

**Southern Police Commission
Continuation Meeting
2019 Budget
September 18, 2018**

A public continuation meeting of the Southern Police Commission was held on Tuesday, September 18, 2018 at the New Freedom Borough Council Chambers, 49 East High Street, New Freedom, PA 17349.

Commission Members Present: Donna Benton (seated alternate), Roy Burkins, Rob Herzberger, Mike Sharkey, Andrew Stewart, John Trout, John-Paul Whitmore (seated alternate)

Members absent: Buck Buchanan, Bruce Merrill, Larry O'Brien

Alternate Members present (not seated): None

Department Staff present: Chief Boddington, Sgt. Smuck, Sgt. Teague, Finance Administrator Prego

Solicitor: Not Present

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The meeting was called to order at 19:05, with the pledge of allegiance to the flag and a moment of silence remembering first responders that have made the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty.

CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Chairman Trout announced that the purpose of this meeting was to deal with budgetary items. He expected the Solicitor to arrive later during the meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

- Chairman Trout asked for any public comments. There were none.

REVIEW OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

- Chairman Trout asked the Recording Secretary to explain the excerpted minutes document that was provided.
- The recording secretary explained that the excerpt minutes were from the July meeting which had been approved at the August meeting to include the addition of certain detailed items that had been requested be added to the minutes as requested by Commissioner Sharkey. The items in the published minutes and excerpt were obtained from the audio recording of the July meeting, and the resultant minutes that had been published on the Web site. The August minutes were not approved at the September regular meeting due to a belief that the additional items Commissioner Sharkey requested be included from the July meeting hadn't been captured in minutes. Commissioner Sharkey, at this meeting, has provided a document further clarifying the items he'd requested to be captured in the July meeting minutes, and that document is attached to and made a part of these minutes, superseding the excerpted document presented.
- The August meeting minutes were re-presented for approval without any changes from the previous meeting's presentation. Chairman Trout requested a motion to approve the August 1, 2018 meeting minutes. Commissioner Whitmore made the motion, seconded by Commissioner Burkins. This motion was approved by an Aye vote.
- The minutes for the September 5, 2018 minutes were also submitted for approval. It was determined to defer approval of these minutes until the October regular meeting due to insufficient time to review them. Members were advised to retain the paper copy they were provided. Soft copies of the draft September minutes had been emailed to all Commissioners, Alternates, and those Department Staff members present at the meeting.

FINANCE AND BUDGET

Revenue

- Sgt. Smuck has provided a set of documents with charts including a three (3) year average and a two (2) year average of calls, time, and other information to determine the required PPU's for 2019. These documents are included and made a part of these minutes. He explained that the 3 year average was arrived at by using the current year's (2018) statistics from January to June, and multiplied by 2 to annualize the information. The second page is the 2 year average presented at the previous meeting. He further explained the methods he'd used to arrive at these results and the forecast of minimum PPU's for each full member and contracted municipality based on the data.
- There was a question from Commissioner Whitmore about the calculations for the school district's PPU's, which was answered in detail by Sgt. Smuck and Administrator Prego. In summary, the school districts are paying a fixed amount which really doesn't fit well with the PPU model. The PPU's presented for the school districts represent what the fixed amounts calculate to, expressed in PPU's.
- Commissioner Herzberger presented a chart with expanded information and differing results to calculate PPU's required for 24-7 coverage for member communities, including monetary attributions to forecast expected income. This chart is made part of these minutes.
- Commissioner Herzberger asked questions of Department Staff and lead a detailed discussion regard how our costs and PPU calculations are affected by out-of-jurisdiction calls and other details.

