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Executive Summary

When the Pennsylvania 1999-2000 Budget discussions included the specter of a looming financial requirement and significant new administrative responsibilities for smaller local governments to provide their own police services, Police News began to make the front page of newspapers and television lead news stories. Municipalities might need to begin paying for services provided by the State Police. Across the region, elected officials and policy makers were forced to rethink their security needs and options. As crime sometimes proves to be more the provenance of sophisticated perpetrators, and community security and coordination requirements increase because of terrorism threats and the increasing uses and transport of hazardous materials, the desirability of multi-municipal approaches to police, fire and emergency services bares consideration.

This report provides a background to effective policing, regional, and other types of inter-governmental approaches. An experienced consultant in the field prepared the report. The South Central Assembly Effective Governance’s Municipal Task Force defined the scope of services for as well as the Executive Committee. The report was unanimously approved at the July 29th, 1999 Board meeting of the Assembly. It is offered to local government elected officials, police officers and officials as a guide and background to local discussions.

Regional policing began in the South Central Assembly Region of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania with the implementation of the Northern York County Regional Police Department on November 1, 1972. This was also the first regional police department in the Commonwealth, initiated shortly after Legislative approval of Act 180, the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act, on July 12 of the same year.

Options

Every municipality in the Commonwealth, regardless of its size and structure (city, borough, town or township) has the power and authority to establish local police services and provide protection and safety for its citizens. Along with the power and authority to establish police services comes the option of deciding how police services will be delivered.

PA STATE POLICE - If a municipality takes no action to, or decides not to establish local police services, the State Police will automatically serve as the primary police services provider for the community. The State Police have a tremendous responsibility throughout the Commonwealth in terms of providing police coverage and supporting local police.
ESTABLISH OWN DEPT. OF TRAD. POLICING - The second option a community may consider to provide police protection and public safety is to establish a police department, fund it, and provide for its functions through the development of police policies and procedures. In the South Central Region, 119 communities chose this option to provide police services.

CONTRACT OF PURCHASE OF SERVICES - This method permits a municipality to purchase police services from another municipality under a purchase of services agreement which specifies the level of service to be provided (patrol, investigation, traffic control, etc.) and the amount to be paid for such services. This method often permits a municipality to receive a wider range of specialized police services than they could afford with their own department. For example, there are many five-officer (or the equivalent) police departments in the State because of the strong desire among local government officials to have an officer available at all times to answer calls and serve the public safety needs of the citizens.

REGIONAL POLICING - This is the method of providing municipal police services that involves the Merging of existing traditional police departments and creating a police entity that is outside the direct control of any one of the municipalities it serves. The agency is governed by a Police Commission composed of appointed representatives of the participating municipalities as well as other persons, if the municipalities choose to appoint other representatives. Labor issues, pension consideration, the merger of equipment and sharing of costs and values of merged equipment constitute the majority of issues that must be agreed to in the formation of the inter-municipal agreement.

This report provides some background on these concerns and offers suggestions from surveys of existing regional organizations. We invite you to review this material and begin the dialogue.

Merrill Yohe, Esq.
Chair
Municipal Task Force Committee
South Central Assembly for Effective Governance
This study of police services in the South Central Region of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania was conducted by Domer G. Orndorf, President, Orndorf & Associates, a Police Management Consulting Agency based in Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania. Mr. Orndorf is a former police chief and public safety director and served for 24 years as the manager and supervisor of the Police Consulting Program for the Pennsylvania Department of Community Affairs and the Center for Local Government Services, Department of Community and Economic Development.
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I. INTRODUCTION

A. History of Regional Police in the South Central Region

Regional policing began in the South Central Region of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania with the implementation of the Northern York County Regional Police Department on November 1, 1972. This was also the first regional police department in the state and came shortly after Legislative approval of Act 180, the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act, on July 12 of the same year. In addition to authorizing cooperation among municipalities, Act 180 (now Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, Title 53, Sections 2301-2315) establishes guidelines for merging governmental units and entities. There are currently twenty-six regional police departments in the Commonwealth and eight in the South Central Region. York County not only has the first regional police department, it also has the most in the South Central Region with three. Five of the eight regional departments were created since 1992. Two were established in the 1970s and one in 1983.

Four of the five most recently created departments were provided funds from the Pennsylvania Department of Community Affairs (Now the Department of Community and Economic Development) to help defray one-time start-up costs. Three of the eight departments, Northern York County Regional and the Southern Regional in York County and the Latimore-York Springs Regional in Adams County, have expanded coverage since originally established. Regional agencies within the South Central Region range in size from 3 officers in the Latimore-York Springs department to 41 officers in Northern York Regional. The eight regional police departments in the South Central Region are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Latimore/York Springs Regional Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern Adams Regional Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>West Shore Regional Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland/Franklin</td>
<td>Mid-Cumberland Valley Regional Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>Susquehanna Regional Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Northeast Regional Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern York County Regional Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Regional Police Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There appears to be continued interest in regional policing among local governments within the South Central Region. Since 1990, in addition to the five departments established, groups of municipalities in eighteen other areas of the region have studied or
reviewed the concept but thus far, have chosen not to implement. Several efforts to consolidate police departments in the Region are ongoing at this time.

B. Options Available to Provide Police Services

Every municipality in the Commonwealth, regardless of its size and structure (city, borough, town or township) has the power and authority to establish local police services and provide protection and safety for its citizens. According to information supplied by the Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development, 188 or 59% of the Regions’ 318 municipalities provided local police services in 1997. Communities with local police services ranged in size from Pillow Borough in Dauphin County, with 341 residents, to Lancaster City with a population of 55,551. Lancaster City also provides services to Lancaster Township which has an additional 13,187 residents. However, the largest police department in terms of officers employed is Harrisburg with 181 and there are numerous one part-time officer departments throughout the Region.

Table 1 on the following page depicts police services information for the Region by County. Lancaster County has the largest number of police departments with thirty-four and Franklin County the least with six departments. Inter-municipal cooperation is most dominant in York County where twelve departments serve more than one municipality. Lebanon County has the greater percentage of its municipalities with local police services with twenty of twenty-six providing services.

Along with the power and authority to establish police services comes the option of deciding how police services will be delivered. There are basically four options available at the present time which are outlined and discussed briefly below.

