of cases assigned, the Investigations Unit case loads for the two service levels would be:

**Proposed EPD Monthly Average Cases Assigned to Detectives**

<b>Unit</b>	<b>Basic Service Level</b>	<b>Typical Community Policing Model Level</b>
Violent Crimes	53	55
Property Crimes	77	142
Financial Crimes	63	95

The table above was used to determine the annual number of cases assigned to each unit for each of the two service levels. In addition, EPD provided estimates of the percentage of cases cleared by arrest and the percentage of cases suspended or unfounded for each unit. Currently, there are high clearance rates in each of the units studied. The VCU has a 55.9% clearance rate, the PCU has a 58.1% clearance rate, and the FCU has a 69.3% clearance rate. With the increase in the number of cases assigned to PCU and FCU, it is expected that the clearance rate will drop in these two units because crimes that are more difficult to solve will be assigned to these units. Therefore, in the two models presented, a 45% clearance rate for each unit has been used which is based on a study conducted a few years ago by the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) for the Tallahassee Police Department. It is expected that the VCU will be able to maintain their current clearance rate. Although it is not a focus of this study, it is important to recognize that an increase in the number of cases assigned to the investigations division will have workload impacts downstream in the Lane County criminal justice system. The increase will particularly impact the Lane County District Attorney’s Office and the Lane County jail.



## Staffing Levels Needed

Tables 2 through 4 illustrate the staffing levels needed for the investigative units studied. As before, the variables that are based on an analysis of data are highlighted in green in the tables while the variables that are based on policy decisions are highlighted in yellow.

### Table 2 – Financial Crimes Unit Staffing Needs Projection

Financial Crimes Unit	Basic Service Level	Typical Community Policing Model Level
Total number of cases assigned annually	755	1,140
Percentage of cases cleared	45%	45%
Average time needed to clear a case (hours)	21.2	21.2
Percentage of cases suspended or unfounded	55%	55%
Average time needed to suspend or unfound a case (hours)	1.2	1.2
Administrative time in minutes per hour per investigator	11.0	11.0
Other activity in minutes per hour per investigator	13.58	13.58
Unrecoverable time in minutes per hour per investigator	1	1
Average percentage time for <u>all leave, call-outs, and training</u>	25%	25%
<b>Total Number of Investigators Needed</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>13</b>

### Table 3 – Property Crimes Unit Staffing Needs Projection

Property Crimes Unit	Basic Service Level	Typical Community Policing Model Level
Total number of cases assigned annually	924	1,704
Percentage of cases cleared	45%	45%
Average time needed to clear a case (hours)	19.7	19.7
Percentage of cases suspended or unfounded	55%	55%
Average time needed to suspend or unfound a case (hours)	1.6	1.6
Administrative time in minutes per hour per investigator	11.0	11.0
Other activity in minutes per hour per investigator	25.83	23.74
Unrecoverable time in minutes per hour per investigator	1	1
Average percentage time for <u>all leave, call-outs, and training</u>	25%	25%
<b>Total Number of Investigators Needed</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>28</b>

**Table 4 – Violent Crimes Unit Staffing Needs Projection**

<b>Violent Crimes Unit</b>	<b>Basic Service Level</b>	<b>Typical Community Policing Model Level</b>
Total number of cases assigned annually	636	660
Percentage of cases cleared	55.9%	55.9%
Average time needed to clear a case (hours)	20.68	20.68
Percentage of cases suspended or unfounded	44.1%	44.1%
Average time needed to suspend or unfound a case (hours)	2.1	2.1
Administrative time in minutes per hour per investigator	11.0	11.0
Other activity in minutes per hour per investigator	23.7	23.7
Unrecoverable time in minutes per hour per investigator	1	1
Average percentage time for all leave, call-outs, and training	25%	25%
<b>Total Number of Investigators Needed</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>

**Basic Service Level Recommendation**

*Financial Crimes Unit – 9 investigators*

*Property Crimes Unit – 17 investigators*

*Violent Crimes Unit – 13 investigators*

**Typical Community Policing Model Level Recommendation**

*Financial Crimes Unit – 13 investigators*

*Property Crimes Unit – 28 investigators*

*Violent Crimes Unit – 13 investigators*

## **Community Policing Support Team Staffing Needs**

The staffing model for the Community Policing Support Team (CPST) is similar to the MAPP discussed above. Since the Community Service Officers (CSOs) assigned to the Bethel Public Safety Station respond to calls for service, some of the same variables are used in both the CPST and MAPP models. The data used in the development of the CPST model were obtained from several sources. First, the values for some variables are based on an analysis of data performed by EPD personnel. These variables are highlighted in green in Table 5. Second, the values for some variables are based on policy decisions made by the command staff of EPD. These variables are highlighted in yellow in Table 5. Third, since estimates of average response travel speed were not available from the department, the average response travel speed for other jurisdictions that have used similar allocation models was employed. Fourth, since records do not exist on the amount of time it takes to complete a phone report or counter contact, original data was collected in order to identify the value for this variable. Data was collected from CSOs on two main types of activities: 1) phone reports and counter contacts and 2) other activity.

