

S B

8 0

Alaska State Senate

SENATOR STEVE RIEGER
District 1

Senate Finance Committee
Chair, Senate Transportation Committee

Legislative Budget and Audit Committee
Administrative Regulation Review Committee
Legislative Council



During Session:
State Capitol, Room 516
Juneau, Alaska 99801
(907) 465-3879

710 West 4th Avenue, Suite 530
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
(907) 258-8188

MEMORANDUM

TO: Representative Jeannette James, Chair
House State Affairs Committee

FROM: Senator Steve Rieger *SR*

DATE: April 12, 1995

RE: Senate Bill 80, An Act relating to police protection service areas in unified municipalities

This memo is to request your scheduling of SB 80, an Act relating to police protection service areas in unified municipalities; and to police protection provided by the state in certain municipal areas for a hearing in the House State Affairs Committee at your earliest possible convenience. If it is possible to schedule it during the week of April 18, I would greatly appreciate it.

SB 80 allows an area in a unified municipality to pay the full cost of trooper police protection. It outlines a structure for levying assessment in such an area, and is an important bill for the people in my district.

Please contact Bryan Butcher in my office if you have any additional questions at x3879.

Alaska State Senate

SENATOR STEVE RIEGER
District 1



Senate Finance Committee
Chair, Senate Transportation Committee

Legislative Budget and Audit Committee
Administrative Regulation Review Committee
Legislative Council

During Session:
State Capitol, Room 516
Juneau, Alaska 99801
(907) 465-3879

716 West 4th Avenue, Suite 530
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
(907) 258-8188

Senate Bill 80

**An Act relating to police protection service areas in unified municipalities;
and to police protection provided by the state in certain municipal areas.**

Sponsor Statement

SB80 is a measure which will increase local self-determination and provide relief to the state operating budget.

The Department Of Public Safety has a responsibility to provide, among other things, state trooper police protection for the citizenry of the state. In some areas of the state there is a desire and willingness to *pay* for such trooper protection, in order to elevate the amount of coverage. In such a situation both the residents of the area and the department benefit, as there is budget relief for the department, and better service for the area.

SB 80 applies specifically to areas within unified municipalities. It sets forth a mechanism an area to petition for additional trooper protection services, receive a statement of the full cost of all trooper coverage in the area, and then vote it in and pay for it.

This bill represents good government at its best. It allows a citizenry which desires a service, and is willing to pay for it, a way to accomplish their goals. Even areas which are not within the area desiring such service benefit, as the budget pressures on the Department Of Public Safety are lessened and more service can be provided to the rest of the state.

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA

BILL NO: SB 80

1995 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Revision Date: _____ Dept. Affected: Public Safety
 Title: "An Act relating to police protection
service areas in unified municipalities..." BRU: Alaska State Troopers
 Sponsor: Senator Steve Rieger Component: Detachments
 Requestor: S. STA COMPONENT SERIAL NO. 0799

EXPENDITURES/REVENUES: (Thousands of Dollars) (inflation not included)

OPERATING	FY 96	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
TOTAL OPERATING	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
CAPITAL EXPENDITURES	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
CHANGE IN REVENUES ()	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
<small>Revenue Code</small>						

FUNDING: (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1006 GF/MHTIA						
Other						
TOTAL	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

Estimate of current year (FY 95) impact: \$ -0-

POSITIONS:

	0	0	0	0	0	0
FULL-TIME						
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary.)
 See attachment.

Prepared By: Francis C. Allan Phone: 269-5691
 Division: Alaska State Troopers Date: 02/27/95
 Approved by Commissioner: *Ronald L. Otto* Date: 3/1/95
 Agency: Ronald L. Otto, Chief of Public Safety

PREPARER TO PROVIDE ALL DISTRIBUTION COPIES TO GOVERNOR'S LEGISLATIVE OFFICE

For further distribution information call the Governor's Legislative Office

SB 80 does not require the Department of Public Safety (DPS) to do anything differently than is currently being done. Only in the event a service area requests Trooper services will there be a fiscal impact. Accordingly, a zero fiscal note is submitted. Included with this analysis, for illustrative purposes only, is an example of Anchorage Hillside possible costs based upon providing 24 hour coverage of 2 troopers. The Department is unable to calculate actual costs as the service area plays a part in determining the level of coverage to be provided by the troopers.