1: Pennsylvania State Police

If a municipality takes no action to, or decides not to establish local police services, the State Police will automatically serve as the primary police services provider for the community. This means that the municipality becomes a part of an established State Police patrol zone which may include other municipalities or parts of municipalities. In many small communities throughout the Commonwealth police agencies exist or cease to exist depending upon the availability of a person to serve as the community’s police officer. When no officer is employed the State Police assume responsibility.

Little is known of what might occur if a larger community such as Carlisle or Lebanon discontinued providing services, for whatever reason. In two situations in the past where communities outside the Region were forced to discontinue local
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POLICE SERVICES DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Number Municipalities</th>
<th>Number with Police Services</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total Departments</th>
<th>Traditional Departments</th>
<th>Contract Departments</th>
<th>Consolidated Departments</th>
<th>Municipalities W/out Local Police</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dauphin</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total/Average</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
policing because of a distressed financial condition, the State Police established coverage specifically for the community. However, when finally relieved of the obligation, State Police officials declared that they would no longer concentrate their forces to specifically provide coverage for one community.

*Are the State Police obligated to provide protection to communities in such situations?* Even though it was thought to be otherwise for many years, there appears to be no legal obligation for the State Police to provide police protection to a municipality if it has no local police department. However, past practice has been that the State Police do automatically assume responsibility. This will very likely occur in the normal situation where a small township or borough discontinues services.

The State Police have a tremendous responsibility throughout the Commonwealth in terms of providing police coverage and supporting local police. While according to data developed by the former Department of Community Affairs, the State Police provide primary coverage to only 18% of the population of the Commonwealth, their patrol responsibilities, as the primary service provider include 69% of the geographic area of the State. In addition, the State Police provide part-time coverage when a local police department is not available. Since the equivalent of five full-time officers is necessary to provide full-time coverage, most of the local police departments with less than that number rely upon the State Police for support. State Police also provide back-up support to many full-time police departments in the State.

Table 2 which follows, provides information on population and area served by local and State Police (as the primary responder) by county in the Region. When viewing the Region as a whole, local police are responsible to 78% of the population and the State Police serve as the primary police agency to 22% of the Region’s residents. In land area, local police cover only 40% while the State Police patrol 60% of the geography of the region, as the only and primary law enforcement agency.

There is much concern among the larger communities in the Region and State over the Governor’s proposal to charge municipalities with populations in excess of 5,000 for the services provided by the State Police. There are currently sixteen municipalities in the South Central Region which fall within that category and will be charged for State Police protection should the proposal become law. Without discussing the merits of the proposal, such a law would change the ease with which many communities fall back on the State Police for services when they are faced with police services issues and decisions in their own police agencies. It would also represent a significant financial outlay for the sixteen municipalities in the
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### POPULATION AND AREA SERVED BY LOCAL AND STATE POLICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Population Served By Local Police</th>
<th>Population Served By State Police</th>
<th>Population Percent</th>
<th>Population Served By State Police Percent</th>
<th>Square Mile Area</th>
<th>Area Served By Local Police</th>
<th>Area Served By State Police</th>
<th>Area Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>78,274</td>
<td>47,300</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>30,974</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>526.0</td>
<td>194.6</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>195,257</td>
<td>149,175</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>46,082</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>555.0</td>
<td>153.1</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dauphin</td>
<td>237,813</td>
<td>190,713</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>47,100</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>548.0</td>
<td>132.6</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>121,082</td>
<td>43,979</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>77,103</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>754.0</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>422,822</td>
<td>369,290</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>53,532</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>974.0</td>
<td>685.0</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>113,744</td>
<td>95,260</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>18,484</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>363.0</td>
<td>213.4</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>41,172</td>
<td>15,582</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>25,590</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>553.0</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>339,574</td>
<td>297,198</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>42,376</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>914.0</td>
<td>548.5</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total/Ave.</td>
<td>1,549,738</td>
<td>1,208,497</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>341,241</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>5,187.0</td>
<td>2,072.8</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
region without local police departments. Collectively, with proposed assessments of $35 per resident for the balance of 1999 and $70 in 2000, it would cost the sixteen communities $3.8 million in 1999 and $7.5 million in 2000 to pay for a service they receive at no cost now.

In the current situation, however, relying upon the State Police for police protection is one of four options for local officials to consider in assuring police services for their citizens. An option which at present is free, except for State taxes imposed on all Pennsylvanians.

2: Establish Own Department or Traditional Policing

The second option a community may consider to provide police protection and public safety is to establish a police department, fund it, and provide for its functions through the development of police policies and procedures. In the South Central Region, 119 communities chose this option to provide police services. Traditional policing provides for total municipal control of the police by the governing body, subject to State and Federal law and regulations. Except for Home Rule municipalities, the Municipal Codes (Third Class City Code, Borough Code, First Class Township Code and Second Class Township Code) regulate the establishment and methods of operation, as do the Compulsory and Binding Arbitration Act, Municipal Police Training Law (Act 120), Local Agency Law, Police Tenure Act and numerous others. Traditional policing is by far the most common and most accepted of the options available to local municipalities. Normally, the typical community in the State providing services in this manner expends about 30% of its budget for police services. In 1997, municipalities in the Region spent a conservative $89 million to fund the operation of traditional police departments. Conservative because of the author's lack of faith in the manner and reliability of reporting municipal expenditures in the Commonwealth.

The 119 traditional police departments in the South Central Region range from the very small to Harrisburg's 181 officers. Police departments, regardless of the method used to police (traditional, purchase of services or regional), are not able to provide full time basic patrol coverage until at least five officers, or their equivalent in part-time staff, are employed. It is only when they become larger that some flexibility becomes available to schedule more than one-officer coverage on a shift. The ability to specialize and the need for rank and supervisory positions develops as a department becomes larger. Nearly three-fourths of the traditional police departments in the Region are ten officers or fewer in size and the majority of those are unable to provide full-time patrol coverage.

The 119 police departments in the Region fall within the following size categories:
### NUMBER OF OFFICERS - TRADITIONAL DEPARTMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>5 &amp; Under</th>
<th>6 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 25</th>
<th>26 &amp; Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dauphin</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perky</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>53%</strong></td>
<td><strong>21%</strong></td>
<td><strong>18%</strong></td>
<td><strong>8%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3: Contract or Purchase of Services

This method permits a municipality to purchase police services from another municipality under a purchase of services agreement which specifies the level of service to be provided (patrol, investigation, traffic control, etc.) and the amount to be paid for such services. In many instances the contract spells out precisely the number of hours of patrol per week, per month or per year and contains provisions for handling special events, as well as a criteria to assure smooth communications between the police department and the contracting municipality.