In order to assess the time it takes to complete a phone report and counter contact, CSOs kept time logs on each phone report and counter contact from July 31 through August 11, 2006. The data collection instrument was developed in conjunction with the unit supervisor and is included in Appendix B. In addition, to the phone reports and counter contacts, CSOs kept time on other activities they performed during the study period. The list of other activities was developed in conjunction with the unit supervisor and included such activities as patrol briefing, check fraud activities, and city hall tours, to name a few. Analysis of the other activity performed by CSOs revealed that they spend on average 16 minutes per day on other activity. Due to the limited amount of other activity performed by CSOs, the other activity was included in the unrecoverable CSO time in the model. The unrecoverable time for CSOs was set at three minutes per hour. One minute was provided in the other models (except patrol) so two minutes were added for the other activity discussed above.

### **Basic Service Level**

Under the Basic Service Level model, the response time goals for Priority 2 and 3 calls have been significantly reduced in comparison to the current response times of 15 minutes for a Priority 2 call for service and 60 minutes for a Priority 3 call for service. This ensures a more rapid response to calls for service and increased community satisfaction. A slight adjustment has also been made to the current leave rate of 22%. Based on the CPST model, it is estimated that 15 CSOs are needed to achieve a basic service level to the citizens of the City of Eugene. In addition, with a preferred ratio of 1 field supervisor for every 6 CSOs, it is recommended that 3 field supervisors are needed under the Basic Service Level model.

***Basic Service Level Recommendation - 15 community service officers  
3 field supervisors***

Typical Community Policing Model Level

In order to develop the second version of the CPST model, only one slight modification was made. The number of phone reports/counter contacts was reduced from 7,700 per year to 7,500 per year. This slight modification did not have a significant impact on the number of staff needed. Therefore, the recommended staffing level is the same for both the Basic Service Level and the Typical Community Policing Model Level.

*Typical Community Policing Model Level Recommendation –*

*15 community service officers  
3 field supervisors*

**Table 5 - Community Policing Support Team Staffing Needs Projection**

<b>Community Policing Support Team</b>	<b>Basic Service Level</b>	<b>Typical Community Policing Model Level</b>
Total number of Priority 2 CFS (primary unit responses only)	440	440
Total number of Priority 3 CFS (primary unit responses only)	1,150	1,150
Total number of back-up unit responses to Priority 2 CFS	80	80
Total number of back-up unit responses to Priority 3 CFS	120	120
Average service time ( <i>fraction of an hour</i> ) per Priority 2 call for service ( <i>primary unit only</i> )	0.42	0.42
Average service time ( <i>fraction of an hour</i> ) per Priority 3 call for service ( <i>primary unit only</i> )	0.57	0.57
Average service time ( <i>fraction of an hour</i> ) per back-up response to Priority 2 CFS	0.02	0.02
Average service time ( <i>fraction of an hour</i> ) per back-up response to Priority 3 CFS	0.05	0.05
Number of phone reports/counter contacts	7,700	7,500
Average service time per desk report ( <i>fraction of an hour</i> )	0.33	0.33
Performance objective for response time to Priority 2 calls ( <i>minutes</i> )	8.0	8.0
Performance objective for response time to Priority 3 calls ( <i>minutes</i> )	20.0	20.0
Average response speed ( <i>mph</i> ) for non-emergency activities	19.0	19.0
<b>Weights: (Total of both weights must equal 100%)</b>		
Weight for response time to priority 2 calls objective	80%	80%
Weight for response time to priority 3 calls objective	20%	20%
Administrative time in minutes per hour per CSO	7.5	7.5
Unrecoverable CSO time in minutes per hour per officer	3	3
Average percentage time for <b>all</b> leave and <b>training</b>	24%	24%
Average number of CSOs to be supervised by each supervisor	6.0	6.0
Percentage of supervisor on-duty time spent on CSO activities	0	0
<b>Total Number of CSOs Needed</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Total Number of Supervisors Needed</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>

## **Data and Records Section Staffing Needs**

Extensive data on the type and number of activities performed by personnel in the Data and Records Section dates back several years. However, there are not any records on the amount of time it takes to perform these activities. Therefore, original data was collected in order to develop the staffing models for the Data and Records Section. In order to assess the time it takes to complete the activities of the personnel in the Data and Records Section, two time logs were created; one for the Records Unit and one for the Operations Analysis Unit. The data collection instruments were developed in conjunction with the section manager and are included in Appendix C. Personnel kept time logs on each activity performed from August 20 through September 1, 2006. All Record Specialists and Administrative Specialists assigned to the Records Unit participated in the data collection process. Although some positions were vacant at the time of the data collection, this includes 21.7 authorized positions (3 Administrative Specialists and 18.7 Records Specialist positions).

