



Chief Executive Office.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES


Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 974-1101 ceo.lacounty.gov

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Fesia A. Davenport

June 24, 2024

To: Supervisor Lindsey P. Horvath, Chair
Supervisor Hilda L. Solis
Supervisor Holly J. Mitchell
Supervisor Janice Hahn
Supervisor Kathryn Barger

From: Fesia A. Davenport 
Chief Executive Officer

MOVING PARKING ENFORCEMENT SERVICES FROM THE SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT (ITEM NO. 85-C, AGENDA OF APRIL 9, 2024)

The Sheriff's Department currently provides parking enforcement services in the unincorporated areas of the County of Los Angeles (County).

As requested and directed by your Board, the Sheriff's Department prepared a business plan to retain and improve parking enforcement services in County unincorporated areas, and the Department of Public Works (DPW) prepared a business plan to establish and optimize civilian parking enforcement services should the Board transfer responsibility for parking enforcement from the Sheriff's Department to DPW. As further directed by your Board, this report compares the Sheriff's and DPW's respective business plans to each other and against your Board's objectives for parking enforcement services.

Based on our analysis, and as explained below, we recommend that:

- Parking enforcement services remain with the Sheriff and that a phased-in budget plan be developed for consideration in the FY 2024-25 Supplemental Budget phase that complies with the Fiscal Resilience Protocol.
- DPW embed a staff person(s) in the Parking Enforcement Unit and establish with the Sheriff's Department a workgroup which would identify, map, prioritize, and systematically assess those unincorporated areas most impacted by illegal parking practices with a joint goal of both enhanced enforcement to disincentivize illegal parking practices and the co-creation of non-enforcement



- solutions (e.g., new signage, changes to traffic flow, auxiliary parking options) to eliminate the need for enforcement in the first place (i.e., to eradicate or mitigate conditions in the built environment which may contribute to illegal parking practices). DPW should also share with the workgroup the ideals in its business plan to leverage technology – as described in section 6 of this memo.
- Sheriff and DPW provide ongoing joint reporting on: operational outputs (e.g., enforcement actions taken and frequency of those actions); community engagement (including identifying communities engaged and engagement frequency); areas that have been mapped and assessed for non-enforcement solutions addressing the built environment; number of non-enforcement solutions initiated and completed; and outcomes measured in various ways (e.g., number of enforcement actions taken, constituent complaints, improved parking practices).
 - Your Board transfer parking enforcement to DPW if the Sheriff's Department is unable to execute its plan and improve outcomes within a reasonable time – we recommend three years – after being allocated the resources identified in its plan.
 - DPW be directed to develop a more complete business plan to operate the parking enforcement function should the Board decide to transfer the function to DPW in the future. If warranted, and to effectuate a seamless transfer, DPW should prepare a "day one" operational plan that itemizes with more specificity, all resources, costs, and milestones needed to implement parking enforcement operations – should the Board decide to move in this direction. Also, DPW should annually update the "day one" plan for the next several years in the event the plan is needed. Annual updates will better position DPW to assume this responsibility and reduce planning time if necessary.

Furthermore, we believe that neither the Sheriff's nor DPW's plan will quickly resolve the pressing quality-of-life issues that some unincorporated communities face with respect to parking. We believe, however, that the Sheriff's Department is better positioned to make improvements sooner than DPW as Sheriff has the benefit of an existing operational model and infrastructure. In this way, the Sheriff's Department has an incumbent's advantage as well as the obligation – the obligation to perform the service well.

For this reason, we approach our recommendations cautiously. We agree with your Board on the need for regular reporting and tracking of metrics and leave open a path to transferring services to DPW if parking enforcement conditions do not measurably improve after the Sheriff's Department's proposed enhancements are implemented. We explain this further in the discussion below regarding whether each plan will result in timely improvements to parking enforcement.

Background

On October 17, 2023, the Board approved a motion directing, among other things, my office to work with the Sheriff and the Director of DPW to prepare a business analysis and proceed with the steps required to transfer parking enforcement services from the Sheriff's Department to DPW.

My office submitted three reports responsive to the motion: 1) on February 29, 2024, a status report that explained moving parking enforcement services from the Sheriff's Department to DPW would require additional funding, identified implementation steps needed to transfer services from a law enforcement to a civilian agency, and highlighted safety concerns raised by union-represented parking enforcement officers; 2) on March 11, 2024, a report transmitting and summarizing DPW's business plan, including estimated startup and operational costs; and 3) on March 18, 2024, a summary of parking enforcement services in neighboring jurisdictions.