This method often permits a municipality to receive a wider range of specialized police services than they could afford with their own department. For example, there are many five officer (or the equivalent) police departments in the State
because of the strong desire among local government officials to have an officer available at all times to answer calls and serve the public safety needs of the citizens. Therefore, providing patrol is the primary concern in departments of this size and it not until they become larger that officers are hired, trained and utilized as skilled criminal investigators. On the other hand, a municipality could purchase much less than full-time coverage from its neighbor and receive skilled investigative services as well as other services immediately. Contracting for services also assures full time response to calls for service even though the municipality is not purchasing the equivalent of five officer coverage. That is of course, if the department from which the community is purchasing services is a full-time department.

4: Regional Policing

This is the method of providing municipal police services that involves the merging of existing traditional police departments and creating a police entity that is outside the direct control of any one of the municipalities it serves. The agency is governed by a Police Commission composed of appointed representatives of the participating municipalities as well as other persons, if the municipalities choose to appoint other representatives. The regional police department provides full services to each participating community in proportion to its share of the cost and according to a cost distribution method acceptable to participating municipalities. The Regional Police Commission establishes operational policies and procedures based on input from each community through its appointed representative(s). The Regional Police Commission also prepares the budget for the department and approves expenditures. It is responsible for negotiating the labor contract(s), hiring, promoting and discipline and all other matters which would be handled by the governing body in a traditional police department. Regional policing requires a Chief of Police who is well versed on business and financial management principles as well as a person who has the ability to work well with local officials from different types of government and public agencies.

While there are other criminal justice agencies providing services to the Region’s citizens, there are essentially no other options a municipality could consider to provide a full range of local police services.
C. The County Sheriff

There has been a growing interest in the possibility of the County Sheriff’s Office providing communities with the services normally provided by local police. The interest has come about since a 1994 Pennsylvania Supreme Court decision (Commonwealth Vs Leet, 641 A.2d 244, 537 Pa.89) which declared that a Deputy Sheriff had the authority to stop and detain a person driving erratically and later charged with Driving Under the Influence. Prior to that time, Sheriffs and their Deputies had no statutory power to enforce the Vehicle Code and the Crimes Code in the Commonwealth. However, some officials believe that Sheriffs never lost their Common Law police powers and if they did, the court decision restores that power.

According to the Pennsylvania Sheriffs’ Association, Sheriffs in several areas of the Commonwealth are currently performing in a law enforcement capacity and providing services to municipalities without local police services or in support of local and State Police. Only the Lancaster County Sheriff’s Office is identified by the Association as a Sheriff’s Office within the Region that provides such support. Until such time as the power of the Sheriff and his Deputies is clearly established, utilizing that organization as a provider of police services for municipalities does not appear to be an option.

D. Other Non-Options

Other considerations in the past for providing local police services have been utilizing elected Constables and contracting for services with a private security company such as the Whodunnit Detective Agency or similar companies. Although Constables have authority to serve summonses and processes and make arrests with warrants, they appear to have no authority to enforce the Vehicle Code or Crimes Code. Municipalities may contract with other municipalities, the State or Federal government or other governmental entities under Act 180, the Intergovernmental Law. However, there is no known authority in the law for a municipality to purchase police services from, or bestow their police power upon, private companies.

II. EXISTING REGIONAL POLICE SERVICES

A. Policing on a Regional Basis

As stated above, the South Central Region, and specifically York County, is the birthplace of regional police in the Commonwealth. Since 1972, in a slow methodical way, the regional policing concept has spread throughout the York County. Spread or developed to the point that thirty-seven or 51% of its municipalities are currently involved in some form of inter-municipal cooperation in providing police services. Thirteen of its
communities are served by regional departments and twenty-four are either the provider or receiver of police services through purchase of service agreements. Both methods of policing result in one police agency providing services to more than one municipality. This must be considered a positive development in a State that has far too many very small, inefficient local police agencies.

*What has caused this growth of regional policing in York County?* While no one knows for certain, the most logical explanation is that local officials see that it works from the nearby examples available. The County and area has had strong examples of how well it works in the Northern York Regional Police Department which has been functioning effectively for twenty-seven years, and the Northeastern Regional Police Department which has had similar success since 1983.

Advocates of the regional police concept usually site the following reasons for supporting this method of policing:

- Regional departments allow the sharing of administrative staffing, supervision and overhead, thereby reducing costs over time.

- Regional departments permit a community to pay for and support only the amount of police services it needs based upon workload. It is not necessary to pay for and provide a full-time department just to have requests for services responded to on a 24 hour-a-day basis.

- Regional departments allow communities to develop more uniform law and police enforcement policies and permits a more effective response to area-wide crime and law enforcement problems.

- By becoming larger in numbers, regional police departments allow communities to use their officers more effectively by assigning them to working shifts when the work is there to do, rather than when the officers are available, or to be there to respond to a call in the event an officer is needed.

- Communities policed by regional departments get a better accounting for their financial contributions as well as the activities and enforcement efforts of the police because of the accounting and accountability methods established in regional departments.

- Police officers in regional police departments are more able to receive training because of their larger size, thereby improving the efficiency of the police.

- Police officers are further removed from local government politics in regional departments, permitting a more professional application of law enforcement and police services.
Because of the larger size, police officers on regional departments receive more opportunities for training, specialization and advancement, thereby improving their career opportunities.

In the South Central Region, regional police departments serve a total of 104,500 people or about 8.6% of those with local police protection. Of the twenty-four municipalities served by regional departments, ten are boroughs and fourteen are townships of the second class. One department, the Mid-Cumberland Valley Regional Police Department serves communities in two counties. Two regional departments, the Latimore-York Springs Regional Police Department and the Southern Regional Police Department, provide police services to a school district under a purchase of service agreement. Regional departments patrol 4.4% or 226.7 square miles of the Region's 5,187 square mile area policed by local police departments.

The average population density of area served by regional departments in the Region is 461 persons per square mile. This compares to an average density of 583 persons per square mile in all communities served by local police, and an average density of 110 persons per square mile in areas of the Region served by State Police (as the primary service provider). Density is a significant factor influencing the need for police services. It seems the more compact people are, the more possibility for activities requiring police intervention. This accounts for larger cities and their suburbs normally requiring a higher ratio of police officers to population.