### **Records Unit**

In order to project staffing needs at the Basic Service Level and Typical Community Policing Model Level, the increase in patrol staffing recommended by the MAPP for these two service levels was utilized along with the recommended increase in investigations staffing. Patrol and investigations staffing was used to project additional staff for the Records Unit because a significant amount of the unit's work comes from patrol and investigations. If patrol staffing is increased then Records Unit staffing must also increase. Likewise, when investigations staffing increases and more cases are assigned to the investigations division, the workload of the Records Unit will increase. In order to project staffing needs in the Records Unit, the actual, not authorized, number of patrol officers (71) and investigators (21) assessed in this study was used. The actual number of officers and investigators is used because it reflects the current workload of the Records Unit. In other words, the Records Unit currently provides service for a total of 92 officers and investigators, not the authorized strength of 111 (90 patrol officers and 21 investigators). In addition, the current number of records specialist positions was used in the calculations. This is estimated at 21 FTE which includes 18.7 FTE for Records Specialist positions, 1.5 FTE in overtime, and 1 FTE for records specialist work that is performed by supervisors.

Based on these numbers, there is currently 1 records specialist position for every 4.38 patrol officers/investigators (92/21). It is recommended that a ratio of 1 records specialist position for every 3.75 patrol officers/investigators be established. With the current ratio, the specialists cannot keep up with the workload which leads to a backlog on data entry and other activities performed by the Records Unit. In addition, supervisors and personnel assigned to the Operations Analysis Unit are required to do data entry for the Records Unit in order to try and keep up with the workload. The backlog of cases prevents real time crime analysis from occurring which limits the ability of EPD officers to fight crime. Therefore, a ratio of 1 records specialist position for every 3.75 patrol officers/investigators seems reasonable and should allow the problems discussed above to

be resolved. The Basic Service Level recommends 139 patrol officers and investigators and the Typical Community Policing Model Level recommends 214 patrol officers and investigators. Applying the ratio of 1 records specialist positions for every 3.75 officers/investigators, the following staffing levels are recommended:

***Basic Service Level Recommendation – 37 Records Specialist positions***

***Typical Community Policing Model Recommendation –  
57 Records Specialist positions.***

An increase in records specialist positions will require additional supervisors as well. Currently, there is one records supervisor for every five records specialist positions. It is recommended that this ratio be maintained as additional specialists are hired. Based on this ratio, the following number of supervisors is recommended:

***Basic Service Level Recommendation – 7 Records Supervisor positions***

***Typical Community Policing Model Recommendation –  
11 Records Supervisor positions.***

### **Operations Analysis Unit**

The same process was used to project staffing needs of the Operations Analysis Unit. Currently, there is one operations analysis position for every 30 patrol officers/investigators (92/3). This ratio seems reasonable because part of the current workload of the Operations Analysis Unit includes the entry of reports for the Records Unit. If additional staff is placed in the Records Unit as recommended, the ratio above is reasonable. Applying the ratio of 1 operations analysis position for every 30 patrol officers/investigators, the following staffing levels are recommended:

***Basic Service Level Recommendation – 5 Operations Analysis personnel***

***Typical Community Policing Model Level Rec. – 7 Operations Analysis personnel.***

## Campus Team Staffing Needs

In order to assess the staffing needs of the University of Oregon Campus Team, a comparative study of PAC-10 Universities was completed. The personnel department or other representative of each university police department was contacted via phone and asked how many sworn police officers were authorized for the department. In addition, the Registrar's Office of each PAC-10 University was contacted to secure current student enrollment numbers. The Universities also employ full-time civilian support staff and in many instances community service officers as well. Because of the variability of the activities performed by the civilian support staff (e.g., most Universities have a separate communications/dispatch unit) and community service officers across the Universities, this analysis will focus on *sworn police officers only*. All of the Universities except for the University of Oregon and Oregon State University have a separate University Police Department to perform the policing activities for the University. Oregon State University contracts with the Oregon State Police to provide law enforcement services to the campus. Similarly, the University of Oregon contracts with EPD for police services.

Table 6 illustrates the rate of law enforcement personnel per 1,000 students at each PAC-10 University. As evident in the table, the law enforcement staffing level at the University of Oregon is tremendously low in comparison to the other Universities. There are currently 4 officers (this includes one sergeant) assigned to the EPD Campus Team (rate of .20 per 1,000 students). The next lowest rate of law enforcement personnel across PAC-10 Universities is .53 officers per 1,000 students while the average rate is 1.25 officers per 1,000 students.

**Table 6 – Comparative Analysis of PAC-10 Universities**

University	Enrollment	# of Sworn Officers	Rate per 1,000 Students
California-Berkeley	33,558	75	2.23
Stanford	19,042	33	1.73
UCLA	35,625	60	1.68
USC	33,000	55	1.67
Arizona	37,036	52	1.40
Washington	42,974	50	1.16
Arizona State	61,033	65	1.06
Washington State	18,690	15	0.80
Oregon State	19,000	10	0.53
<b>Oregon*</b>	<b>20,394</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0.20</b>
		Average Rate	1.25

\* The number of sworn officers at the University of Oregon does not include the two officers assigned to the West University Neighborhood Foot Patrol team

The above comparison is for illustrative purposes only. It cannot be used to make staffing projections for the Campus Team. Besides the University of Oregon and Oregon State University, the remaining PAC-10 Universities all have separate university police departments. Significant staff are needed to have an independent police department. These departments have sworn officers serving the following functions: patrol, investigations, community service, crime prevention, supervision, and administration. Basically, they are completely autonomous from their local police departments and do not receive much assistance from them. This is not true for the University of Oregon. Patrol officers who are not assigned to the Campus Team continue to patrol the campus and surrounding areas. EPD detectives investigate the offenses which occur on the University of Oregon campus. Officers are hired by the University of Oregon to work major events such as football games. This is not the relationship that the other autonomous university police departments have with their local police departments. This makes comparison across the Universities impractical. The University is bearing less than their full share of their public safety responsibility, funding less than 5 FTE for campus law enforcement. The lack of police staff on campus is another reflection of inadequate revenues for basic police services combined with the dramatic reduction of state support for higher education. It is our recommendation that EPD administrators discuss these issues with University of Oregon officials and seek a more equitable relationship.