My office, the Sheriff, and DPW also verbally updated your Board during your March 19, 2024, public meeting. During that meeting and after receiving the verbal update, your Board adopted a motion requesting the Sheriff to provide a verbal and written report to the Board within 45 days with a proposed business plan to retain and enhance parking enforcement services and incorporate equitable investments back into communities where citation revenues are collected.

On April 9, 2024, your Board adopted two motions related to parking enforcement. The first motion, authored by Supervisor Hahn, directed my office to pause the transfer of parking enforcement services from the Sheriff's Department to DPW until a transition plan is properly vetted, reviewed through the budget process, and approved by the Board. The motion further directed my office to work with the Sheriff's Department and DPW to develop recommendations for the Board's consideration that outline a transition plan for parking enforcement services should the Board choose to make that transition.

The second motion, authored by Supervisor Mitchell, directed my office to review the Sheriff's business plan to determine whether: (1) the plan adequately considers budget impacts, available resources, and service delivery to the unincorporated areas; (2) the plan compares favorably to the business analysis prepared by DPW; (3) the presumed successful execution of the plan clearly demonstrates that maintaining parking enforcement services at the Sheriff's Department provides County residents with the highest and most cost-effective level of parking enforcement services; and (4) the plan provides performance metrics and a commitment by the Sheriff's Department to track execution of the proposed plan. Based on my office's analysis, the motion further directed my office to report back during the 2024-25 Final Changes budget phase on a recommendation for the placement of parking enforcement services, including an appropriate phased implementation plan and funding model for any recommended

transfer of services to DPW.¹ On May 17, 2024, the Sheriff's Department provided a written business plan to enhance parking enforcement services at the Sheriff's Department. On May 21, 2024, Sheriff Luna verbally updated your Board on the business plan.

Identifying Board Objectives to Measure Each Business Plan

My office reviewed DPW's and the Sheriff's business plans and prepared a matrix comparing the information provided in the two plans (Attachment I). To appropriately evaluate the plans, our first step was to distill the objectives for parking enforcement established by your Board through your various motions and directives, as well as discussion during Board meetings related to parking enforcement. These objectives include:

| |
|---|
| 1. Extend parking enforcement services to evenings and weekends. |
| 2. Provide necessary staffing, programmatic, and other costs associated with enhancement plans. |
| 3. Ensure the program will improve the quality-of-life concerns associated with parking enforcement, such as reducing double-parked cars or cars parked outside of permitted areas and hours. |
| 4. Account for the safety concerns of the Parking Control Officers. |
| 5. Allow for a timely enhancement of parking enforcement. |
| 6. Include the integration of modern technologies/data management to improve services. |
| 7. Provide local communities with engagement opportunities through outreach efforts. |
| 8. Estimate new parking revenues that will assist in funding the costs internally. |
| 9. Ensure parking enforcement resources are deployed equitably across communities. |

¹ The motion also directed my office to work with the Sheriff's Department and DPW to provide verbal and written updates quarterly to the Board on the status of improvements to parking enforcement services with specified metrics; create thorough, accurate, and transparent financial reporting on the budgeting and delivery of parking enforcement services; recommend protocols for annual funding to either the Sheriff's Department or DPW contingent on meeting performance metrics for parking enforcement; and work with the Sheriff's Department and/or DPW to ensure equitable investment back into communities where citation revenue is collected, and include information on these investments in the quarterly reporting.

Measuring How Well Each Plan Meets Your Board's Objectives

Our next step was to evaluate the information provided in each plan to assess how well each plan meets the above objectives. Our evaluation is based not only on the information contained in each plan, but also on information we gathered during workgroup meetings with stakeholders, information received from the Sheriff's Department and DPW, site visits to the Sheriff's East Los Angeles Station and their parking enforcement administrative headquarters to evaluate existing parking enforcement services, and meetings with the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation and the City of Long Beach Public Works to better understand their operational models.

Below is our analysis of each objective. The analysis is summarized in Attachment II.

1. Extend parking enforcement to evenings and weekends

Both plans extend parking enforcement services to evenings and weekends. The Sheriff's plan would operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week. DPW's plan would operate 20 hours a day, seven days a week, with a call center that accept calls from residents 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

CEO Assessment:

The hours of providing enforcement services in each plan are very close. Based on the Board's deliberations on the parking enforcement motions, a continuous service availability model seems preferred for highly impacted areas. If, under the Sheriff's model, parking enforcement services will in fact be provided 24 hours a day, then this model seems more closely aligned with the Board's deliberation on the parking enforcement motions.

