

City of Jacksonville - The Jacksonville Journey
Law Enforcement & Deterrence Sub-Committee

MINUTES

OF

POLICE PRESENCE SUB-WORK GROUP

SUB-COMMITTEE

January 22, 2008

The Jacksonville Journey - Police Presence

Sub-Workgroup

January 22, 2008

3:30 p.m.

PROCEEDINGS before the Jacksonville Journey Police Presence Sub-Committee taken on Tuesday, January 22, 2008, Edward Ball Building, 8th Floor - 214 N. Hogan Street, Jacksonville, Duval County, Florida commencing at approximately 3:30 p.m.

Police Presence Sub-Workgroup

Lanny Russell, Chair
Isaiah Rumlín, Member
Melissa Nelson, Member
Frank Mackesy, Member

APPEARANCES

COMMITTEE CHAIRS & MEMBERS:

LANNY RUSSELL, Chair
ISAIHAH RURLIN, Member
MELISSA NELSON, Member
FRANK MACKESY, Member

EXCUSED ABSENT:

ISAIHAH RURLIN, Member

PROFESSIONAL STAFF:

PAM MARKHAM, City Inspector General

STAFF:

MISTY SKIPPER

JILL JONES

OTHERS PRESENT:

Megan Harper, Smith, Hulsey & Busey

Phil Fritz, Florida Times Union

PROCEEDINGS

January 22, 2008

Increasing Police Presence

Call to Order and Comments. Chairman Russell called the meeting to order at approximately 3:45 p.m.

Purpose of Meeting: Discuss the Mayors crime initiate - The Jacksonville Journey - Take a Step - Increasing Police Presence Sub-Committee.

Chairman Russell welcomed the group and asked the group to go around the table for introductions. Following the Introductions Chairman Russell reminded the committee of the Sunshine Law.

Chairman Russell began by explaining this sub-committee has two component parts. The first is to determine the need for more police presence and the second is ideas/suggestions regarding utilization of presently employed police officers. Member Mackesy explained as it relates to the issue of determining the need for more police presence that the City has already employed the services of an outside consultant from California to analyze and compare our current police presence and needs with other similar counties. Member Mackesy went more in-depth by explaining this was a 400 page scientific approach breaking down specific policing functions in comparison with other agencies. Chairman Russell then asked how we take advantage of the work that has already been done to make this sub-committee effective in working out the primary goal. Member Mackesy indicated the Sheriff's office and the Mayor's office had already been meeting and reaching decisions based off the utilization of the study and he was unsure as to what more this sub-committee could truly add until the decisions had been reached and then perhaps this sub-committee could review the same for validation purposes. Following are some questions regarding the Matrix (Study):

Q: Does the Matrix conclude how many additional police officers are needed? **Yes, 40% patrol time should be pro-active law enforcement i.e. stopping cars, checking out suspects, etc;**

however, at this time there is not enough pro-active police time. With this study it has been determined we would need twenty-one (21) additional police officers to get to 40% pro-active policing and an additional 40 CSO s. The 40 CSO s are what is referred to as a forced multiplier which are non-sworn in civilian employees that would take over tasks that did not require a sworn in police officer such as traffic reports and non-violent crimes. With additional CSO's, it would free up sworn police officers and would thus result in greater police presence.

Q: Chairman Russell then asked if 40 CSO s and 21 sworn police officers would get them to the 40% proactive police presence? Mackesy then indicated that the Sheriff wanted to get to 45% proactive policing rather than 40% since the City is leading the State in murders and traffic homicides. This would require 69 sworn police officers and 40 CO s. As an explanation Mackesy referenced 1 to 1.35 meaning 1 CSO saves 1.35 police officers.

Q: Chairman Russell then asked what else do we need to look at beyond the Matrix report? Mackesy answered that 40 to 50% of the officers time (bench time) is proactive policing the rest of the time they are doing other necessary police work i.e. handling calls, paper work, etc. Without pro-activity time they cannot do community policing. Again it was reiterated that the goal was 45% pro-active policing time.

Q: What about more effective use of technology such as comstat? Technology validates crime it does not prevent crime which causes the police officers to be reactive rather than proactive. Q: Should our goal be more than 45% Lets see how we do 45%.

Additionally, we are expecting to receive 3 million dollars in over-time which will bridge the gap between hiring the new CSO s and police officers and getting them up to speed with the veteran police officers.

The remainder of the meeting was focused on what as a committee should be the focus and goals of this group as it would appear the issues in the Matrix were already being addressed and coming close to a resolution. Our role in the Matrix will be in validation. The feelings of the group would be to focus more on community policing with evaluating programs such as community policing, Chad Co. and Comstat and will lend a hand in pro-active policing. And lastly to discuss the per capita expenditure which would determine an appropriate level for funding the sheriff s office and validate police officials needs.

The next meeting will focus on:

- (1) Identifying subject matters.
- (2) Per capita expenditure
and
- (3) Community policing

Adjournment. Meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.