## **School Resource Team Staffing Needs**

There are currently 5 officers and 1 sergeant assigned to the School Resource Team at EPD. The School Resource Team is responsible for 27 elementary schools, 2 K-8 schools, 10 middle schools, 5 high schools, and 5 alternative high schools (2 of which are in separate facilities from the existing high schools). On average, a school resource officer at EPD is responsible for 1 high school, 2 middle schools, and 5 elementary schools.

Two approaches were used to assess staffing needs of the School Resource Team. First, EPD personnel analyzed the 2003 Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS) survey conducted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics. The survey is conducted every 3-4 years and collects data from over 3,000 State and local law enforcement agencies, including all agencies that employ 100 or more sworn officers. The 2003 data are the most current data available. For agencies serving 100,000 to 250,000 population, the average number of sworn School Resource Officers (SROs) is 10. The median population of this group of communities is almost exactly equal to the population of the City of Eugene. Based on this assessment, 5 additional sworn personnel should be assigned to the School Resource Team to meet the average of similar cities (considered a basic service level).

Second, it is commonly recommended among the SRO community that 1 SRO should be assigned to each high school, 1 SRO to every 2 middle schools, and 1 SRO to every 4 elementary schools. Although the original source of these recommendations are unknown, it is commonly discussed among the SRO community as the staffing standards to follow. If these standards are applied to the EPD School Resource Team, 11 additional sworn personnel should be assigned to the School Resource Team for a total of 16 sworn personnel assigned to the team (considered a typical community policing model service level). This figure was obtained based on the number of schools covered by the School Resource Team: 5 high schools, excluding alternative high schools (5 officers needed), 10 middle schools (5 officers needed), 2 K-8 and 27 elementary schools (6 officers needed).

***Basic Service Level Recommendation – 10 school resource team officers***

***Typical Community Policing Model Level Recommendation –  
16 school resource team officers***

## **Command Staff Personnel**

While there are a number of estimates relating to the ratio of command staff personnel to sworn police officers, these numbers are highly dependent on organizational variables that are unique to each city and police department. For instance, size and structure may dictate needs for command personnel that vary widely from large to small departments, and for departments that have large versus small geographical jurisdictions. In addition, the style of policing (more traditional versus community and intelligence-led) also plays an important role in determining needs for command personnel. More progressive departments with community and intelligence-led policing strategies generally require less supervisory and command personnel. Then too, the individual discretion of the chief executive is a critical factor in determining command staff personnel ratios to sworn officers within any department.

The national average for command staff personnel in a city similar to Eugene (lieutenants and above) is 8.0 percent of the total number of officers. The Eugene Police Department is slightly lower at 6.5 percent, and for line positions (patrol) the current ratio is 4.9 percent versus a national average of 6.0 percent of total sworn officers. The Eugene Police Department is within national norms and we do not suggest major changes in this structure. Obviously, as the number of officers, investigators, and civilian staff increases, the number of command staff personnel will need to increase as well.

## Summary of Staffing Needs

Based on the models discussed above, Table 7 illustrates the staffing needs for each of the units studied for each of the two service levels.

**Table 7 – Eugene Police Department Staffing Needs Projection**

	<b>Current # Authorized</b>	<b>Basic Service Level</b>	<b>Typical Community Policing Model Level</b>
<b>Patrol</b>			
Patrol Officers	90	100	160
Sergeants	13	16	25
<b>Investigations Division</b>			
Financial Crimes Unit	4	9	13
Property Crimes Unit	8	17	28
Violent Crimes Unit	9	13	13
<b>Community Policing Support Team</b>			
Community Service Officers	7	15	15
Supervisors	1	3	3
<b>Data and Records Section</b>			
Records Specialist positions	18.7	37	57
Records Supervisor positions	4	7	11
Operations Analysis Unit	2	5	7
<b>School Resource Team (officers only)</b>	5	10	16

Two issues need to be addressed in reference to the above table. First, there is a difference (sometimes substantial) between the authorized and actual number of personnel in each section/division. This is particularly problematic for the patrol division. The current authorized strength for first responders to calls for service in patrol is 90 plus 3 K-9 officers for a total of 93. Since K-9 officers were excluded in the development of the patrol model, the above table references an authorized patrol strength of 90. However, in October 2006 there were only 71 patrol officers who were first responders to calls for service. The difference between 71 and 90 were due to current recruits who are not currently call responders, officers who were AIC sergeants, injured officers, and vacancies. These numbers will vary monthly which is why the authorized strength is used to project staffing needs. According to a departmental memo, the average number of first responders to calls for service has remained around 70 since 2000.