The form appearing in Appendix A (along with the Public Official Opinion Survey in Appendix B) were provided to each of the eight regional police departments in an attempt to develop in-depth information on the make-up of each department, the services provided, the application of sound management principles and the use and application of developing technology in the law enforcement field. Unfortunately, only four of the eight departments returned the completed forms and therefore the results of the survey information is limited. Perhaps, had we been able to give the leaders of the regional departments more time to gather the information the results would have been better. Because of our inability to develop more information on the eight departments, the data and information that appears in this section is a combination of that we gathered and what was developed previously by the Center for Local Government Services. The information is as current and as complete as is possible at this time.

Table 3 on the following pages provides specific data on each of the eight regional police departments in the South Central Region. Several significant points must be made about the information on Table 3. The first deals with the staffing of regional departments as compared to all local police departments. There are 101.4 full-time (equivalent) police officers employed by the eight departments. Full-time equivalency is determined by estimating that the typical part-time officer works an average of 500 hours per year. This
### REGIONAL POLICE DEPARTMENT DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Municipalities Served</th>
<th>Population Served</th>
<th>Area Sq. Miles</th>
<th>Population Density</th>
<th>Number Officers</th>
<th>Officers Per 1,000 Pop.</th>
<th>1998 Cost</th>
<th>Cost Per Capita</th>
<th>Comm. Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADAMS CO. Latimore-York Springs Regional Police Dept. Established 1/1/78</td>
<td>Latimore Township York Springs Borough (Contracts to Bermudian Springs School District)</td>
<td>2,756</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>128.8</td>
<td>3 FT</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>$143,000</td>
<td>$51.89</td>
<td>2 Appointees from each and 1 additional appointed by Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Adams Regional Police Dept. Established 1/1/92</td>
<td>Oxford Township Berwick Township</td>
<td>5,268</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>302.7</td>
<td>5 FT</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>$381,375</td>
<td>$72.39</td>
<td>3 Oxford 2 Berwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUMBERLAND CO. West Shore Regional Police Dept. Established 1/1/95</td>
<td>Lemoyne Borough Wormleysburg Borough</td>
<td>6,806</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3,105.3</td>
<td>10 FT</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>$856,911</td>
<td>$125.91</td>
<td>2 Lemoyne 2 Wormleysburg 1 At Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUMBERLAND/FRANKLIN COS. Mid-Cumberland Valley Regional Police Dept. Established 2/1/93</td>
<td>Shippensburg Borough Shippensburg Township</td>
<td>9,997</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3,105.3</td>
<td>9 FT</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>$786,970</td>
<td>$78.72</td>
<td>2 Ship. Boro 2 Ship. Twp. 1 At Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANCASTER Susquehanna Regional Police Dept. Established 7/1/96</td>
<td>Conoy Township East Donegal Township Marietta Borough</td>
<td>10,673</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>286.9</td>
<td>11 FT</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>$745,849</td>
<td>$69.88</td>
<td>1 Representative from each Mun.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 (a)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Municipalities Served</th>
<th>Population Served</th>
<th>Area Sq. Miles</th>
<th>Population Density</th>
<th>Number Officers 1,000 Pop.</th>
<th>1998 Cost</th>
<th>Cost Per Capita</th>
<th>Comm. Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YORK CO.</td>
<td>Dillsburg Borough&lt;br&gt;Conowago Township&lt;br&gt;Dover Borough&lt;br&gt;Dover Township&lt;br&gt;Franklin Township&lt;br&gt;Manchester Township&lt;br&gt;North York Borough&lt;br&gt;Paradise Township</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>123.2</td>
<td>422.1</td>
<td>41 FT</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>$3,342,250</td>
<td>$64.27&lt;br&gt;1 Representative from each municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern Regional Police Dept.</td>
<td>E. Manchester Twp.&lt;br&gt;Manchester Borough&lt;br&gt;Mount Wolf Borough</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>446.9</td>
<td>8 FT</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$515,775</td>
<td>$64.47&lt;br&gt;2 Representatives from each municipality - 1 other rotates between each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Regional Police Dept.</td>
<td>New Freedom Boro.&lt;br&gt;Shrewsbury Boro.&lt;br&gt;(Contracts to Southern York County School District)</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2,307.7</td>
<td>9 FT</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$645,593</td>
<td>$71.73&lt;br&gt;Mayor, 1 Council &amp; 1 non-elected person from each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total /Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>104,500</td>
<td>226.7</td>
<td>460.9</td>
<td>101.4</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>$7,417,723</td>
<td>$70.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 (b)
estimate is based upon research conducted by the Department of Community Affairs several years ago and is believed to be accurate. The total hours of all part-time officers are then divided by 1,760, which is the number of actual duty hours available from the average full-time officer. The resulting figure is added to the total number of full-time officers to determine the full-time equivalency. When the population served by regional departments is divided into the total number of officers, it results in an average of 0.97 officers per 1,000 population. This police-to-population ratio of 0.97 for regional departments compares very favorably with the Region ratio of 1.52 for all local police. Since personnel costs represent the major portion of the typical police budget, it is here where the most significant cost savings are made under the regional police concept.

Another factor displayed in Table 3 is the variety of methods chosen by the eight departments to provide oversight and leadership. The Intergovernmental Cooperation Act allows the communities involved to determine the organization structure of regional functions. The eight groups of communities having regional police departments have utilized six different methods of structuring their Regional Police Commissions. The methods are displayed in the last column of Table 3 and clearly demonstrate the latitude available to local government officials in deciding how to control the police department.

Lastly, the information in Table 3 lends support to the fact that population density, and not the geographic size of an area, is the most significant factor in determining staffing needs for a municipal police department. The Latimore-York Springs Regional Police Department, with only three officers, covers an area of 21.4 square miles while it takes eleven officers to patrol 2.5 square miles in the West Shore Regional Police Department area. Many people who argue against regionalizing police services claim that small forces are not able to cover large geographic areas.

Traditional police departments, except those functioning under a home rule charter or optional charter, are regulated by the Municipal Code governing the municipality as well as state law regulating all municipalities in the Commonwealth. For example, borough police service is regulated by the Borough Code as well as state law such as Act 120, the Police Training Law, the Police Tenure Act, the Heart and Lung Act, Act 111 on Compulsory and Binding Arbitration, and so forth. On the other hand, the intergovernmental cooperation law seems to indicate that regional police departments functioning under authority of that law, are not bound by laws affecting a particular class of municipality. Therefore, regional police departments are not required to establish civil service systems for the purpose of hiring, promotions, furloughs and hearing cases involving discipline, in particular, suspensions, removals or reduction in rank.