Expenses

- Financial Administrator Prego presented a proposed spending budget chart with projected expenses broken down by major budget categories. The projected expense budget presented is a collaborative effort of the Chief, Officers, and Administrative staff. This budget chart is made a part of these minutes.
- Salaries & Wages – Officers: The staffing numbers are based on 13.25 officers. We are currently short 2 officers that we hope are on staff by January. The budget shows the full complement of officers. The 2018 results represent the current short staffing. There is a placeholder in the budget for pay increases based on information provided by Commissioner Sharkey with reference to the current contract negotiations being successful.
- Payroll & Personnel Expenses: The drivers in this section are health insurance. There may be and 8% increase. The MMO is another thing in there. We're subtracting almost \$8k. Another big expense is workers compensation. The maximum change is expected to be 25%.
- Vehicles: We've gotten the new car, a Charger. There is very little residual value in the cars that we can trade and we need them for our obligations with the SROs. The next vehicle purchase will be in the vicinity of \$45k.
- Police Operating Expenses: The cost from the County for additional vehicle computers is included. Body armor – we will need 4 additional vests. Liability policies: There continue to be outstanding cases with potential liability. There's not a huge increase anticipated.
- Occupancy Expenses: The offer from New Freedom was at the current rate with a 5 year lease. There remain open concerns moving forward with the Department's location.
- Administrative Expenses: Labor contract expenses were in this item last year (2018). There are none this year. The part-time administrator pay is in there.
- Capital Outlay – Vehicles: Another new vehicle purchase is anticipated.
- Capital Outlay – Equipment: Body Cameras are included.

- With current liabilities considered, there may be \$100,000.00 in reserve available for some of these expenses.
- There was other detailed discussion regarding specific anticipated expenses, mostly exchanges between Administrator Prego and Commissioner Herzberger.

Chief Boddington mentioned that every budget has expected expenses “set in stone” and then there’s the “wish list”.

- We’re trying to keep up with upgrading vehicles to avoid being “nickel and dimed” on maintenance.
- Technologies are changing as are the liabilities associated with police work.
- Sgt. Teague is looking into “body cams” to address some of these issues. He asked Sgt. Teague to address the Commission with his findings.
- Sgt. Teague explained that body cams are gaining popularity with police departments and with the officers and suitable products and systems coming out fairly quickly. A vendor gave our department some body cams for a year to try out and see what we think. We’ve been using them since last February, one for each officer.
- The body cameras are recharged and video data is uploaded at the same time. Sgt. Teague explained in considerable detail the operation of the cameras and associated video and audio processing systems. They can record both audio and video, and current Pennsylvania wiretap laws allow this sort of operation. The cameras can interoperate with the officer’s phone and data can be transferred to our server to be used as evidence.
- With Axon, there are several financial plans available to obtain the cameras. Estimated costs for one plan, \$25,000 initial outlay for a year, and every year after that \$8,500. With this plan, there’s complete service coverage and every 2½ years we get new equipment. Another plan cost estimate is \$16,000 to purchase the equipment and we own it, including any break/fix, replacement, and maintenance costs. The costs with this plan add \$4,000 for data storage and processing user interfaces. Equipment changes and upgrades are at our expense at the then-prevailing costs.
- Sgt. Teague has spoken with other departments to find their results regarding what brands they’re using and how it’s working out. There’re mixed reviews.
- WatchGuard, who provides our vehicular cameras now, have a system that will integrate with what’s in the cars. They are expected to call on us two weeks from now to demonstrate and provide 2 test cameras and set up the software. They are likely more expensive. There may be a 3 year warranty, from then on we own it and it’s our responsible for ongoing break/fix, replacement, and maintenance.
- Recent history indicates the value of the body cameras, including our ability to take an objective look at officer’s performance in response to citizen complaints when interacting with us.
- Commissioner Benton asked about legal requirements, right to know, etc. Sgt. Teague explained that our Commonwealth wiretap laws were ridiculous, but have changed and we now have no obligation to notify or gain permission to record audio and video, even in someone’s house. Chief Boddington added that the Right-to-Know laws allow us to redact portions of recordings or deny requests if the information they request regards a pending case. Examples were given.
- Chief Boddington opined that we will need body camera capability. The officers are pleased with the protection that it provides them regarding their behavior with interacting with the public, and the results of their encounters with individuals and their reactions.