2. Provide necessary staffing, programmatic, and other costs associated with enhancement plans

My office continues to evaluate the job descriptions of the proposed additional Sheriff's staff, but we believe that the staffing and other known program delivery costs and proposed enhancements presented in both plans are sufficient to enhance existing service levels. Because the plans for both departments are estimated projections, we cannot say with certainty that all enforcement challenges will be eliminated, but we believe with proper and diligent implementation increased resources will go a long way in addressing the challenges.

The total costs of Phases I and II in both plans, including existing costs, are shown below, and are more specifically detailed in Attachment I. The annual ongoing cost

of the Sheriff’s plan is roughly \$12.6 million a year less than DPW’s plan. DPW’s business plan is more costly in part because of DPW’s stated need to establish and staff a new dispatch and call center, as well as additional contracted security needs to extend the hours of coverage beyond the current DPW work schedule to account for the 20-hour operation of parking enforcement at DPW field office locations.

Additionally, DPW’s business plan assumes the transfer of 63 vehicles from the Sheriff’s Department. However, the Sheriff indicated a need for these vehicles outside of Parking Enforcement Operations. As such, DPW may need to acquire new vehicles at startup if the Sheriff vehicles are not able to be repurposed for DPW’s use. New vehicle costs are not factored into the cost comparison below and would increase DPW’s one-time costs.

| Cost Comparison: DPW and Sheriff Parking Enforcement Business Plans (<i>in millions</i>) | | | |
|---|------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| | DPW | Sheriff (gas/hybrid vehicles) | Sheriff (electric vehicles) |
| Annual | \$38.0 | \$25.4 | \$25.4 |
| One-time | \$10.5 | \$3.9 | \$10.4 |
| Total | \$48.5 | \$29.3 | \$35.8 |

CEO Assessment:

Before accounting for revenue generated under either plan, DPW’s model would have a greater budgetary impact on the County general fund than the Sheriff’s proposal. If the service delivery by both departments are high quality, the revenue generated substantially similar, and service delivery qualitatively similar, then the Sheriff’s proposal more closely aligns with budgetary policy to reduce impacts on the County general fund when other options are available.

3. Ensure the program will improve the quality-of-life concerns associated with parking enforcement, such as reducing double-parked cars or cars parked outside of permitted areas and hours

Both plans lacked strong details in this area, but DPW’s plan better described how the Department intended to meet this Board objective. It is important to note that each department indicated this objective would be addressed in Phase II of their respective plans. In the Sheriff’s plan, this would seemingly be addressed by the expansion of services and the improvement in community outreach and input. Beyond that, the Sheriff did not include additional details demonstrating how this objective would specifically be addressed.

The DPW plan similarly indicated these issues would be largely addressed in Phase II by adhering to the performance metrics (e.g., improving response time) and improvements in their media and communications plans. DPW provided additional ideas around ensuring that parking policies and enforcement efforts consider the needs of all community members, such as those with disabilities and low-income individuals. DPW indicated this would be done by managing the public right-of-way to ensure it is accessible to all residents and enhancing the overall quality of life. DPW further indicated this may also involve providing accessible parking options and offering alternative transportation solutions.²

CEO Assessment:

DPW's plan provides more details on the types of things DPW would implement to improve quality-of-life. Sheriff's plan lacks detail in this area and seems to assume that more staff translates into more services, which in turn drives more parking enforcement services. On this point, the specifics in DPW's plan make it a more favorable plan.

4. Account for the safety concerns of the Parking Control Officers

This is not a metric called out in the parking enforcement motions, but was raised repeatedly by both Sheriff Luna and DPW leadership, as well as labor-represented staff, and was discussed during your Board meetings. As such, we are including this objective as a factor for your Board to assess how well each plan would account for the safety of Parking Control Officers.

The Sheriff's plan better described methods to ensure the safety of Parking Control Officers because it is an existing, long-standing process built into its parking enforcement operations. Under current operations at the Sheriff's Department, Parking Control Officers are connected to the Sheriff's dispatch radios. In case of emergency, the radios act as a "lifeline" if a parking enforcement officer is confronted with a dangerous situation. Their direct access to the Sheriff's dispatch system allows for immediate response from Sheriff deputies.