Three of the four regional departments returning our survey indicated that they have not established civil service systems, although the same number indicated that they administer competitive tests for police positions. All four departments have written job descriptions for police positions and two of the four conduct regular evaluations of employee
performance. All four departments regulate outside employment by police officers. Three of the four have established community relations programs which include Crime Watch, DARE, Bicycle Safety and Registration, Business Security and similar programs. Three of the four have established Community Policing Programs and have acquired Federal grants for that purpose.

Thirty-seven vehicles are used in the four departments to accommodate the patrol and other needs of 70 officers, or a ratio of one vehicle for every 1.89 officers. Cellular telephones are used in all departments by patrol officers and three of the four have direct access from the patrol car to CLEAN (Commonwealth Law Enforcement Assistance Network) and NCIC (National Crime Information Center), which are state and national computer systems for crime information, wanted persons, vehicle licensing, and general police information. One department has fingerprint scanners in patrol vehicles and two of the four have computer systems which allow them to develop staffing plans based upon workload. Two of the four departments measure and monitor citizen satisfaction by conducting random samples of police department contacts.

The four departments, with 70 officers, handled 32,473 incidents in 1998 which reflects a police officer workload ratio of 464 incidents per officer for the year, a rather high ratio.

B. Existing Contracted Police Services

Table 1 indicates that there are twenty-one purchase of service police departments in the South Central Region. They are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Municipalities Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Abbottstown Borough and Hamilton Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Fairfield Borough and Hamiltonban Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>East Cocalico Township, Adamstown Borough and West Cocalico Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>East Earl Township and Terre Hill Borough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>East Lampeter Township and Upper Leacock Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>Lancaster City and Lancaster Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>Manheim Township and East Petersburg Borough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>Manor Township and Mountville Borough</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lancaster  New Holland Borough and Earl Township
Lebanon  Lebanon City and West Lebanon Township
Lebanon  North Cornwall Township and West Cornwall Township
Lebanon  South Annville Township and Mount Gretna Borough
York  Carroll Township, Franklintown Borough and Monaghan Township
York  Hellam Township and Hallam Borough
York  Jackson Township and Spring Grove Borough
York  Lower Windsor Township and East Prospect Borough
York  Newberry Township, Goldsboro Borough and York Haven Borough
York  North Hopewell Township and Winterstown Borough
York  West Manchester Township and New Salem Borough
York  Windsor Township, Windsor Borough, Felton Borough and Yorkana Borough
York  York Township, Yoe Borough, Dallastown Borough and Jacobus Borough

The above listed contracting police agencies serve there own communities and twenty-eight other municipalities. Contracting departments serve one city, twenty-two boroughs and twenty-six townships. The providing departments range in size from Abbottstown Borough in Adams County with one officer to Lancaster City with 137 officers. Their ability to provide a full range of police services also varies with size. It is apparent that the citizens of Lancaster Township should be able to expect more specialized and sophisticated services from Lancaster City than should the citizens of Hamilton Township hope to receive from the Abbottstown Police Department. However, the one officer department apparently provides an additional dimension of law enforcement to Hamilton Township’s citizens than that afforded solely be the State Police.
III. FINANCING POLICE SERVICES

Historically, police services has been one of the most costly of all the services provided by local government. Local policing is comparable to the cost of building highways in most of Pennsylvania’s communities maintaining local police departments. The cost of the service alone mandates close scrutiny by local government officials. Using data supplied by the Center for Local Government Services, Department of Community and Economic Development, an attempt was made to measure the cost of policing the South Central Region. The chart below displays police cost information. While the police cost information is as sound as is available from any source, there are some weaknesses and they should be recognized. The information on police costs was gathered specifically for use in a study of law enforcement services currently being conducted by the Local Government Commission under authority of House Resolution 167 of 1997.

Apparent from the list of communities and the information submitted, some communities with local police departments failed to include information on costs. Others duplicated cost information in situations where they were provided police services under a purchase of service agreement. Others submitted cost data which seemed out of proportion to the size of the police department. Add to this the fact that a very large number of municipalities do not show the actual cost of police services in their police department budgets. Some police budgets do not show the cost of maintaining the police headquarters building, insurances such as medical and hospitalization, police liability and vehicle insurance. The unreliability of police cost information makes it extremely difficult to compare the cost of regional police with the cost of providing services under the traditional method. This is also the reason many local government officials feel that regional policing always costs more, while in fact, it is usually less costly. Listed below is financial data on both traditional policing and regional police in the South Central Region:

### Table 4 - Police Financial Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Pop. Served by Other Local Departments</th>
<th>Cost of Other Local Departments</th>
<th>Cost Per Capita Other Local Departments</th>
<th>Pop. Served Regional Departments</th>
<th>Cost of Regional Departments</th>
<th>Cost Per Capita Regional Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>32,092</td>
<td>$1,762,156</td>
<td>$54.91</td>
<td>8,027</td>
<td>$527,375</td>
<td>$65.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>129,938</td>
<td>9,439,976</td>
<td>72.65</td>
<td>16,803</td>
<td>1,643,881</td>
<td>98.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dauphin</td>
<td>189,061</td>
<td>23,829,216</td>
<td>126.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin(1)</td>
<td>33,008</td>
<td>2,935,718</td>
<td>88.94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>238,091</td>
<td>25,187,606</td>
<td>105.79</td>
<td>10,673</td>
<td>745,849</td>
<td>69.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>96,777</td>
<td>7,004,697</td>
<td>72.38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>7,498</td>
<td>211,305</td>
<td>28.18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>205,073</td>
<td>19,141,511</td>
<td>93.34</td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>4,503,618</td>
<td>65.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total/Ave.</td>
<td>931,538</td>
<td>$89,512,195</td>
<td>$98.87</td>
<td>104,503</td>
<td>$7,420,723</td>
<td>$71.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) The Mid-Cumberland Valley Regional Police Department which serves in both Cumberland and Franklin County is listed under Cumberland County.
A total of $89,512,195 was expended in 1997 to fund the 119 traditional police departments in the eight counties, as compared to $7,232,266 to support the eight regional departments. Although an unbalanced comparison, (regional departments serve only 8.6% of the total population served by local police), collectively regional departments are less costly to the taxpayer than are other local departments. However, such is not the case when viewed individually by county. Adams County and Cumberland County both reflect a higher per capita cost for regional police.