- There was further detailed discussion and clarifying questions regarding costs and value. Battery replacement costs are a consideration and included in the maintenance plans of the most preferred solution.
- The line item in the budget is \$30k, the highest likely cost.
- A citizen in the audience asked about whether the replacement cameras under these plans would be new or refurbished. She was relating the question to her experiences with cell phones. Sgt. Teague explained that replacement cameras could be new or refurbished, and the vendor would assume responsibility for break/fix and maintenance the replacement units regardless of new or refurbished, so it really doesn't matter.
- Sgt. Teague mentioned that Solicitor Ruth has already reviewed, and concurred with, the Department operational policy regarding body camera use.

Chairman Trout announced that the 2019 MMO is calculated to be \$139,733.00 and must be paid by December 31, 2019. This obligation must be met with general funds money or any general state aid to municipal pensions. It must be submitted by the end of September or early October as clarified by Administrator Prego with specific dates. He requested a motion to approve the MMO. A motion was made by Commissioner Whitmore, seconded by Commissioner Stewart. There were no questions. A vote was taken and there was a unanimous Aye vote.

Chairman Trout asked Commissioner Herzberger, the Finance Committee Chairperson, if there was any action required on the budget at this meeting. Commissioner Herzberger led the discussion. Administrator Prego stated that 13.25 officers are the minimum number of officers required to maintain 24/7 coverage for all 4 municipalities, which works out to 53.00 PPU's. The PPU allocation for Railroad and Winterstown has to be considered. If it's too high, they're likely to no longer participate, in which case the revenue from those municipalities will be lost with no reduction in actual costs. Winterstown is up for renewal in March 2019, and there is an ongoing service agreement with Railroad based on service demand. An observation was made by someone that Railroad Borough is part of the travel path between our other municipalities.

Commissioner Sharkey made a motion that less than 1 PPU, which is 520 hours, should be billed at the current hourly rate. Commissioner Herzberger opined that this discussion should be part of the IGA committee topics. The motion was withdrawn.

Administrator Prego asked what figures to use to finalize the budget based on 53.00 PPU's. There was considerable detailed discussion. The Finance Committee will work with administrator Prego to come up with the required information.

Chairman Trout announce that the purpose of the meeting was to deal with the budget, and that it's been dealt with. He asked for a motion to adjourn. That motion was made by Commissioner Burkins, and seconded by Commissioner Benton. An Aye vote was taken and the meeting adjourned.

September 18, 2018

Dear Commission Members:

At the July 17, 2018 meeting of the Southern regional Police Commission I proposed establishing a committee consisting of one person designated by each member municipality of the Southern Regional Police Commission (Boroughs of Glen Rock, New Freedom, Shrewsbury and Stewartstown) with the purpose to recommend changes to the current Intergovernmental Agreement to accomplish the following purposes:

1. Provide for a commitment to a five year period of continued participation as a full member of Southern Regional Police Commission whereby each member municipality agrees that they can not and will not withdraw from the agreement. This would be a primary objective.
2. Provide a mechanism describing how the prior 3 year PPU usage is calculated. This should be calculated annually and provide clarification to member municipalities for a minimum PPU obligation as part of the agreement.
3. Provide a mechanism to classify amendments or changes to the agreement as major or minor changes to allow minor changes to be made without requiring unanimity from member municipalities.
4. Provide a clearer definition of financial obligations if member municipalities wish to withdraw in the future. Any future withdrawal from the agreement should carry a level of financial penalties (i.e. "painful exit") to sufficiently ensure Commission obligations are able to met and the remaining member municipalities are not burdened by long term financial obligations created when withdrawing municipalities were members.
5. Propose any additional changes to ensure a stronger partnership between members and provide the long-term success and ongoing concern of the Southern Regional Police Department and its governing Commission.

I reiterated points 1-4 above similarly at the August 1st, 2018 meeting. I hereby submit them for inclusion in the minutes.