DPW does not have access to the Sheriff's dispatch system and proposes to establish a new system to work with the Sheriff's Department to provide a law enforcement response if DPW Parking Control Officers faced dangerous conditions in the field. The details of this system, as well as the cost and implementation timeline are not specified in DPW's report.

² As recommended above and below, DPW should embed a staff person(s) within the Sheriff's Parking Enforcement Unit and the departments should establish an evergreen workgroup to evaluate and address solutions like these to determine which are feasible, among other things, even if parking enforcement stays with the Sheriff's Department.

CEO Assessment:

Sheriff's plan for security for its parking enforcement officers is an existing process and, in this regard, has an advantage over the plan proposed by DPW. The dispatch system proposed by DPW is just one component of safety. Another important component seems to be a timely response from Sheriff's deputies when the need arises. It is unclear why timely responses could not be replicated if DPW established its own dispatch center. Given the foregoing, the Sheriff's plan is more favorable than DPW's.

5. Allow for a timely enhancement of parking enforcement

Because the Sheriff's Department currently operates parking enforcement, Phase I and Phase II of the Sheriff's Department's plan includes hiring additional Parking Control Officers and enhancements would begin in Phase I. For DPW, Phase I would be focused on transferring operations from the Sheriff's Department with enhancements taking place in Phase II. Therefore, DPW would have a longer timeline to phase in its plan components since they would have to develop some of the operations from scratch, such as setting up their new parking enforcement locations, establishing operations with the transferred staff, obtaining vehicles (if Sheriff's vehicles are not transferred), and implementing a call and dispatch center, among other operational details.

Parking Control Officers at the Sheriff's Department have access to the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS). CLETS is a computer network that gives police departments access to national databases maintained by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of Motor Vehicles, the State of California, and others. According to the California Department of Justice's Manual on CLETS, the CLETS information can only be accessed by authorized law enforcement and criminal justice personnel. Any information obtained from the system must be accessed and used for "official use" only. As DPW is not a law enforcement agency, it appears it would not have access to CLETS and DPW would therefore need to secure an alternate method of getting this type of information which would likely add new costs and additional time to do so. Without access to CLETS, their capacity to call in stolen vehicles or vehicles involved in crimes would be impacted.

As mentioned above, if DPW must procure new electric vehicles to outfit its parking enforcement operations in the event that the Sheriff needs to retain their current vehicles, the procurement process for obtaining sufficient vehicles could impact startup timelines. DPW estimates up to 12 months from the date funding is received by DPW to procure and outfit required vehicles and install charging stations. For Phase II, the vehicle procurement timeline presented is more manageable. However, DPW would need the funding during Phase I to start the purchasing process for Phase II.

Finally, DPW would need to work with the Sheriff's Department to transfer all related contracts (e.g., towing) which could contribute to some additional startup delays.

CEO Assessment:

On October 17, 2023, when your Board approved the initial motion to transfer parking enforcement services from the Sheriff's Department to DPW, the motion, related Board discussion, and resulting analyses brought into sharp focus severe parking-related quality-of-life issues that disproportionately impacted some unincorporated communities in the County – many of them being in the First and Second Supervisorial Districts. Specifically, images depicting the severity of illegal parking in unincorporated areas were shown, including double and triple parked cars and RVs.

Because promptly resolving parking issues in impacted unincorporated communities matters most to those whose daily lives are currently impacted, we included the time-needed-to-implement as a factor in our analysis of each plan.

After carefully reviewing both plans, we are not confident that either plan will result in immediate improvements in unincorporated areas. To get started on enhanced services, both plans require that new funding be identified and allocated, operational ramp up, and new hiring and procurement. However, the Sheriff's Department has an advantage over DPW because it has existing operational model and staff in place, infrastructure (e.g., mobile computers used to access CLETS), equipment (i.e., vehicles), and contracts in place (i.e., towing). None of these are insurmountable for DPW, but it will take time for DPW to establish and operationalize. Even assuming DPW is "laser focused" on standing up their parking control unit with a sense of urgency, we believe it still would take DPW longer to complete the tasks that would position it to provide enhanced services than it would take the Sheriff's Department to position itself to enhance services. Because of this, we believe the Sheriff's Department's plan meets this objective more favorably than DPW's plan.