This bill allows residents within a unified municipality to form police service areas that would contract with the Department of Public Safety for trooper police service.

Interested residents within a proposed service area would circulate a petition to gather signatures. The petition must include the boundaries of the proposed service area as well as the additional trooper services to be provided by the Department of Public Safety. Upon receipt of a petition containing at least 10% of the voters living in the proposed area, the municipal clerk will submit it to the Commissioner of the Department of Public Safety. The Commissioner will notify the clerk of the estimated costs to provide the specified trooper services within the proposed area for a three-year period.

An election will be held to determine whether a police protection service area should be formed, and to approve of the related costs. If a majority votes to approve the proposition, the Commissioner will be required to provide those services to the area. The governing body will levy assessments in the area and make the required payments to the Commissioner.

The bill also provides that at least once every three years, the election process is repeated to determine if the service area should be continued. The Commissioner is required to provide revised cost estimates at that time.

The process to recruit, test, and fully train new state troopers takes approximately 18 months. The Commissioner needs adequate time to respond to a potential election. If adequate time is not provided for, the Commissioner may be required to close current trooper posts or significantly under-staff other trooper locations and service areas in order to provide trooper services to newly formed service areas.

This bill applies to several geographic areas in the state. This bill requires several processes to be completed prior to the Department of Public Safety being impacted. Since these conditions are dependent on the petition and election process, the Department of Public Safety anticipates no immediate fiscal impact at this time.

Amendments Proposed:

Section (d) of the bill provides that upon approval of the question by a majority of the voters residing in the service area, the service area will be formed and the Commissioner of the DPS shall provide the additional services in that area. Amend bill to allow the Commissioner of the Department of Public Safety a time period of 18 months to begin providing service after an election. The process to recruit, test, and fully train new state troopers takes approximately 18 months. If the Commissioner is not provided an adequate time period, drastic changes in trooper deployment may be necessary in order to provide the voter mandated services in the newly formed areas. This changes could include closing current trooper posts or significantly reducing staff in trooper posts and service areas that have no other police protection options.

Amendments Proposed (Cont'd.):

Section (f) of the bill provides for a service area to be dissolved within 120 days after certification of an election if the question to continue the police protection services is disapproved by a majority of the residents voting on the question. Amend bill to allow 12 month notice to the DPS before dissolving a service area. The 12 month period would allow for attrition to take care of potential layoffs and allow for gradual redistribution of the workforce. Layoffs would result in vacancies spread throughout the State. The workforce would need to be redistributed in accordance with the bidding procedures and seniority rights in accordance with the collective bargaining agreement.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
ALASKA STATE TROOPERS
"Hillside" Contracting Costs

	10 x Troopers	1 x Sergeant	Admin Clerk II	Other Costs	TOTAL	Ongoing Costs each year (3)
Personal Services	695.3	79.5	37.0		811.8	695.3
Travel	15.0	1.5	0.0		16.5	16.5
Contractual	128.8	12.9	2.2	93.6 ⁽¹⁾	237.5	237.5
Supplies	30.6	3.1	2.6		36.3	14.4
Equipment	226.4	22.6	7.1	17.4 ⁽²⁾	273.5	0.0
Subtotal	1,096.1	119.6	48.9	111.0	1,375.6	963.7
Recruitment and Training Costs					110.0	10.0
Total Direct Costs					1,485.6	973.7
Management and Administration costs, 15%					222.8	146.1
ESTIMATED TOTAL COSTS					1,708.4	1,119.8

(1) 4,000 sq. ft. @ \$1.95 per sq. ft. x 12

(2) 3 x microcomputers.

(3) Inflation, step increases not reflected.

ASSUMPTIONS: Population approximately 20,000;
Suburban Residential; 1 High School, 1 Junior High
School, 5 Elementary Schools.

**SOUTHEAST ANCHORAGE
LAW ENFORCEMENT SURVEY
SUMMARY OF RESULTS
February 10, 1992**

Attached is the summary of results of a law enforcement survey conducted in southeast Anchorage in January 1992.