A. Northern York County Regional Police Cost Studies

Support for the conclusion that regional police is less costly was developed by the Pennsylvania Department of Community Affairs in two separate studies of the Northern York County Regional Police Department as well as similar studies of the eight regional departments existing in the Commonwealth in 1988. The initial study of the Northern York Police, although it involved other issues as well, centered on cost effectiveness and used 1987 financial data. The second study conducted five years later in 1992 dealt only with the cost of the regional department compared to other local police services.

The method employed in conducting the study involved selecting other communities as near as possible to the communities served by the Northern York Police, and which maintained their own individual police agencies, to create a model for comparison. In the first study six communities were selected and in the second eight were necessary because of the expansion of the regional department. Model communities were matched closely by the type of government, population served, real estate value, amount of earned income tax, occupation taxes generated, size of the policing area, road miles and total municipal expenditures. Once the model was created, the actual cost of police services was established in each community by reviewing expenditures, documenting hidden police costs found in other portions of municipal expenditure reports, and removing any costs listed under police department costs that did not belong there. The cost of police services in the model communities was then compared with the cost of the Northern York County Regional Police Department. The cost related conclusions of both studies were:

- In 1987, the citizens of the communities served by the Northern York Police were paying $465,000 or 26% less for police services than were those in communities which were part of the model.

- In 1992, with the regional department now serving eight communities, the cost was $809,163 or 28.8% less for the communities served by the regional department than the citizens of the eight communities selected for the model paid for their individual police departments.

Following the 1987 study of the Northern York County Regional Police Department, the
Department of Community Affairs conducted similar studies of the seven other regional departments existing in the Commonwealth at that time and collectively, the eight departments were found to be saving 24%, on the average. All had lower operating costs, except one. Perhaps it is time for another financial review of the Northern York Police as well as an appropriate time to conduct studies of other regional departments to strengthen or dispute previous findings.

B. Cost Impact Factors

Why is the regional approach to policing less costly in the long term? The answer to this question may vary to some degree in each situation and it cannot be assured that regional police will cost less every time the approach is used. Much depends upon what the situation is prior to merging police forces, in terms of police staffing, equipment and the management of police services in individual departments.

1. Staffing

Personnel costs usually account for 85% to 90% of the police budget. Therefore, it is important that care be taken in determining the number of officers necessary to provide adequate police protection to a community or group of communities. Are the number of officers employed by existing departments “bare bones” or are there more officers than is necessary to handle the workload? As stated previously, in many situations there are more officers employed than is necessary because the criteria for determining officer needs is assuring that an officer is available at all times to respond to calls for service, and not workload. If the area under consideration for a regional police department is an area where numerous “5 and under” officer departments exist, there will likely be a cost reduction with the regional police approach by eliminating overstaffing.

Along with determining proper staffing of officers is the need to assure civilian employee support to perform non-swellon tasks. Some departments use highly paid police officers in many non-police functions such as computer data entry, file clerks, school guards, and similar tasks. The demand for efficiency in the regional police approach often results in a separation of sworn and non-sworn functions and an ultimate cost reduction.

Overstaffing in specialist and or ranking positions occurs when there are numerous small departments. Detective positions are created simply because it assures follow-up of reported crime even though there may not be enough crime occurring in the community to justify a full-time detective. Ranking positions are created to assure leadership when the Chief is not available rather than to supervise a shift or unit on a full-time basis. Eliminating these positions in a merger of police departments, and/or assigning supervisory responsibilities if such ranking position are necessary, results in a more effective use of staff and cost reduction.
2. Equipment
Although the cost reduction is not as great in this area when existing police departments are merged, there is an opportunity to reduce costs by eliminating the duplication of equipment. Usually every police department maintains the number of vehicles necessary to patrol its jurisdiction, plus one or more back-up patrol units. The back-up units are sometimes shared by the municipal manager, code enforcement officer, or some other official, but they are normally and primarily police vehicles, purchased and maintained by the police department. The number of such vehicles necessary after a merger of departments is lower and the cost for them is reduced. Each department often has its own, and sometimes a wide range of equipment that is purchased and maintained by the department. When police departments are merged, the amount of equipment necessary exceeds the needs of the new department and therefore costs are reduced.

3. Management
The need for accountability in a regional police department not only assures the documenting of police activity but it also assures the need to get the most out of the funds allocated for police services. In most of the existing regional police departments in the Commonwealth, there is no mechanism available to obtain more funds if the department goes “over budget”. Unlike the traditional setting, the Chief of Police cannot borrow funds from the highway department or the recreation department if the regional department runs out of money. The Chief cannot ask the governing body for an additional appropriation. The regional Chief must live with the original financial plan established for the year. The Chief must also use the funds allocated to the department from each participating municipality wisely, investing the funds to achieve the highest gains possible until they are used. Financial gains are usually achieved by regional departments because of the need to manage finances effectively.

IV. PROBLEM AREAS AND LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

A. Problem Areas
The development of eight regional police departments in the Region in twenty-seven years is not what would normally be expected for an innovative local government program. Why then, are there not more regional police departments in the Region and State?
The are numerous reasons or obstacles encountered by groups of communities pursuing the development of a regional police department. Some are minor and rearing their heads on a very limited basis, while others are present constantly. The issues raised which seem to discourage the regional police concept come from three sources:

(1) The public or the citizens of the communities pursuing the development of a regional police program.
(2) The police officers employed by participating communities.

(3) The elected officials making up the governing bodies of participating communities.

Also, and in addition to the concerns of each of the above sources, and one that is present among all parties, is the "fear of the unknown" or the uncertainty of what will really happen when police departments are merged.

1. The Public

The typical citizen of the typical community, regardless of the method used to deliver police services, basically wants to feel safe in his home and property and to feel certain that should a situation occur in his life requiring police intervention, that an officer(s) will respond in a timely manner, be properly prepared and equipped, and go about an orderly process of investigating the matter and bringing it to a satisfactory conclusion. Therefore, the concerns of the citizens of communities considering regional police will center around those areas. Specifically, response time, how often the police car will be in their neighborhood, patrolling around schools and plays areas, child safety programs and accessing the police are the kind of issues usually concerning the public. Also, issues involving police officer's jobs and benefits may be raised if the person knows a member of the force. Lastly, citizens are always concerned about cost and getting a fair return for their tax dollar.