6. Include the integration of modern technologies and data management to improve services

DPW better described how the implementation of modern technologies would support parking enforcement operations, including license plate recognition systems, parking meters with electronic payment options including credit cards and mobile payments, parking guidance systems to help drivers locate available parking spaces, and the development of GIS-based map layers that capture parking

restrictions and street sweeping routes. DPW also described its plan to leverage data management, tracking, and analytics to support operations.

The Sheriff's plan focuses on staffing, engaging with the community, and improving relations with your Board offices and DPW. The Department has known challenges with its information technology infrastructure. Additional work is needed to integrate data and modern technology into the Sheriff's Department plans to enhance operations to position the Department to routinely report on Board-required metrics for parking enforcement operations without spending inordinate amounts of time pulling and reconciling data.

In addition to serving unincorporated areas, Parking Control Officers issue handwritten parking citations at County facilities countywide. Other County agencies, such as the Department of Beaches and Harbors and the Internal Services Department, and non-County agencies issue handwritten citations that are also processed by the Sheriff's Department. As parking enforcement moves towards modern technologies, the Sheriff's Department should work with partners to discontinue issuing handwritten citations in favor of more efficient technology enabled ticketing system.

CEO Assessment:

DPW seems better poised to leverage technology to enhance parking enforcement service delivery and to leverage it to track performance using metrics identified by the Board. The Sheriff's plan did not address how technology might be used to incorporate the work of other ticketing agencies. DPW's plan did not address how the Department would manage this portion of parking enforcement services. On the whole, DPW is likely better positioned to leverage technology to improve service delivery.

7. Provide local communities with engagement opportunities through outreach efforts

The Sheriff's Department described in detail current community engagement efforts, including attending standing regular stakeholder meetings (including East Los Angeles Business Meeting, Maravilla Group Meeting, and the Gardena Neighborhood Association), and plans to establish additional frequent meetings with interested residents, business owners, and community groups/stakeholders. These stakeholder meetings will include addressing updates to enforcement issues; discussing mapping issues; and establishing forums for the exchange of ideas related to signage improvements. In addition, the Sheriff's Department has improved its public portal and is in the process of creating a parking enforcement customer satisfaction survey for those who report violations to provide feedback on how they viewed the Department's response.

DPW also acknowledged the need to enhance public awareness and collaboration with stakeholders in its plan. DPW plans to solicit feedback, conduct surveys, engage with communities regarding parking regulations and enforcement procedures, and develop a Communication Plan to support these efforts.

Additionally, both departments will need to cultivate a collaborative and mission-centered partnerships with your Board and other interested County entities to create a shared understanding and vision for the improvement of parking enforcement services in the County.

CEO Assessment:

During Board meetings to discuss parking enforcement, your Board expressed a strong desire for stepped-up community outreach and engagement, especially in areas that are disparately impacted by parking issues. We believe that both departments will need to expand their plans for community outreach and engagement efforts to better understand, and meet, the parking enforcement service needs of the residents, business owners, and other community groups in the County's unincorporated areas.

8. Estimate new parking revenues that will assist in funding the costs internally

The enhanced efforts in parking enforcement are expected to increase revenues from parking citations. The Sheriff's Department currently generates approximately \$12.3 million in revenue annually from existing operations. The Sheriff's Department estimates that their plan will increase revenue to approximately \$21 million annually after Phase I of their plan and \$26 million annually after Phase II implementation. If these revenue estimates hold, the Sheriff would cover its ongoing operational costs of \$25.4 million (but not its onetime costs) from citation revenue.

Because DPW lacks historical data or experience with citation revenue collection, they lacked an independent basis from which to estimate parking citation revenues. It could be inferred that DPW could collect revenue at levels similar to the Sheriff's Department's revenue projections collects. It is also assumed that DPW's operations, once fully implemented, would result in an increase in revenues over current levels like those the Sheriff's Department is estimating. Assuming that DPW's citation revenue is the same as Sheriff's estimated revenues after Phase II implementation (\$26 million annually), citation revenues would not cover DPW's proposed operating costs of \$37 million annually, leaving a gap for the County's general fund to cover. Additionally, it is likely that citation revenues will decrease initially with the transfer of services from the Sheriff's Department to DPW, as service levels are expected to decrease temporarily. The duration of the decrease in revenue cannot be estimated at based at this time.

