July 10, 2002

To: Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky, Chairman
   Supervisor Gloria Molina
   Supervisor Yvonne Brathwaite Burke
   Supervisor Don Knabe
   Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: David E. Janssen
   Chief Administrative Officer

SHERIFF LAW ENFORCEMENT SERVICES CONTRACTS POLICY

This is in response to Supervisor Molina’s motion of May 14, 2002, instructing the Chief Administrative Office (CAO), with the aid of County Counsel and Auditor-Controller, to draft a policy or ordinance requiring an analysis to be performed prior to approval of any future Sheriff contract to provide law enforcement services to incorporated cities. The analysis should include: 1) a determination of whether the contract ensures that the County will record, bill, and collect all fees for billable services provided to Contract Cities; 2) an analysis of the services provided or costs incurred by the Department that are or are not charged to Contract Cities; and 3) an analysis by the Department identifying any negative impact on Sheriff services to the unincorporated areas, which is to be approved by the Chief Administrative Officer and Auditor-Controller.

The CAO convened several meetings with representatives from the Auditor-Controller, County Counsel, and Sheriff’s Department. The result of those meetings is a policy, which is an attempt, to address concerns raised in providing Sheriff law enforcement services to cities and the unincorporated areas of the County. The following is recommended:

   Board Policy: The Sheriff is required to work with the Auditor-Controller and CAO to provide the Board, prior to approval of new and/or renewal contracts providing law enforcement services to incorporated cities, an analysis which includes identifying the type of services requested, the resources needed and where they will come from, and the impact to unincorporated area services as a result of providing such services.
This policy should provide the Board with additional information to better understand how contract city services impact the Sheriff’s operations including the deployment of his resources overall, as well as to the unincorporated areas. The information should also compliment and assist the continuing efforts of the working committee coordinated by the CAO Unincorporated Area Services and Special Projects Branch which is addressing patrol service levels in the unincorporated areas.

**Contract City Services – Contract Language**

In addition, the motion asks for a determination of whether the contract ensures that the County will record, bill and collect all fees for billable services provided to Contract Cities. County Counsel reviewed the existing contract and has advised that the contract requires full reimbursement of services requested by the City and provided by the Sheriff, at the rates established by the Auditor-Controller. The contract also requires that the Sheriff bill and the City pay for all services performed on a monthly basis in accordance with the policy and procedures established by the Board and the Auditor-Controller. The contract also contains a provision stating that the Sheriff shall have the final and conclusive say in determining unresolved disputes if both parties cannot come to a mutual agreement after consultation.

The check and balance to determine if the County is appropriately following the proper accounting and monitoring procedures related to contracts is through periodic audits of the Sheriff’s Department conducted by the Auditor-Controller.

**Contract City Services - Policy**

With regard to the issue of the determination of what Sheriff Department services and related costs are charged to the contract cities, current practice is based on a policy adopted by the Board on March 30, 1971. The policy was established based on a study and report prepared by the consulting firm, Booz, Allen and Hamilton. The Auditor-Controller works closely with the Sheriff’s Department to apply this policy to determine what services contract cities are charged, and in the development of the rates used to bill contract cities.

However, the current policy is based on a study conducted over thirty years ago, the work group recommends that the Auditor-Controller, with the assistance of the CAO, be instructed to hire a consultant to review the policy and practice utilized by the County and also review how other counties address this issue, including an analysis of what is billed to contract cities and to propose appropriate changes. Depending on the findings, your Board could decide to bring together potentially impacted stakeholders to discuss and recommend changes to the policy. Pending completion of such a study and subsequent Board action to amend the Board policy, the work group recommends continued use of the current Board policy.
Contract City - Analysis Proposed

Lastly, the motion requires that the Sheriff prepare an analysis to determine whether a new and/or renewal contract for city law enforcement will negatively impact Sheriff’s services to the unincorporated areas. The Sheriff’s analysis is to be approved by the CAO and Auditor-Controller. In order to achieve what is understood to be the desired results of the motion, the workgroup determined that the Sheriff’s analysis should include two parts: first, identification of where the resources needed for the proposed contract would come from, and, second, identification of how the proposed contract would impact resources and services provided to the unincorporated areas. This analysis should be prepared concurrent with the Sheriff Department’s analysis of the service needs of the City for which a new and/or renewal contract is proposed, and should be presented to the Board in advance of the filing of the board letter to provide time for questions and answers. The Auditor-Controller should review the cost allocations associated with the analysis and the CAO should review the budgetary impact of the proposal.

Conclusion

In summary, establishing a policy by which your Board is provided with information on the impact of contract city services on the Sheriff’s overall operations and resources and especially the impact of such contract(s) on unincorporated areas services prior to your approval should be beneficial to your Board’s decision-making. Depending on the findings of the consultant study, your Board may determine to initiate discussions involving stakeholders to recommend an amended Board policy for charging for Contract City services.

If you have any questions, please contact me or your staff may contact Barbara Uyeda of my staff at (213) 974-1457.
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c: Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors
   Auditor-Controller
   County Counsel
   Sheriff