2. The Police

Police Officers and police department employees have a more personal interest in the merger of departments. It is their jobs and livelihoods that are at issue. Therefore, their concerns center around keeping their job, benefits, seniority, rank, specialty, and status, often gained through many years of struggle and effort on their part. They are also concerned about job security in the new department, preserving their right to appeal grievances, and career opportunities. While many officers and employees are opposed to anything that will rock the boat, a large number recognize that merging police agencies will give them more opportunities to grow and develop as police professionals. When opposed to the effort to merge police they can be a powerful deterrent, and because they are out there eight hours a day dealing with the public, they are able to influence public opinion to their point of view.

3. Elected Officials

Generally, merging police departments generates concern from several different directions among those elected officials involved in such an effort. First, many business and professional organizations, the media, and State and local agencies support the basic concept of intergovernmental cooperation. Therefore, even though the officials of a community may not support the thought of merging their
department, they go along with the effort because it has support from various sources and they do not wish to offend their neighbors. This often occurs when there is no cost involved in pursuing the issue. Secondly, there is major concern among elected officials about giving up the total power to control their police department. There is also a high degree of concern with the cost involved in merging the police and the availability of grants and financial support. Another source of concern among elected officials is for the role the Mayor or other authority figures will play if their department is merged with others. Some townships have designated Police Commissioners, Safety Directors or other positions which have been given authority over the police similar to that held by the Mayor. Lastly, elected officials are concerned that their officers and employees will be protected and have opportunities, and that the service level to their citizens will improve.

All the foregoing are legitimate concerns and any group hoping to achieve success in implementing a regional police department will have to address these concerns effectively. However, what often happens in the process of developing a regional police program is that concerns which are extremely difficult to address until very late in the process are brought forward as major issues by those opposed to the regional effort. Establishing precisely where the boundaries of each patrol zone will be, exactly who will fill the command positions, how the police cars will be marked, how much money will be transferred to the pension fund, what the shoulder patch and uniform will look like and the value of merged equipment are issues that need not be decided until after a decision is made to implement a regional police department. But, such issues often bring viable efforts to develop regional police agencies to a sudden stop. Groups of communities sincerely interested in trying to make regional policing a reality have to guard against being consumed by minor concerns.

B. Regional Police Department Governing Body Survey

Recognizing that issues vary from area to area in the Commonwealth, an attempt was made to determine the concerns and problems experienced in developing and implementing a regional department, and its performance since implementation, from officials in the Region. Using the Public Official Opinion Survey form in Appendix B, the Chiefs of Police and members of the governing Regional Police Commissions of each of the eight regional police agencies in the South Central Region were contacted and asked for their views. Obviously, some officials from departments that were implemented years ago were not able to provide input on problems in developing and implementing the department but did provide information on performance. With 50% of the officials from the eight departments responding the most popular responses to the questions asked are as follows:

**Question**

“What in your opinion, was the most difficult obstacle(s) to overcome in developing and implementing a regional police department?”
Response
1. Political jealousies among elected local officials 50%
2. Uncertainty of what will actually occur 33%
3. Lack of clear guidelines 8%
4. Implementation costs to high 8%

Question
"After the communities approved the regional department, what difficulties were experienced in the physical aspects of merging existing police departments?"
Response
1. Merging pension programs 60%
2. Selecting the chief of police and staff officers 20%
3. Establishing operational policies and procedures 10%
4. Transfer of authority to regional police commission 10%

Question
"How would you rate the performance of the regional police department now or since its implementation?"
Response (Highest possible score - 110)
1. Regional police provides better coverage. 102
2. Regional police provides more and better services. 96
3. Regional police is more efficient in handling workload. 91
4. Regional police provides more control and input into police operations. 87
5. Police officers on regional departments have more career opportunities. 84
6. Regional police is less costly. 80
7. Regional police provides more uniform enforcement policies. 80
8. The regional department is more able and is better equipped to handle the situation when they arrive at the scene. 73
9. Regional police is more professional in dealing with the public and is more “client” oriented. 66
10. The regional department is less political. 62

One would believe from the above, that difficulties experienced by elected officials relating to one another is one of the major obstacles to overcome in developing a regional police program. Also, the uncertainty of what will actually occur seems to point to a need to more clearly define how things will work under the regional policing concept. This can be achieved by legislative action in areas where there is concern, such as has already been accomplished by placing regional police departments under Act 600 and clarifying the
specific method of merging police pension funds. Although merging police department labor contracts was not the first choice of those responding to the above survey, it was the second choice of some officials, as was dealing with civil service issues.

The problem of merging pensions in the past is clearly evident in the survey on responses to the question dealing with difficulties in implementing regional departments. All the regional departments in the Region were implemented prior to the action of the State Legislature in correcting the problem of merging police pensions.

Regional police commission members and chiefs of police gave high marks to the performance of regional police. Coverage, more and better services and efficiency in doing the job are the highest regarded benefits of regional policing.

C. Legislative Issues

The Legislature of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania should be encouraged to enact amendments to the Intergovernmental Cooperation Law (Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, Title 53, Sections 2301 through 2315) which would address the following areas:

1. Labor Contracts
   Legislation should require that any labor contracts in place and affecting employees merged into newly created governmental units (regional police departments) under the Act shall continue in effect until such time that a new labor contract establishing salaries, benefits and working conditions is negotiated for employees of the newly created governmental unit, or for a period of one year from the date of the creation of the governmental unit if the employees of the newly created governmental unit fail to notify the governing body of the unit of their intent to negotiate for salaries, benefits and working conditions. State law should further require that employees merged into newly created governmental units and previously employed by participating municipalities should not suffer loss of salary or benefits from that they received prior to the effective date of the creation of the governmental unit, unless such reduction is negotiated through the collective bargaining process established by law and regulating the particular class of employee.

2. Civil Service
   A requirement in the law on intergovernmental cooperation should state that whenever a new governmental unit is created under the Act, where employees of participating municipalities are merged into the new unit, and where a portion of those employees were previously covered by civil service, the continuation of civil service for those employees, as well as any newly hired employees should be subject to collective bargaining, should the majority of those employees desire civil service coverage. Once established, if bargained for and approved, the specific procedure for the functioning of the civil service process should be included in the
language of the intergovernmental cooperation agreement authorizing the creation of the governmental unit, the specifics of which should thereafter by subject to collective bargaining.