CEO Assessment:

Future citation revenue is difficult to project because there are many factors that might impact the number of citations issued. For example, if compliance improves because of stepped up enforcement, citations might level off or decrease, which would affect revenue projections. Additionally, without historical data, DPW is at a disadvantage in its ability to estimate citation revenues. However, even if we assume that both departments could collect approximately \$26 million in citation revenue, only the Sheriff's proposed plan would be cost neutral once Phase II is fully operationally, not counting onetime startup costs.

9. Ensure that parking enforcement resources are deployed equitably across communities

Neither plan provides detailed implementation information regarding the equitable deployment of resources. The Sheriff's plan suggested they would work with CEO to ensure that budgeted field personnel are deployed throughout the County in an equitable manner. The DPW plan indicates that they would ensure that enforcement efforts consider the needs of all community members.

CEO Assessment:

Both plans lacking meaningful detail. The Sheriff's plan seems more transactional (i.e., deploy field staff as appropriate) and DPW's plan is more conceptual (i.e., equity for all). Both departments would need to work closely with Board offices and the Anti-Racism, Diversity and Inclusion Initiative, to ensure their plans meet the needs of the most impacted communities. Plans should describe how each department would identify, map, assess, prioritize, and engage our unincorporated communities.

By proceeding in this way, the focus and resource deployment would be data-driven and prioritize those communities dealing with the highest impacts rather than deployment based on collection of revenue. Because the total cost of parking enforcement exceeds the amount of parking citation revenue, the revenue should generally be used to partially offset the cost of the overall program, with equitable investments based on the level of need in the communities determined by data as well as various outreach and community engagement efforts.

Recommendations

Keep Parking Enforcement in the Sheriff's Department

Based on the above analysis, both plans compared favorably to your Board's objectives. Although the DPW plan has strong components, the Sheriff's plan has stronger components because of the advantages that come with running the

existing operation (e.g., infrastructure, lower overall enhancement costs). For these reasons, we recommend that your Board maintain parking enforcement services in the Sheriff's Department. This option appears to be more cost effective and enhancements are expected to improve conditions in impacted communities before those impacts would be realized if the operation was transferred to DPW. Specifically, it would take DPW longer to establish current service levels before any enhancements could be made, with the quality of services likely declining upon transfer to DPW as they develop resources and gain knowledge about this new program. If revenue projections are accurate, the Sheriff's Department's ongoing parking enforcement costs could be offset with revenue whereas DPW's would require additional funding to close the gap between revenue and operating costs.

Transfer Parking Enforcement Operations to DPW If Goals Are Not Met Within Stated Timeframe

Because our recommendation to keep parking enforcement services in the Sheriff's Department assumes that implementation of the Sheriff's business plan will result in the outcomes envisioned by your Board, retaining parking enforcement in the Sheriff's Department should also be contingent on outcomes that meet your Board's objectives. Should the Department fail to realize desired outcomes, we recommend that the parking enforcement operation transfer to DPW. We believe three years after implementation of the Sheriff's business plan provides a fair assessment window that accounts for ramp-up. Success or failure in meeting the desired outcomes will be identified through Board-directed quarterly reports designed to ensure that the Department is held accountable for delivering outcomes.

Continued Refinement of DPW's Plan Should It Be Needed in the Future

We recommend that DPW continue to refine its business plan and finalize knowledge regarding all necessary details needed to implement parking enforcement on day 1 – should the operation be transferred to DPW. The plan should establish/refine cost estimates, identify necessary contracted services (contracting timelines), refine procurement timelines, and refine ramp-up timelines needed to operationalize parking enforcement. DPW should keep the plan updated to ensure that it has a well defined option and actionable path to transferring the operation if needed in the future.

DPW Embed Staff in Sheriff's Parking Control Operations

Finally, we recommend that DPW embed staff in the Sheriff's Department's parking enforcement unit. In addition, both departments should establish a workgroup to evaluate parking conditions in the County's most impacted unincorporated areas, and use data to develop and implement creative, non-enforcement solutions that, when coupled with enforcement efforts, help resolve parking issues. These solutions could include, new signage, striping, meters, parking permits, changes to

traffic flow, and auxiliary parking options. The DPW member(s) of the workgroup should also share with the workgroup DPW's suggestion related to leveraging technology as described in section 6 of this analysis. The departments should report on these efforts quarterly as part of their regular parking enforcement reports.