The intent of the survey was to obtain as much feedback as possible on what southeast Anchorage residents want in police protection related to levels of service, costs, and providers, in order that direction would be available to the task force and to elected officials.

The survey was prepared by the Southeast Anchorage Police Protection Task Force, organized in October 1991 to explore alternatives for law enforcement in southeast Anchorage and to work toward alternatives which can be supported by the residents and which may be recommended to elected officials and voters in southeast Anchorage. The task force is composed of representatives of each of the southeast Anchorage community councils and HALO, Inc., a southeast Anchorage homeowners and landowners' organization. The contact for the task force is Maribeth Brown, Chair, 345-1468.

The survey was mailed to 10,546 households in southeast Anchorage. The mailing labels were obtained from Motznik Computer Services, Inc., from lists of registered voters in southeast Anchorage who voted in any 1990 or 1991 election or who have registered to vote since October 6, 1990. (Where two or more registered voters with the same last name were shown at the same address, one collectively-addressed form was sent.)

A total of 2,067 responses were received as of January 31.

Responses are summarized in total and are also subtotaled by community council.

(Review copies of survey results by Community Council area are available from your Community Council and at Samson-Diamond Library.)

**SOUTHEAST ANCHORAGE
LAW ENFORCEMENT SURVEY
SUMMARY OF RESULTS
February 10, 1992**

RESULTS OF 2,067 RESPONSES

1. Response totals by community council district:

Question: Please circle the Community Council District in which you live (the attached map indicates those areas)

Abbott Loop	466	Glen Alps	17	Mid-Hillside	295
Basher	21	Hillside East	182	Rabbit Creek	355
Bear Valley	43	Huff-O'Malley	578	Don't Know/missing	110

2. Types of law enforcement identified by respondents as important*:

Question: What types of law enforcement do you see as important for you and your family? Please give a score for each to show how important you think each service is (3=very important, 2=somewhat important, 1=not important)

**Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding*

a) respond to and investigate serious crimes, accidents with injury, crimes in progress

very important	1,935	(94%)
somewhat important	59	(3%)
not important	39	(2%)
no response	34	(2%)

b) conduct regular neighborhood patrols

very important	459	(22%)
somewhat important	779	(38%)
not important	773	(37%)
no response	56	(3%)

c) investigate civil problems, noise/nuisance, disorderly conduct, non-motor vehicle accidents, run-away juveniles

very important	438	(21%)
somewhat important	995	(48%)
not important	571	(28%)
no response	63	(3%)

d) investigate non-violent crimes (e.g., burglary, theft, criminal mischief, trespass, embezzlement) with no immediate suspect

very important	834	(40%)
somewhat important	964	(47%)
not important	221	(11%)
no response	48	(2%)

e) conduct routine traffic patrols and enforcement

very important	409	(20%)
somewhat important	748	(36%)
not important	851	(41%)
no response	60	(3%)

f) establish and support community service programs, such as Neighborhood Watch Program, School Liaison Program

very important	398	(19%)
somewhat important	780	(38%)
not important	817	(40%)
no response	72	(4%)

3. Highest taxes respondents willing to pay for law enforcement indicated as "very important" and "somewhat important" in above question.

Question: What is the most you are willing to pay for the law enforcement you have indicated as "very important" and "somewhat important" in question 2? Please check one.

\$0	213	(10%)
\$100 per \$100,000 assessed value	655	(32%)
\$200 per \$100,000 assessed value	516	(25%)
\$300 per \$100,000 assessed value	302	(15%)
\$400 per \$100,000 assessed value	247	(12%)
no response	135	(7%)

4. Respondents' satisfaction with level of law enforcement in area (after 11-1-91):

Question: Rate your satisfaction with the current (after November 1, 1991) level of law enforcement in your area (the information sheet describes those services). Please check one.

very satisfied	313	(15%)
satisfied	480	(23%)
neutral	574	(28%)
dissatisfied	421	(20%)
very dissatisfied	236	(11%)
no response	43	(2%)

5. Law enforcement agency generally preferred by respondents.

Question: Check the law enforcement agency that you generally prefer for your area.