Mayor Mike Sharkey

IACP FORMULA

3 Year Average

Municipality	Total Calls	Obligated Time	Total Hours	Patrol Officers Needed	Officer Total Staffing	Municipality Percentage	Total Fixed Positions	Fixed Positions per municipality	Suggested Officer Compliment	Minimum PPU's 2019 3 Year Ave	2018 PPU's by %
Shrewsbury	1403	1052.25	3156.75	0.72	1.9416	0.3121	5.00	1.5603	3.50	14.01	17.38
New Freedom	1274	955.5	2866.50	0.65	1.7631	0.2834	5.00	1.4168	3.18	12.72	15.26
Glen Rock	652	489	1467.00	0.33	0.9023	0.1450	5.00	0.7251	1.63	6.51	7.32
Stewartstown	763	572.25	1716.75	0.39	1.0559	0.1697	5.00	0.8485	1.90	7.62	10.43
Railroad	102	76.5	229.50	0.05	0.1412	0.0227	5.00	0.1134	0.25	1.02	0.33
Winterstown	146	109.5	328.50	0.08	0.2021	0.0325	5.00	0.1624	0.36	1.46	0.92
School District	126	94.5	283.50	0.06	0.1744	0.0280	5.00	0.1401	0.31	3.85	1.36
SE SD	30	22.5	67.50	0.02	0.0415	0.0067	5.00	0.0334	0.07	3.85	
Totals	4496	3372.00	10116.00	2.31	6.2220	100.0000%	5.00	5.0000	11.22	51.03	53.00

	2016	2017/2018	2 Year Ave	3 Year Ave	OOJ % Calculations
Shrewsbury	1454	1302	1378	1367	36.00 1403
New Freedom	1277	1286	1281.5	1241	33.00 1274
Glen Rock	612	655	633.5	635	17.00 652
Stewartstown	872	677	774.5	743	20.00 763
Railroad	99	106	102.5	102	106.00
Winterstown	110	169	139.5	146	
Southern SD	114	134	124	126	
Southeastern SD	49	20	34.5	30	
Out of Jurisdiction	137	77	107	106	
Totals	4724	4426	4575	4496	

IACP FORMULA

2 Year Average

Municipality	Total Calls	Obligated Time	Total Hours	Patrol Officers Needed	Officer Total Staffing	Municipality Percentage	Total Fixed Positions	Fixed Positions per municipality	Suggested Officer Compliment	Minimum PPU's 2019	2018 PPU's by %
Shrewsbury	1414	1060.50	3181.50	0.73	1.9568	0.3091	5.00	1.5454	3.50	14.01	17.38
New Freedom	1315	986.25	2958.75	0.68	1.8198	0.2874	5.00	1.4372	3.26	13.03	15.26
Glen Rock	650	487.5	1462.50	0.33	0.8995	0.1421	5.00	0.7104	1.61	6.44	7.32
Stewartstown	795	596.25	1788.75	0.41	1.1002	0.1738	5.00	0.8689	1.97	7.88	10.43
Railroad	102	76.5	229.50	0.05	0.1412	0.0223	5.00	0.1115	0.25	1.01	0.33
Winterstown	140	105	315.00	0.07	0.1937	0.0306	5.00	0.1530	0.35	1.39	0.92
School District	124	93	279.00	0.06	0.1716	0.0271	5.00	0.1355	0.31	3.85	1.36
SE SD	35	26.25	78.75	0.02	0.0484	0.0077	5.00	0.0383	0.09	3.85	
Totals	4575	3431.25	10293.75	2.35	6.3314	100.0000%	5.00	5.0000	11.33	51.45	53.00

	2016	2017/2018	2 Year Ave	3 Year Ave	OOJ % Calculations
Shrewsbury	1454	1302	1378	1367	36.25
New Freedom	1277	1286	1281.5	1241	33.71
Glen Rock	612	655	633.5	635	16.66
Stewartstown	872	677	774.5	743	20.37
Railroad	99	106	102.5	102	107.00
Winterstown	110	169	139.5	146	
Southern SD	114	134	124	126	
Southeastern SD	49	20	34.5	30	
Out of Jurisdiction	137	77	107	106	
Totals	4724	4426	4575	4496	