Second, since the difference between the actual and authorized strength is typically 20 patrol officers, an excessive amount of overtime including mandatory overtime is used in the patrol division. In fact, a total of 5 FTE in overtime to backfill for leave and vacancies is routinely expended each year in patrol. Considerable amounts of patrol overtime are expended for other purposes besides backfill – court time being the largest. Court overtime would likely increase with the addition of officers though extended duty, backfill, and training overtime would be expected to decrease. This excessive amount of

overtime in patrol has strained current patrol resources and has led to significant morale problems among patrol officers. Overtime is also a significant issue in the Records Unit in which it is routine to expend 1.5 FTE in overtime each year. This problem is further compounded by the fact the EPD has no overtime item in the budget and must hold positions vacant to pay the inevitable overtime.

It is assumed that when EPD meets their recommended authorized patrol strength of 100 under the basic service level model that the amount of overtime will be reduced. However, even if the budget authorized 100 officers in patrol, that number cannot actually be achieved because of the need to pay overtime out of vacant positions. Therefore, the department needs to either seek a sizable overtime budget item authorized to pay officers for attending court, backfilling shifts when an officer is out, and all other duties that cause overtime. These same events occur in every police department in the United States and are routinely budgeted as a separate item in the department budget. If this is not feasible, the second option is to seek an authorized patrol strength above the level recommended in this report. In other words, the department can seek an authorized patrol strength of 103 so that 100 officers can be assigned as primary call responders and another 3 positions can be left permanently vacant to pay for overtime.

The following staffing additions above current authorized staffing levels are needed to obtain a **Basic Service Level**:

Officers - 15  
Investigators - 18  
Sergeants - 3  
Civilians – 29.3  
Civilian Supervisors – 5

**Total Staff Increase Needed – 70.3**

**This represents a 43.5% increase over current authorized staffing levels.**

The following staffing additions above current authorized staffing levels are needed to obtain a **Typical Community Policing Model Level**:

Officers - 81  
Investigators - 33  
Sergeants - 12  
Civilians – 51.3  
Civilian Supervisors – 9

**Total Staff Increase Needed – 186.3**

**This represents a 115.2% increase over current authorized staffing levels.**

## **Conclusion**

The City of Eugene reflects a police department that is in severe stress. It is currently 29 patrol officer positions below that needed to provide a basic service level to the citizens of Eugene. The current strength of 71 officers is 19 positions below the 90 authorized, not counting the additional three positions for needed supervisors. This is not a new problem for the city and the department. In the last two years, the department has addressed part of this need through the use of overtime to fill mandatory staffing levels. It is common for EPD to expend 5 FTE a year in overtime for patrol officers. While this original concept was sound, and provided a popular, flexible, tactically solid, yet temporary means to fix an immediate problem, it has now become a burden. There is a limit to the amount of time an individual officer can work in any given period of time. Some officers report working as many as 60 hours per week consecutively during a given month. This is simply unacceptable, and presents other potentially significant problems to the department such as loss of morale, high turnover, low work productivity, and high risk from civil litigation arising from the above. To the department's credit, these problems have not yet begun to erode the high work productivity and attitude of most officers and supervisory/command staff. However, this is simply a matter of time.

An additional burden to the Eugene Police Department (EPD) is providing direct law enforcement services to the University of Oregon campus. With only four sworn officers (this includes one sergeant) currently assigned to the campus team, the students and staff of the University of Oregon are dramatically under-served. Indeed, Oregon State University is second only to the University of Oregon in lack of officers assigned to their respective campuses within the PAC-10 comparative group. Quite frankly, we have never seen such a difficult and severely under-funded and under-staffed situation. The lack of police staff on campuses is another reflection of inadequate revenues for basic police services combined with the dramatic reduction of state support for higher education. Most universities across the United States have their own separate police departments that provide police and security services to the university community. Neighboring local and city departments are called upon to assist during routine events that require additional staffing (e.g., sporting events, graduation), and during critical incidents that may sporadically arise on the campus (e.g., special operations, hostage/crisis situations, major felonies). These types of situations are handled through interlocal agreements between the two entities. All of the other PAC-10 Universities reflect this type of police and security functionality within their respective state universities. We recommend that current officers assigned to the University of Oregon be either significantly bolstered by additional officers and supervisory personnel or be reassigned within the Eugene Police Department. This is a very dramatic step! However, we believe that the current situation in providing police services to the University of Oregon is untenable. Not only are services non-existent on a 24-hour basis, but the severe lack of staffing potentially jeopardizes individual officer safety. The only other solution is for the University of Oregon System to provide much greater funding for EPD officers to work on the campus.