Next Steps

Approve Sheriff's Business Plan

Should your Board adopt these recommendations, your Board should approve the Department's parking enforcement plan. My office will work with the Department to develop a phased funding plan for the FY 2024-25 Supplemental Budget phase. Because we received the Department's business plan on May 17, 2024, we lacked sufficient time to develop a sound and well-vetted phasing plan in time for the Final Changes budget phase. My office will develop a phasing plan and funding recommendations for your Board's consideration of the Supplemental Budget Phase, consistent with your Board-adopted Fiscal Resilience Process. As part of our work to develop a phasing plan and funding recommendations for the 2024-25 Supplemental Budget phase, we will also work with the Sheriff's Department to develop an incentive-based phasing/funding model tied to performance and an equity-based deployment plan.

Should you have any questions or concerns, please contact me or Mason Matthews at (213) 974-2395 or mmatthews@ceo.lacounty.gov.

FAD:JMN:MRM
RM:pp

Attachments

c: Executive Office, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel
Sheriff
Public Works

ATTACHMENT I

| PARKING ENFORCEMENT SERVICES Summary of Business Plans Respectively Submitted by the Department of Public Works and the Sheriff's Department | |
|---|--|
| Public Works Business Plan Date: March 11, 2024 | Sheriff's Business Plan Date: May 17, 2024 |
| Phase I: Transfer parking enforcement staff and functions to DPW, hire admin staff, and purchase equipment. Phase II: Enhance parking enforcement with additional staffing, assets, and technical improvements. | Phase I: Strategic and Evidence-Based Expansion of PED. Phase II: Performance Metrics and Further Enhancement. |
| Additional Positions | |
| Phase I: Transfer the current 90 parking control positions (69 Parking Control Officers (PCOs), 12 Supervising Parking Control Officers (SPCOs), 9 admin), add 3 new admin positions. Phase I: 93 positions Phase II: Add 6 SPCOs, 39 PCOs, and 20 admin. (call center/dispatch, fleet services, admin, support) Phase II: Add 65 positions Total: 158 positions (126 SPCOs and PCOs) | Phase I: Current parking enforcement division staff consists of 90 staff, 81 operational (12 Supervising Parking Control Officers (SPCOs), 69 Parking Control Officers (PCOs)), the remaining are administrative support staff. 22 PCO positions are currently vacant. Ten new hires currently pending. Add 31 positions (7 SPCOs, 18 PCOs, 6 admin) Phase I: Current - 90 positions Add 31 positions Phase II: Add 7 SPCOs, 18 PCOs, and 1 admin. Phase II: Add 26 positions Total: 147 positions (131 SPCOs and PCOs) |
| Implementation Plan(s) | |
| Phase I: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equipment, Facility needs, contracting, and new uniforms • Establish a new 24/7 dispatch and call center • Vehicles: Transfer all 63 vehicles and equipment in batches and install new radios and decals. If all vehicles are not transferred this will result in additional cost. | Phase I: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational expenses for new hires: \$1.5 million for other operational expenses (uniforms, equipment, radios, and contractor-related expenses such as hand-held citation processing devices). • Vehicles: 34 gas/hybrid vehicles (9 replacement vehicles and 25 new vehicles) will be needed at a cost of approximately \$2.1 million. If the electric vehicle option is chosen, 51 |

PARKING ENFORCEMENT SERVICES
 Summary of Business Plans Respectively Submitted by the Department of Public
 Works and the Sheriff's Department

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Phase II:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equipment, Facility needs, contracting. • Dispatch and call center • Vehicles: Purchase 92 electric vehicles (\$5.3 million) and charging stations (\$4.6 million). This would include the replacement of the gas/hybrid vehicles transferred from Sheriff. | <p>electric vehicles will be required at a cost of approximately \$3.2 million, plus an additional \$4.6 million for EV charging stations.</p> <p>Phase II:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance metrics will determine when, but also to what extent, additional PED staff and operational resources will be warranted. • Operational expenses add \$1.1 million to support the new staff. • Vehicles: 25 additional gas/hybrid vehicles will be required at a cost of approximately \$1.5 million. If the electric vehicles option is chosen, an additional 38 vehicles will be required at a cost of approximately \$2.4 million. |
| Hours of Operation/Office locations | |
| <p>20 hours per day (3 am to 11 pm), 7 days a week, additional security will be needed to address extended parking enforcement hours at DPW field locations (\$1.9 million annually) 8 locations throughout county</p> | <p>24/7 operation 23 patrol stations</p> |
| Budget | |
| <p>Current & Phase I: \$23,233,900 annual, plus one-time costs of \$1,754,900</p> <p>Phase II: Increase of \$14,765,606 annual plus one-time \$10,535,700</p> <p>Total Phase I & II Budget request: Annual: \$37,999,506 One-time: <u>\$10,535,700</u></p> <p>Total: \$48,535,206</p> | <p>Current & Phase I: \$23,103,000 (gas/hybrid) \$28,792,000 (gas/electric)</p> <p>Phase II: \$6,180,000 (gas/hybrid) \$7,050,000 (gas/electric)</p> <p>Total Phase I & II Budget request: Annual: \$25,421,000 \$25,421,000 One-time*: <u>\$3,862,000</u> <u>\$10,421,000</u></p> <p>Total: \$29,283,000 (gas/hybrid) \$35,842,000 (gas/electric)</p> <p>(*vehicle costs only)</p> |