**Southern Regional Police Department
2019 Budget**

	Top Level Summary				
	Jan - Dec 18	Jan - Dec 19	Dollar Change	% Change	% of Budget
Salaries & Wages - Officers	1,062,419	1,251,374	188,955	17.79%	54.06%
Salaries & Wages - Admin	41,122	70,946	29,824	72.53%	3.06%
Payroll & Personnel Expenses	594,128	641,182	47,054	7.92%	27.70%
Vehicle Expenses	62,228	67,223	4,995	8.03%	2.90%
Police Operating Expenses	62,132	76,633	14,501	23.34%	3.31%
Occupancy Expenses	51,090	51,220	130	0.25%	2.21%
Administrative Expenses	94,439	81,350	(13,089)	-13.86%	3.51%

Southern Regional Police Department

2019 Budget

Top Level Summary

	Jan - Dec 18	Jan - Dec 19	Dollar Change	% Change	% of Budget
Capital Outlay - Equipment	-	30,000	30,000	100.00%	1.30%
Capital Outlay - Vehicles	35,000	45,000	10,000	28.57%	1.94%
Total Expenses	2,002,558	2,314,928	312,370	15.60%	100.00%
Payroll & Personnel Expenses	1,774,450	2,011,270	236,820	13.34%	87.75%
Vehicle Expenses	82,222	112,222	30,000	36.49%	4.84%
Manufacturing Expenses	8,100	10,000	1,900	23.46%	0.43%
Utility Expenses	127,186	132,186	5,000	3.93%	2.15%
Administrative Expenses	10,500	13,250	2,750	26.20%	0.57%

Member/ Customer	Smuck 16-18	Percent of Hours	Time Call	Obligated Time	Patrol Factor	Total Actual	Admin Hours	Total Hours	Hours /PPU	Number of PPU's	Percent of PPU's	Cost	Subsidy	Adjust For Subsidy	19 Cost	% of Budget	18 Cost	% Change \$ Change
Shrew	1367	26.34%	0.75	1025.3	3	3075.8	3380	6455.3	520	12.41	26.34%	\$ 632,135	\$ -	\$ 72,326	\$ 704,461	29%	\$ 643,938	9.40% \$ 60,523
NF	1241	23.91%	0.75	930.8	3	2792.3	3068	5860.3	520	11.27	23.91%	\$ 573,870	\$ -	\$ 65,659	\$ 639,529	27%	\$ 565,650	13.06% \$ 73,879
GR	635	12.24%	0.75	476.3	3	1428.8	1570	2998.6	520	5.77	12.24%	\$ 293,640	\$ -	\$ 33,597	\$ 327,237	14%	\$ 271,188	20.67% \$ 56,049
Stew	743	14.32%	0.75	557.3	3	1671.8	1837	3508.6	520	6.75	14.32%	\$ 343,582	\$ -	\$ 39,311	\$ 382,893	16%	\$ 386,504	-0.93% \$ (3,611)
RR	102	1.97%	0.75	76.5	3	229.5	252	481.7	520	0.93	1.97%	\$ 47,167	\$ (32,167)	\$ -	\$ 15,000	1%	\$ 15,000	0.00% \$ -
Winter	146	2.81%	0.75	109.5	3	328.5	361	689.4	520	1.33	2.81%	\$ 67,514	\$ (25,274)	\$ -	\$ 42,240	2%	\$ 42,240	0.00% \$ -
SO SRO		8.19%	0.75	1560.0		956.3	1051	2007.0	520	3.86	8.19%	\$ 196,537	\$ (52,217)	\$ -	\$ 144,320	6%		
SE SRO		8.19%	0.75	1560.0		956.3	1051	2007.0	520	3.86	8.19%	\$ 196,537	\$ (52,217)	\$ -	\$ 144,320	6%		
other	106	2.04%	0.75	79.5	3	238.5	262	500.6	520	0.96	2.04%	\$ 49,017	\$ (49,017)	\$ -	\$ -	0%		
Total	4340	100%		6375.0		11677.6	12831	24508.6		47.13	100%	\$ 2,400,000	\$ (210,892)	\$ 210,892	\$ 2,400,000	100%		

Members 76.80%
Shrew 34.30%
NF 31.13%
GR 15.93%
Stew 18.64%
Total 100.00%

S/A 17.17
N/F 15.58
G.R. 7.97
ST 9.33

61
133
386
386
96
570.06