



CITY OF WASHINGTON, ILLINOIS Public Safety Committee Agenda Communication

Meeting Date: February 14, 2022

Prepared By: Chief McCoy and Deputy Chief Stevens

Agenda Item: Public Safety Budget Overview for FY 2022-23

Explanation: Prior to presentation of a full proposed budget later this year, we will cover the outline of Public Safety budget plans including Emergency Management Agency, Fire and Rescue, Police (General Fund), and Police (Special Projects). Special Projects encompasses restricted use funds, while the other three are budgets under the General Fund of the City. Each of these fund discussions excludes personnel costs, which we will address separately in accordance with the past practice of department head budget development.

Emergency Management Agency: The current fiscal year (FY) budget totals \$53,300 with expected actual expenses of \$54,881, a difference of \$1,581. That difference is due to higher than planned costs in obtaining new radio equipment to include WEMA on the countywide radio project, which will ensure regional interoperability. Those radios are on order and expected to arrive this FY.

FY 22-23's proposed budget totals \$29,550, a significant decrease because the radio purchase is an unusual expense. Radio use costs may be budgeted high because port fees (think of this as airtime) has not been set by the Tazewell County ETSB, which will run the county radio system. The estimate is made from Motorola's statewide contract, which ends this year, plus an inflation adjustment. Once the Starcom system is working, we can discontinue use of the current radio tower and repeater lease, a savings not reflected in the budget (about \$200 monthly).

Fire and Rescue: The current FY budget is \$1,165,574, mostly driven by contract costs with Washington Fire Department. Actual expenses in the current FY will be very close to this total budget, with significant projects completed including a generator replacement at the main firehouse, driveway repair at the same facility, and pavement at the Constitution training facility. The City is responsible for major repairs at the firehouse, although the Department has not held the City strictly responsible for all applicable expenses. The lack of major projects in FY 22-23 drives our budget estimate down to \$1,151,171. This budget involves few major project expenses, which can cause it to vary from year to year as those expenses come due.

Police (General Fund): The current FY budget is \$864,728. This is the general operating budget for the Department, providing goods and services generally necessary for operation. Actual expenses in the current FY will be substantially under budget, mostly due to a shift in Evidence and Property storage plans. We budgeted funds in the current year hoping to move toward bringing the facility into a serviceable condition. We have learned through an engineering analysis that the current building cannot be made suitable for its current use. Pouring funds into that building, only to replace it within a year, would be a waste, so the bulk of that funding remains unspent. Firearms training appears to be an area of savings, but is in reality shifted cost. This FY we expect to receive an ammunition order that is

over a year old. “This year’s” order will not arrive until 2023. We have routinely adjusted for long wait times, but supply issues have extended those times. There will appear to be a \$16,000 increase in budget request for this line. That is offset by savings in the current year. We continually examine training in this area to maximize what value we receive from available training material.

The budget request is for \$1,989,520. \$900,000 of that is related to replacement of the Property and Evidence facility. Although we expect that funding to come from grant funding, it is listed here as a General Fund expense. For end budgeting purposes, the City may well choose to shift this to a more appropriate account for building. A second expense of unusual (for the PD) proportion is replacement of in-car video systems. We have budgeted that expense at \$214,000. We expect the system to have a useful life of 5 years. Alternately, we could include a finance charge of about \$8,800 to spread payments out over the 5 years. In-car video is an item we placed on the Capital Equipment Replacement Fund, which has accumulated about \$62,000 to help offset this cost (resulting cost to the General Fund, \$152,000). This purchase will correct shortcomings in the current video system and ensure the platform is capable of handling the upcoming addition body cameras. We expect this cost will also reduce IT expenses by about \$3,600 annually by reducing server maintenance. It likely allows us to eliminate some backbone hardware by moving the service to the cloud.

Overall with our actual expenses next year, we may be able to eliminate some budgeted duplicative costs in technology maintenance which are caused by an inability to confidently predict when we can replace certain technologies (radio, in-car cameras), as we have budgeted both for maintenance of the old systems and replacement.

Total GF Budget Request: \$1,989,520

Expected Evidence Building offset from grant funds: \$900,000

CERF offset from in-car cameras: \$62,000

Resulting GF cost minus these offsets: \$1,027,520

Special Projects: Special Projects includes restricted-use funds such as the Alcohol Enforcement Fund, Drug Enforcement Fund, Vehicle Seizure, and donated canine funds. Our current FY budget here is \$78,250. Use of these funds can vary from year to year based on required projects. For examples, we do not purchase a police dog annually and our recent purchase of mobile radar units will not be repeated for several years. A year or two of lower use of these funds maintains them for comparatively larger purchases in the future, as these funds are restricted. In the future, we expect to be able to use technology to increase our efficiency. The budget request for FY 22-23 is \$38,050. \$9,000 of that total is for the canine unit, provided from funds donated specifically for that purpose. Funds similarly restricted provide for maintenance of alcohol enforcement supplies or drug enforcement expenses such as chemical testing requirements. We expect legal fees associated with vehicle seizure to be up slightly at \$9050. Those funds are segregated from normal legal expenses as they provide for adjudication of vehicle seizures, with the funding taken from forfeited vehicle seizure bonds.

Personnel: The Police Department seeks to adjust staffing in two areas to respond to developed needs. In officer staffing, we seek the addition of one authorized position. We would apply that to a full-time drug enforcement task. While all officers have a drug enforcement component to their jobs, we know that dedication to this area produces results in lessening crime and disorder for our community. Much like any other area of human behavior, we do not expect to arrest our way out of a society-wide drug problem. We currently lack the resources to pursue illegal drug distributors within

our community. We have seen through a part-time dedication of a specialized officer for a short time that our estimation of drug sales within the City was likely low. Each of us likes to believe that problems come in to our city or a few residents go outside our City to seek illicit drugs, leaving many of the associated problems somehow outside our border. That is not the case. We also know that while we cannot arrest our way out of a wide-ranging societal problem, we can apply pressure to reduce its incidence and effect in our community. Reducing the local availability of illicit drugs will reduce risks to our residents, particularly as we continue to deal with pressures associated with 2 years of isolation.

The second adjustment is moving a civilian position from part-time to full-time. Sherry Guimond is a Police Administrative Support Specialist (PASS) whose “part-time” position includes property and evidence management. Her “part-time” position in calendar year 2021 resulted in 40.23 hours per week. Based on those hours, she does receive City health insurance. We seek to formalize that full-time position based on the long-term need for more professional and formalized property and evidence management and for her foray into grant applications. PASS Guimond has a work history that includes specialized government contracting, which translates easily into grant application and compliance work. She has recent training in seeking private and government grants. We would seek to increasingly segregate her time away from general PASS duties toward evidence and property management, grant applications and compliance. The fiscal result for FY 22-23 is authorizing PASS at 3 full-time positions instead of 2 while keeping part-time Full-Time Equivalency (FTE) the same. This allows us to cover the front desk while maximizing efficiency in the covered areas.

Fiscal Impact: Operational funding outside of personnel costs are outlined above. Total Public Safety budgets outlined above compare at \$2,161,852 for FY 21-22 versus \$3,208,291 for FY 22-23 (or \$2,094,291 with the listed grant and CERF offsets). Adjustments to personnel costs vary based on individual hire for a police officer (depending on lateral entry or training requirements), but are generally budgeted at \$81,550. The addition of a full-time civilian position without a corresponding adjustment to part-time authorization we estimate at \$19,920.

Action Requested: Committee consideration, input, and recommendation to the full Council for a consensus Public Safety budget.