PARKING ENFORCEMENT SERVICES
 Summary of Business Plans Respectively Submitted by the Department of Public
 Works and the Sheriff's Department



















| Difference in Total Cost (annual ongoing and one-time) after Phase II Implementation and prior to Revenue Offset | |
|---|---|
| \$12,693,206 - \$19,252,206 | |
| Performance Metrics | |
| <p>The DPW parking enforcement program will collect and analyze data to enhance understanding of parking patterns, identify areas of high demand, optimize enforcement strategies, and better manage the public right-of-way to ensure it is accessible and enhances the quality of life for residents. Performance metrics to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Violation rates • Revenue generation • Response time • Appeals and disputes • Customer satisfaction • Equity and accessibility • Safety improvements • Efficiency of resources • Environmental impact | <p>LASD will work with CEO and Board Offices to enhance performance metrics.</p> <p>Metrics will be used to develop the hiring plan for Phase II, and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Violation rates • Revenue generation • Response times • Appeals and disputes • Customer satisfaction • Equity and accessibility • Safety improvements • Efficiency of resources • Environmental impact |
| Other Issues/Details | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue estimates not specified in the plan, assume they would be similar to Sheriff when fully staffed. • Potential negative impacts on service levels in first year as operations transfer from Sheriff to DPW. • Estimates that it could take 1 year for the purchase and onboarding of new electric vehicles. • Establish and staff a dispatch and call center. • Continued Sheriff's support needed for emergency law enforcement/backup for PCOs. • Accessibility of CLETS by PW. • Outreach and Engagement: Recognize need to regularly | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced services will generate an additional \$14 million in revenue once Phase II is fully operational, and all PCO positions are filled. • Hiring plan will allow for the dedication of the SPCOs to one patrol station, which will improve direct supervision and community engagement. • Outreach and Engagement: Expand community outreach, attend stakeholder meetings, and establish regular frequent meetings with interested residents, business owners, and stakeholders to further discuss parking related matters |

PARKING ENFORCEMENT SERVICES

Summary of Business Plans Respectively Submitted by the Department of Public Works and the Sheriff's Department

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>collaborate and communicate with stakeholders incl. local businesses and residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Technology: Integrate modern technologies such as license plate recognition, electronic parking meters, and GIS-enabled data management.• Need to engage union for staff transfers.• Transfer citation processing vendor, towing, and other contracts. | <p>respective to each patrol station's area of responsibility.</p> |
|--|--|

PARKING ENFORCEMENT ENHANCEMENT

| Board Objectives for Parking Enforcement | Sheriff's Plan | DPW Plan |
|---|--|---|
| 1. Extend parking enforcement services to evenings and weekends. |  High |  High |
| 2. Provide necessary staffing, programmatic, and other costs associated with enhancement plans. |  High |  High |
| 3. Ensure the program will improve the quality-of-life concerns associated with parking enforcement, such as reducing double-parked cars or cars parked outside of permitted areas and hours. |  Low |  Medium |
| 4. Account for the safety concerns of the Parking Control Officers. |  High |  Low |
| 5. Allow for a timely enhancement of parking enforcement. |  Medium+ |  Low |
| 6. Include the integration of modern technologies and data management to improve services. |  Medium |  Medium+ |
| 7. Provide local communities with engagement opportunities through outreach efforts. |  Medium+ |  Medium |
| 8. Estimate new parking revenues that will assist in funding the costs internally. |  Medium |  Low |
| 9. Ensure that parking enforcement resources are deployed equitably across communities. |  Low |  Not responsive |

*Pie Chart represents level of responsiveness to Board's objectives.