Local Agency Formation Commission of Napa County
Subdivision of the State of California

1700 Second Street, Suite 268
Napa, California 94559
Telephone: (707) 259-8645
Facsimile: (707) 251-1053
http://napa.lafco.ca.gov

April 2, 2012
Agenda Item No. 8a (Discussion)

March 27, 2012

TO: Local Agency Formation Commission

FROM: Keene Simonds, Executive Officer
Brendon Freeman, Analyst

SUBJECT: **Municipal Service Review on Countywide Law Enforcement Services**
The Commission will receive a draft report on its scheduled municipal service review on countywide law enforcement services. The draft examines the availability and adequacy of local law enforcement services relative to the Commission's mandates to facilitate orderly growth and development. This includes making determinative statements on specific governance and service factors prescribed under law. The draft is being presented to the Commission for discussion and feedback in anticipation of preparing a final report for approval at the next regular meeting.

The Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 directs Local Agency Formation Commissions (LAFCOs) to prepare municipal service reviews every five years to inform their other planning and regulatory activities. This includes, most notably, preparing and updating all local agencies' spheres of influence as needed. Municipal service reviews vary in scope and can focus on a particular agency, service, or geographic region as defined by LAFCOs. Municipal service reviews may also lead LAFCOs to take other actions under its authority such as forming, consolidating, or dissolving one or more local agencies. Municipal service reviews culminate with LAFCOs making determinations on a number of governance-related factors that include addressing infrastructure needs or deficiencies, growth and population trends, and financial standing consistent with California Government Code Section 56430.

A. Discussion and Analysis

Countywide Law Enforcement Services

Consistent with LAFCO of Napa County's ("Commission") adopted study schedule, staff has been working on a municipal service review on law enforcement services provided throughout Napa County. The municipal service review's principal objective is to develop and expand the Commission's knowledge and understanding of the current and planned provision of local law enforcement services relative to present and projected needs throughout the county. This includes, in particular, evaluating the availability and adequacy of law enforcement services provided – directly or indirectly – by the six principal local service providers operating in Napa County subject to Commission

Lewis Chilton, Chair
Councilmember, Town of Yountville

Brad Wagenknecht, Vice Chair
County of Napa Supervisor, 1st District

Brian J. Kelly, Commissioner
Representative of the General Public

Joan Bennett, Commissioner
Councilmember, City of American Canyon

Bill Dodd, Commissioner
County of Napa Supervisor, 4th District

Gregory Rodeno, Alternate Commissioner
Representative of the General Public

Juliana Inman, Alternate Commissioner
Councilmember, City of Napa

Mark Luce, Alternate Commissioner
County of Napa Supervisor, 2nd District

Keene Simonds
Executive Officer

oversight. These agencies include: (a) City of American Canyon; (b) City of Calistoga; (c) City of Napa; (d) City of St. Helena; (e) Town of Yountville; and (f) County of Napa. The Commission will use the municipal service review to inform its decision-making as it relates to performing future sphere updates for the affected agencies as well as evaluating future jurisdictional changes throughout the county.

Draft Report

Staff has prepared a draft report on the municipal service review for Commission review and feedback. The draft report is relatively intact from a preliminary version presented for discussion at the December 2, 2011 meeting with two key changes. First, the draft report has been expanded to review the Town of Yountville independent of its contracting relationship for law enforcement services with the County of Napa. Second, the draft report includes an Executive Summary narrating key service and policy issues underlying local law enforcement services relative to the Commission's mandate to facilitate orderly growth and development. The Executive Summary also includes close to 100 determinative statements addressing all of the prescribed factors mandated for Commission consideration under LAFCO law.

With regards to central issues identified, and as detailed in the Executive Summary, the draft report validates local law enforcement services are effectively managed and largely responsive in meeting current community needs; needs that distinctively vary throughout the region based on policies, preferences, and demographics. The draft report notes overall crime levels in Napa County are trending downward and the most serious offenses – violent – have decreased by nearly 20% over the last five reported years. Nonetheless, the draft report identifies three prominent issues underlying local law enforcement services directly relevant to the Commission's mandates in facilitating orderly municipal growth and development and are summarized below.

- **Approaching Tipping Point**
  The draft report substantiates there is an increasing fiscal pressure on local law enforcement agencies in keeping up with baseline costs; costs that are predominantly dependent on an increasingly scarce source of general tax revenues. This dynamic – funding rising baseline costs through stretched general fund monies – suggests there may be an approaching "tipping point" in which current service levels will no longer be sustainable given agencywide considerations. This latter comment is particularly applicable to the two north county cities.

- **Growth Matters**
  The draft report demonstrates there are two important correlations between growth and crime in Napa County. First, crime totals over the last five reported years for each of the six affected agencies generally correspond with resident population changes. This point is highlighted by American Canyon having experienced relatively matching changes in both population (32%) and crime

(40%). Put another way, more growth brings more crime. Second, higher densities generally produce higher crime rates. This point is illustrated by comparing Calistoga and St. Helena given both have relatively similar resident population amounts, but have averaged dramatically different annual crime totals at 30 and 18 reported incidents for every 1,000 residents, respectively. The exceedingly high number of average annual crimes in Calistoga compared to St. Helena appears most attributed to the former's resident density being nearly double the latter.

- **More than Economies of Scale**
  The draft report draws attention to significant geographic distinctions in local law enforcement services between north and south county cities relative to costs, demands, and other key considerations; distinctions that appear fueled in part, *but not exclusively*, by economies of scale (emphasis added). These distinctions include the north county cities – Calistoga and St. Helena – averaging between 60% and 100% more in sworn staffing expenditures and service calls than the two south county cities – American Canyon and Napa – on a per capita measurement. Average clearance rates overall in the south county cities are also notably higher.

Additionally, and drawing from the three preceding central issues, the draft report includes measured recommendations aimed at generating additional discussion on perceived opportunities to improve local law enforcement services going forward. These recommendations fall short of prescribing specific actions, but memorialize areas the Commission believes warrant further review with the intention of reevaluating if and when considering any future boundary/service changes involving the affected communities. This includes – most notably – encouraging collaboration between Calistoga and St. Helena as it relates to animal control, dispatch, and eventually looking at merging their respective law enforcement services through a joint-authority or contracting with the County Sheriff.

B. Commission Review

Commissioners are encouraged to discuss and provide feedback to staff on the draft report. Specific feedback is respectfully requested as it relates to areas of additional analysis. Staff will be initiating a 30-day public comment period on the draft report following the meeting in anticipation of returning in June with a final report – with or without amendments – for approval by the Commission.

Attachment:

~~1) Draft Report~~