



From: James Henderson
To: Peter Abbott
CC: Thomas Duncan
Subject: IACP Review

Sent: Wed, 23 Apr 2008 15:19:50 GMT

IACP review 4-23-08.doc (54Kb)

Please see attached.

Under Florida law, e-mail addresses are public records. If you do not want your e-mail address released in response to a public-records request, do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead, contact this office by phone or in writing. E-mail messages sent or received by City of Sarasota officials and employees in connection with official City business are public records subject to disclosure under the Florida Public Records Act.



Interoffice Memorandum

Date: 4-23-08

To: Peter J. Abbott, Chief of Police
From: Sergeant, Planning And Inspections Unit
Subject: IACP "Draft" Report Review

I was asked to review the "draft" IACP interim report on organization and staffing by Capt. Duncan. I did review the document and made a number of comments. After our meeting this morning to discuss upcoming changes to the table of organization I reviewed Captain Duncan's report. I would like to submit the following additional comments for your review.

Problems Identified in the IACP "Draft" Report:

Page #1: They state in the opening paragraph that in better economic times they would recommend no cutbacks in personnel. Thus validating that our current staffing level is correct. The opening statement goes on to indicate greater needs based on post 911 events.

Page #1: In the second paragraph who asked them to look at opportunities to reduce personnel? That was not the purpose of this survey, and not what members were told the IACP investigators were here for. I do not remember their survey asking for budget reduction ideas.

Page #2: The report states the USD Captain is supported by an admin assistant and two officers. The IACP was provided a copy of our Table of Organization (from here on referred to as T.O.). No where does it indicate there are two officers working for the USD Captain.

Page #3: The report states District Lt's do not command first responders. According to the T.O. there are in fact three sergeants and twenty two officers under the District Lt's. They are all uniformed first responders and drive marked or tactical cars.

Page #3: Traffic/Marine Unit reported to have eight officers. T.O. states seven traffic officers and two marine officers. (April 2008 two traffic vacancies, one marine vacancy).

Page #3: CRT reported as five officers reporting to Central District Lt. T.O. shows four officers and CRT reports to North District Lt. (April 2008 two vacancies).

Page #3: NET reported as six officers reporting to Central District Lt. T.O. shows five officers and NET reports to North District Lt. (April 2008 one vacancy). Additionally the description of what services CRT and NET provide are almost identical. IACP was provided with annex B of GO 203 which states:

- a. COMMUNITY RESOURCE TEAM (CRT): Provides special enforcement, social and educational services to the public housing community.
- b. NEIGHBORHOOD ENFORCEMENT TEAM (NET): Provides selective enforcement to reduce or eliminate suppressible street crimes through the apprehension of criminal suspects and deterring the criminal element. Utilizes the Problem Oriented Policing method to reach its goals.

Page #3: Crime Preventions reported as two officers providing crime prevention services. They do not mention the Volunteer Coordinator or Project Lifesaver.

Page #4: T.O. states twenty eight school crossing guards. Why approximate 30?

Page #4: Crimes Against Persons, there is no mention of the sexual assault investigators.

Page #4: Crimes Against Property reported as eight detectives. T.O. states seven detectives. (April 2008 six detective's one vacancy).

Page #4: Crimes Against Children reported as three detectives and a "community service officer" The position is a community service aid and a civilian. T.O. states four detectives. There is no mention of the vacant computer crimes detective. There is also no mention of the two SRO as assigned to this unit. (April 2008 two vacant detectives).

Page #4: Criminalistics Unit reported as having an "office assistant III" T.O. states one administrative specialist I.

Page #4: SRO reported as assigned to a number of local schools. I believe that number to be four elementary, one middle school and Temple Beth School.

Page #5: Vice Narcotics reported as two senior transcribers. T.O. states one Admin Specialist II and one senior transcriber.

Page #5: Support Services Division reported to support the "executive function" what is that?

Page #5: Property and Evidence, there is no mention that they are currently one person short.

Page # 5 and 6. Look at the actual T.O. and all the items listed under Support Services. They have minimized to say the least. There are 35 total positions not counting Lt's or special units i.e. swat.

Page #8: "call management strategies" are we no longer going to be a full service department? And have the tax payers been informed of this?

Page #8: There are two places, Supervision of Patrol and District Lt's, that reference is made to information that does not appear in this report. How can you make major changes if you have not seen the final recommendations?

Page #9: NET/CRT the report states a reduction of two officers when in fact their plan only reduces by one officer from current T.O.

Page #9: Traffic/Marine are they recommending six traffic and one marine? Current T.O. is seven traffic and two marine.

Page #9: K9, failure to mention K9 is already one short of T.O. April 2008 one vacant K-9.

Page #9: Transient issues are like crime prevention issues. They should be handled by every officer. And the Gang coordinator duties should be reassigned, not the body.

Page #10: DARE fulfills part of our LETF requirements for community education.

Page #10: Support Services is a division currently so big it is divided in two and has two Lt's. They recommend adding so much more that you have to immediately divide it again.

Page #11: Fiscal Control, I believe they are currently one short.

Page #11: Quartermaster/Maintenance. There are a tremendous number of accreditation issues which flow through this area. Sgt. Rainey does an outstanding job of working on these issues. Despite her best efforts we still fell short in a number of areas during our Mock Assessment. With her excellent work and understanding we should pass accreditation. How does IACP know the public works supervision is sufficient to do the job? Since they did not ask me what standards applied to this area, even if they had interviewed the person, they would have no idea what to have asked. I doubt the current City Fleet Supervisor has any clue what is involved. And our current civilian quartermaster handles very little of the process needed for accreditation.

Page #11: Property/Evidence the report recommends reduction of one technician. Again is this counting the person they are currently short or not? See my just completed staff

inspection of Property and Evidence. One issue identified is the growing backlog of property that should be disposed of, but current short staffing does not permit the work to be done. This problem existed as of April 2008 and is growing.

Page #12: The report now stresses having extremely limited vacancy rates in Uniform and CID. They fail to address current vacancies and their TDY proposal that would have to draw at times from CID.

Page #12: The City has blindly followed every other recommendation from IACP with no apparent consideration for the safety of the officers or public. Why did they choose to ignore the last recommendation?

I believe the "draft" IACP interim report on organization and staffing contains so many errors the document can not be relied on to make staffing recommendations.

J. D. Henderson
Sergeant