Alaska State Troopers	1,076	(52%)
Anchorage Police Dept	272	(13%)
it doesn't matter to me	687	(33%)
no response	32	(2%)

5. Respondents' support for law enforcement service alternatives:

Question: Please indicate your support by circling yes or no for each of the following alternatives for law enforcement. (Options a) and b) are the only ones currently available to southeast Anchorage. If high interest is shown in any of the other options, the task force will pursue their legal and political possibilities.)

alternative	yes	no	no response
a) Anchorage Police Dept. at \$380 per \$100,000 assessed value (Oct 1991 ballot)	433 (21%)	1,501 (73%)	131 (6%)
b) Leave things as they are now	618 (30%)	1,254 (61%)	185 (9%)
c) Seek a separate service area using State Troopers, supported by taxes (but lower than \$380 per \$100,000 assessed value)	1,246 (60%)	620 (30%)	201 (10%)
d) Seek a separate service area using State Troopers supported by taxes (but lower than \$380 per \$100,000 assessed value), with a further contribution to the APD of no more than \$50 per \$100,000 assessed value for services we receive from APD when travelling downtown and for APD emergency backup to the Troopers in Southeast Anchorage	749 (36%)	1,094 (53%)	224 (11%)
e) Seek a separate service area using the APD, supported by taxes (but lower than \$380 per \$100,000 assessed value)	732 (35%)	1,108 (54%)	227 (11%)
f) Gradually phase into APD to full service and cost	428 (21%)	1,364 (66%)	275 (13%)

Rank on the totem

The Commission on Salaries and Emoluments increased, effective Jan. 1, 1994, compensation for Assembly members to \$20,000 per year and for the chairman of the Assembly to \$23,400 per year. No increases were approved for members of the School Board or the Anchorage Telephone Utility Board. The mayor's salary will be the subject of the panel's Sept. 29 meeting.

The following list shows how the mayor compares with the top earners on the municipal payroll in 1992. (There are about 3,500 employees in all.)

Job title	Department	Pay and benefits
1. Mechanic foreman	ML&P	\$190,624
2. Journeyman mechanic	ML&P	182,329
3. General manager	ATU	146,036
4. Senior patrol officer	Police	144,310
5. Senior patrol officer	Police	139,461*
6. Senior patrol officer	Police	134,179
7. Senior patrol officer	Police	133,066
8. Senior patrol officer	Police	132,219*
9. Superintendent	ML&P	131,773*
10. Senior patrol officer	Police	126,868*
11. Superintendent	ML&P	125,874
12. Senior patrol officer	Police	125,646*
13. Data technician	ATU	125,093*
14. Senior patrol officer	Police	123,732
15. Senior patrol officer	Police	122,343
16. Paramedic supervisor	Fire	122,268
17. Mechanic's helper	ML&P	119,837*
18. Senior patrol officer	Police	119,623*
19. Foreman	ML&P	119,186
20. Foreman	ML&P	119,095
21. Captain	Fire	117,717*
22. Battalion chief	Fire	117,296*
23. Foreman	ML&P	116,973
24. Relay substn foreman	ML&P	116,903
25. Maint. technician	ML&P	116,599
26. Senior patrol officer	Police	116,490*
27. Maint. technician	ML&P	116,454
28. Mechanic foreman	ML&P	116,229
29. Senior patrol officer	Police	115,696
30. Captain	Fire	115,695*
31. Battalion chief	Fire	115,078*
32. Senior Captain	Fire	114,889*
33. Paramedic supervisor	Fire	114,274*
34. Superintendent	ML&P	114,228
35. Lieutenant	Police	113,568*
36. Sergeant	Police	113,352*
37. Senior Captain	Fire	113,335*
38. Maint. technician	ML&P	113,071
39. Foreman	ML&P	112,965
40. Senior Captain	Fire	112,899*
41. Sergeant	Police	112,880*
42. Senior patrol officer	Police	112,623*
43. Senior patrol officer	Police	112,253*
44. Sergeant	Police	112,209
45. Senior patrol officer	Police	112,124
46. Superintendent	ML&P	112,013
47. Senior Captain	Fire	111,982*
147. Mayor	Mayor	102,048

* includes cash-in of accrued leave time