The City of Eugene is a beautiful city nestled around the confluence of the McKenzie and Willamette Rivers in west-central Oregon less than 80 miles from the Pacific Ocean and the Cascade Mountains. It has a vibrant community of 148,500 citizens, that proudly boast the “World’s Greatest City for the Arts and Outdoors.” Unfortunately, the City of Eugene also has a significant property crime problem. For instance in 2005, only two percent of similar cities across the United States had more auto thefts, and the rates of burglary and theft are alarmingly high for a city of this size. The property crime rate in the City of Eugene is very high. This is particularly troubling since the city is relatively remote, not adjoining to any large metropolitan area. We believe that this very high property crime rate is reflective of the lack of effectiveness of the entire criminal justice system in Lane County. The entire system is fractured and broken – the District Attorney’s Office is under-funded and under-staffed, the jail system is overcrowded resulting in property crime offenders not being held for any length of time, and the general lack of police presence and deterrence as a result, again, of under-funding and under-staffing of Eugene Police Department, all promote the ineffectiveness of crime prevention and crime deterrence. While the City of Eugene and Lane County have both had population increases over the last ten years, funding for essential criminal justice services have remained stagnant. The current situation is an obvious result of such political and economic neglect.

In almost all staffing studies, some positions could be recaptured by reorganization and civilianization of the department. However, in Eugene, the police department has already been highly civilianized and is very efficient. There are virtually no officer positions or duties that could be garnered by civilians within the department. The only real solution must come from the addition of sworn police officers. This is an immediate need, and every effort should be made to recruit and secure candidates for these open positions as soon as possible.

## **Appendix A**

### **Investigations Division Data Collection Forms**

# Eugene Police Department Staffing Study

Magellan Research Corporation has been asked to conduct a staffing study for the Eugene Police Department. The study will determine the number of employees needed to handle the workload of the department. This part of the project will culminate with the development of a disposition-based staffing model to determine detective staffing needs within the department.

You have been asked to participate in this study. Basically, the disposition-based staffing model is derived from time spent on case-related and other activities, in other words, all work-related activity. **Please document all time spent on all of your activities. If time is not accurately documented, then an underestimation of staffing needs will occur.** Do not report lunches and breaks; these activities will be accounted for separately in the development of the model.

At this time, we need to know how you spend your workday. Time sheets have been created to capture the time you spend on case-related and other activities. It is critical that you report all activities, even if they occur on weekends or in the evenings.

Three additional documents are attached: Case-Related Activity Time Sheet (2 pages), Other Activity Sheet and Case-Related Activity Definitions (2 pages).

## Case-Related Activity Time Sheet

The Case-Related Activity Time Sheet is a two-sided form. For each case that is assigned to you from July 24 – August 18, you will need to fill out a Case-Related Activity Time Sheet. You should be able to fill out most of the front-side of the sheet soon after the case is assigned to you. The front-side of the sheet contains case-specific information. Specify the criminal offense alleged at the time of case assignment. Also, check all “Case Enhancers” that apply to each case. If a case does not have any enhancers, leave the section blank. Once a final disposition has occurred on the case, note the “Date Case Completed” in the space provided and check the one box under “Final Disposition Type” that best fits the disposition in that case. Once a disposition has been entered, please return the Case-Related Activity Time Sheet to your supervisor.

On the back-side of the Case-Related Activity Time Sheet is a list of activities. For each activity you perform on the case, note the time (in minutes) next to the activity. The several boxes next to each activity are for multiple entries for the same activity over several days on the same case. For example, you may spend time on supplement preparation on several different days before a case is completed. **Begin filling out the time sheets on Monday July 24.**

- **Fill out a new Case-Related Activity Time Sheet for each case assigned to you from July 24 through August 18.**

- **Continue to track time spent on these cases through Sunday September 3.**

## Other Activity Sheet

The protocol for the Other Activity Sheet is included on the sheet itself.

## Case-Related Activity Definitions

A list of activity definitions for the activities listed on the back-side of the Case-Related Activity Time Sheet has been included for your reference.

We realize that filling out the time sheet daily is an additional task to your already busy schedule, but it is imperative that this task be done diligently. We have tried to make the process as easy as possible. The determination of the number of detectives needed in the department will be as accurate as the information we receive on your time sheets. If time is left off of your sheets, then an underestimation of staffing needs will occur, so please account for all activity.

If you have any questions, contact Eric Fritsch at 940-565-4954 or at [efritsch@pacs.unt.edu](mailto:efritsch@pacs.unt.edu)



# Eugene Police Department Staffing Study

## Case-Related Activity Time Sheet

Case Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Date Case Assigned to Investigations Division: \_\_\_\_\_

Unit Case Assigned to: \_\_\_\_\_

Investigator Case Assigned to: \_\_\_\_\_

Criminal Offense: \_\_\_\_\_ Grade: \_\_\_\_\_ Counts: \_\_\_\_\_

Criminal Offense: \_\_\_\_\_ Grade: \_\_\_\_\_ Counts: \_\_\_\_\_

Criminal Offense: \_\_\_\_\_ Grade: \_\_\_\_\_ Counts: \_\_\_\_\_

Information Report: \_\_\_\_\_ Grade: \_\_\_\_\_ Counts: \_\_\_\_\_

Information Report: \_\_\_\_\_ Grade: \_\_\_\_\_ Counts: \_\_\_\_\_

**Case Enhancers: *Check All That Apply***

- Complex evidence/case
- Multiple victims/witnesses/suspects
- Victim/witness issues (child, elderly, disabled, uncooperative, etc.)
- Multiple leads
- Extensive evidence/property/unknown victim
- Multiple charges on one suspect
- Language barriers
- Major case
- Multiple jurisdictions

**Date Case Completed:**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Final Disposition Type: Check one box**

- Arrest
- Exceptionally Cleared
- Cleared Otherwise
- Suspended
- Suspended ATL
- Unfounded

**Criminal Offense Grade Codes:**

A = First Degree Felony  
B = Second Degree Felony  
C = Third Degree Felony  
M/A = Class A Misdemeanor  
M/B = Class B Misdemeanor  
M/C = Class C Misdemeanor

## Case-Related Activity Time Sheet

Case Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Activity	Time in Minutes						
Login of Case/Review of Case							
Suspect Interviews/Interrogations							
Record/Database Computer Searches (non-suspect)							
Supplement Preparation							
Locating Wanted Suspects/Runaways							
Book-In/Custody Reports							
Consulting with Other Agencies/Other EPD Detectives/D.A.'s/CPS							
Juvenile Book-In / Juvenile Transport							
Juvenile Magistrate Warnings/Interview							
Record/Database Computer Searches (suspect)							
Contacts with Victim, Complainant, Witness							
Arrest/Search Warrant/Seizure Preparation							
Subpoena of Records (Grand Jury Signing)							
View Evidence/Dispositions on Property Cards/ View Video Evidence							
Case Preparation							
Photo Line-ups							
Property Recovery/Search for Evidence or Property							
Crime Analysis/BOLO's/Intel Dissemination							
Case Correspondence Referrals/ Updates via Chain							
Surveillance							
Auto Impound Lot							
Neighborhood Canvass							

**Login of Case/Review of Case**

*Document case receipt and logged into monthly case assignment report. Report is reviewed for viable leads and the leads are prioritized.*

**Suspect Interviews/Interrogations**

*Phone/field/station interviews with persons believed to be responsible for the offense.*

**Record/Database Computer Searches (non-suspect)**

*Utilization of investigative resources to determine accurate and/or confirm information regarding the case. This can include locating witness and verifying information.*

**Supplement Preparation**

*Documentation of information that is developed or received during the course of the investigation.*

**Locating Wanted Suspects/Runaways**

*Steps that are undertaken to take subjects into custody. This can include emails and phone calls, trips to make arrests, etc.*

**Book-In/Custody Reports**

*From the point after an arrest is made-from transport to completing the booking process and all associated paperwork necessary for arraignment/release purposes.*

**Consulting with Other Agencies/Other EPD Detectives/D.A.'s/CPS**

*Information gathering/sharing that assists in the development of the case.*

**Juvenile Book-In / Juvenile Transport**

*Processing of juvenile offenders/runaways and the transport of the juvenile to the appropriate facility.*

**Juvenile Magistrate Warnings/Interview**

*Notification of the magistrate to respond to EPD to provide the required warnings to a juvenile. Process of the magistrate providing the warnings through the interview and magistrate interview/statement certification process.*

**Record/Database Computer Searches (suspect)**

*Utilization of investigative resources to determine accurate and/or confirm information regarding the case*

**Contacts with Victim, Complainant, Witness**

*Phone calls, emails and/or interviews to verify facts and/or obtain any additional information regarding the case.*

**Arrest/Search Warrant/Seizure Preparation**

*Arrest and search warrant/affidavit preparation, including any time that is spent getting warrant signed.*

**Subpoena of Records (Grand Jury Signing)**

*Preparation of subpoena completion, grand jury signature, and execution.*

**View Evidence/Dispositions on Property Cards/View Video Evidence**

*Review and release procedure for any evidence that is related to the case.*

**Case Preparation**

*Preparation of case report for submission to the District Attorney's office.*

**Photo Line-ups**

*Process of compiling photo lineups and the showing of them to witnesses/suspects/victims.*

**Property Recovery/Search for Evidence or Property**

*Time spent conducting searches to collect evidence. Includes consent searches, search warrant execution and property turned in as evidence. This is the process of recovering, weighing and impounding property related to the offense.*

**Crime Analysis/BOLO's/Intel Dissemination**

*Review of statistical reports and/or crime data to locate trends or information that may indicate this case is part of an ongoing crime pattern. Dissemination of information to agencies and officers to inform them regarding this offense and to obtain additional information.*

**Case Correspondence Referrals/ Updates via Chain**

*Briefings that are conducted with supervisors that provide updated information that is necessary to inform Command regarding the offense. Also, documentation process to communicate the inability to contact a complainant by phone or person.*

**Surveillance**

*Watching of a place, vehicle or person that is pertinent to case development.*

**Auto Impound Lot**

*Response to any police auto pound that is necessary for investigative follow-up.*

**Neighborhood Canvass**

*Surveying an offense neighborhood to develop information regarding the case.*

# Eugene Police Department Staffing Study

## Other Activity Sheet

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Unit: \_\_\_\_\_

**Number of case dispositions this week:** \_\_\_\_\_

- *This includes cases assigned before and after July 24. Note the number of cases assigned to you that were disposed of during the week.*

Week:  July 24 – July 30       July 31 – August 6       August 7 – August 13  
 August 14 – August 20       August 21 – August 27       August 28 – September 3

You are filling out Case-Related Activity Time Sheets on each case assigned to you during the study period. In order to get an accurate measure of staffing needs, time that is not currently being collected on the Time Sheet needs to be built into the staffing model. Basically, we are trying to account for all the activities you perform and time you expend in your position. We realize that some of the activities you perform are not tied to a particular case or are related to a case assigned prior to July 24. You are requested to fill out the time (in minutes) you spend on each activity from Monday July 24 through Sunday September 3. You are requested to fill out one sheet per week. Once again, this is time that is not currently being captured on your Case-Related Activity Time Sheet.

Please turn in this sheet to your supervisor each Monday

Activity	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday	Sunday
<b>Work on Cases Previously Assigned</b>							
Outside Agency Assist/Referral							
Assist on Case Assigned to other Detective							
Community Presentations/Meetings							
Auction							
Vehicle Inspections							
Vehicle Maintenance and Refuel							
Internal Meetings (Unit/Division)							
External Meetings (Intel)							
Projects/Special Assignments							
Assist other PD's and other EPD Detectives							
General Computer Work (emails/timesheets/stats, database entries)							
Schools/In Service							
Instructing/Training							
Court/Grand Jury Testimony							
Miscellaneous Delegated Tasks							
Other							

## **Appendix B**

### **Community Policing Support Team Data Collection Form**

## Eugene Police Department Staffing Study Community Service Officers

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Total Number of Phone Reports Completed: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Total Number of Counter Contacts Completed: \_\_\_\_\_

Magellan Research Corporation has been asked to conduct a staffing study for the Eugene Police Department. The study will determine the number of employees needed to handle the workload of the department. You have been asked to participate in this study. At this time, we need to know how much time you spend on the below activities each day.

Please document all time spent on these activities. If time is not accurately documented, then an underestimation of staffing needs will occur. We realize that filling out the sheet daily is an additional task to your already busy schedule, but it is imperative that this task be done diligently. We have tried to make the process as easy as possible. Do not report lunches and breaks; these activities will be accounted for separately.

Two tables are below. The first table includes two activities; phone report and counter contact. For each phone report you complete during the day, document the number of minutes it takes you to complete each report in a separate box. The same should be done for each counter contact. There is space for 20 phone reports and 20 counter contacts each day. The second table should be completed at the end of each working day. At the end of the day, estimate the amount of time (in minutes) you spent on each activity listed in the second table.

Please fill out a separate sheet each day from July 31 – August 11.

Activity										
<b>Phone Report</b>										
<b>Counter Contact</b>										

Activity	Time in Minutes
Attempts to contact victim	
Patrol briefing	
Sexual predator notification	
Check fraud activities	
Juvenile shoplifter program activities	
City hall tours	
Presentations	
Other	

## **Appendix C**

### **Data and Records Section Data Collection Forms**



## **Eugene Police Department Staffing Study Data and Records Section**

Magellan Research Corporation has been asked to conduct a staffing study for the Eugene Police Department. The study will determine the number of employees needed to handle the workload of the department. You have been asked to participate in this study. At this time, we need to know how much time you spend on specific activities each day.

Please document all time spent on these activities. If time is not accurately documented, then an underestimation of staffing needs will occur. We realize that filling out the sheet daily is an additional task to your already busy schedule, but it is imperative that this task be done diligently. We have tried to make the process as easy as possible.

The time sheet includes a list of activities in the left column. For each activity you complete during the day, document the number of minutes it takes you to complete each activity in a separate box. For example, for each data entry completed document the amount of minutes you spend on each entry. If you completed 15 different data entries during the day, then the time, in minutes, it took to complete each data entry should be entered in the appropriate boxes. At the end of the day, total the number of times you performed each activity and enter it in the “Total for Day” column.

Please fill out a separate sheet each day from August 20 – September 1.

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Total for Day</b>	<b>Time in Minutes</b>									
<b>Background/Records Checks and Contacts</b> <i>Back counter, Front Counter, Greeter,  File position, Internal Clickers</i>											
<b>Data Entry</b> <i>All computer entries, UTC, Coding, Other</i>											
<b>Fees</b> <i>All transactions, Muni Court</i>											
<b>Mail</b> <i>Insurance, US Post, Internal, Fax</i>											
<b>Release of Information</b> <i>Reports (includes routing), Follow ups, SCF, photo</i>											
<b>Telephone Calls</b> <i>Incoming calls only</i>											
<b>Tow Transactions/Impounded Vehicles</b>											
<b>Warrants</b> <i>Entered or confirmed</i>											
<b>Purge</b> <i>Citations, Reports, Warrants</i>											

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Total for Day</b>	<b>Time in Minutes</b>									
<b>Entry of Pawned Property</b>											
<b>Entry of Stolen Property</b>											
<b>Entry of Field Interview Cards and Other Data Entry</b>											
<b>Entry of Reports for the Records Section</b>											
<b>Writing Special Reports</b>											
<b>Review and Entry of Pawned Property from BWI</b>											
<b>All Other Activity</b>											