3. **Seniority**
The law authorizing intergovernmental cooperation should require that when a new governmental unit is created under the Act involving the consolidation of personnel previously employed by participating municipalities, credit for years of employment with the participating municipality shall be transferred to the newly created governmental unit for the purpose of establishing seniority rights for employee benefits, promotional opportunities and furlough lists, and each employee merged into the newly created governmental unit be given credit for the most recent total continued period of employment with the municipality by which such person was employed at the time of the creation of the governmental unit.

4. **Re-employment**
The intergovernmental cooperation law should require that in the event a governmental unit created under the Act fails, is abolished or is terminated within two years of the effective date of the creation of such unit, those employees employed by participating municipalities and originally merged into the newly created governmental unit who are furloughed, shall be re-employed by the municipality by which they were employed at the time of the creation of the governmental unit. The right of re-employment should exist for two years.

D. **Financial Support**

Currently, there is a grant program in the Commonwealth specifically for the creation of regional police departments. Four of the five regional police departments in the Region which were created since 1992 applied for and received grants under the program.

The Regional Police Assistance grant program is administered through the joint efforts of the Center for Local Government Services and the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency. The Center for Local Government Services provides the technical assistance in preparing a group of municipalities to apply for grants by assisting with feasibility studies and preparing information necessary to apply for the grant. The Commission on Crime and Delinquency handles the application for the grant and works with the communities in administering the grant. The grant provided a maximum of $99,000 over a three year period to implement regional police departments. A maximum of $49,000 is available in the first year, $33,000 in the second year and $17,000 in the third year. Local police salaries and other police costs may be used for matching requirements, which are 25% in the first year, 50% in the second year and 75% in the third year.
The requirements to apply for and receive funds under this program are as follows:

a. There must be a feasibility study conducted prior to making application.

b. The regional department created under the program must employ a minimum of five full-time officers and a full-time chief of police.

c. The department created under the program must have a computerized records system.

d. There must be an open and competitive selection process for the chief of police position.

The success of this program, in assisting communities with the initial cost of establishing regional police departments, is evident in the fact that 16 new regional departments have been created in the state since its inception, with nine of those receiving grants under this program. The others were not eligible because of grant requirements, or for some reason did not apply. Several received smaller grants from the Council of Governments Intermunicipal Projects grant program (now the Shared Municipal Services grant program) administered by the Center for Local Government Services. The State Legislature should consider strengthening grant programs for regional police and providing additional financial support to assist communities in administering regional police programs.

On April 17, 1996 the State Senate Policy and Development Research Office issued a report on Police Regionalization which among other recommendations, called for:

1. Providing State Business Tax credits for contributions for establishing regional police departments.

2. Establishing a dedicated funding source for regional police departments by increasing the current fee attached to criminal convictions by $5 which would generate $530,000.

3. Increasing State pension aid for regional police departments.

4. Increasing reimbursements to regional police departments for officer training.

An October 24, 1995 final report of the House of Representatives Task Force on Law Enforcement and Public Safety called for earmarking funds for the development of regional police departments by attaching assessments to criminal convictions.

Action by the State Legislature on regional police issues and financial support, would provide the energy necessary to develop the regional police concept to its fullest potential
E. Questions at Issue.

What must be determined to allow a municipality to make a sound decision on whether to become part of a regional police department? There are essentially four things elected officials want to know about any major project involving intergovernmental cooperation. They are:

1. **What is it?**
   The size and structure of the police agency necessary to provide police services to all participating municipalities. This includes the number of police officers required based upon workload, the number of non-sworn civilian positions, the number of supervisory and ranking positions and the number of specialty positions required. Specific specialty functions such as investigative units, traffic safety units and community policing programs and respective staffing should be included.

2. **What will it cost?**
   When the size and structure of the proposed regional department is determined a first year operational budget should be established based upon current salaries, benefits and current department administrative and equipment costs. The number of vehicles necessary for the department and to establish the budget is determined by the number of officers necessary. It is extremely important to determine the actual cost of each existing department by uncovering the hidden costs often found in other sections of the municipality's budgets.

3. **What will our share of the cost be?**
   A method of distributing cost among participating municipalities must be determined from among many options. The most important aspect of any formula or method is that it be fair and able to accommodate growth and decline in the needs of each municipality. Currently, in the Region's eight existing regional police departments, five different methods are used to distribute cost among participating municipalities. Four use population as the sole factor, two use the Police Protection Unit (PPU) method, one department's cost is distributed among its communities based upon real estate value and calls for service and the Southern Regional Police Department communities divide 50% of the cost equally and the remaining 50% divided based upon incidents occurring(25%) and population(25%).

The PPU method allows a community to purchase the number of units of service necessary to police the community. A unit of service amounts to ten hours of service each week, or four units of service per officer per week, and therefore five officer coverage for a community would be twenty PPUs. The cost of units are determined by dividing the total number of sworn officers, at four units per officer, into the annual operating budget.
D. How will it be controlled?
There is a great amount of variety among the Region's regional police departments in the method of establishing control over the departments. Two current departments have Regional Police Commissions composed of equal representation from each municipality. Two have equal representation from each municipality plus one "at large" representative. One department has equal representation from each municipality plus one other representative appointed by the Commission. Another Regional Police Commission is composed of equal representation from each municipality plus one representative appointed on a rotating basis from each municipality, and the last requires that the Mayor, one Councilperson and one non-elected person be appointed from each participating community. Table 3 provides more specific detail of the structure of existing Regional Police Commissions within the Region.

When all the data has been collected and the above four factors determined, participating municipalities should be in a position to determine whether to proceed with implementing the regional department. All the other issues can be decided after a commitment is made to go ahead. It will probably be necessary to make assurances to satisfy those concerned about certain issues. For example, stating that no officer or employee will loose their job may serve to encourage those concerned with job security. A statement that an open and competitive selection process will be conducted from among qualified officers on existing departments for the Chief of Police and other ranking positions should provide assurance to those concerned with their personal careers.

In conclusion to this section on problem areas and legislative issues, action by the State Legislature to address the concerns of the public, the police and local government officials would do much to ease the pain of developing and implementing regional police programs in the Commonwealth.

V. ROLE OF LOCAL OFFICIALS

Of the 318 municipalities in the South Central Region, 188 (59%) have decided to exercise the power granted to all municipalities by the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and establish local police services. In doing so, local officials in those communities have accepted the awesome responsibility of policing and depriving people of their rights to freedom and perhaps life itself, should it become necessary. Because of the liability associated with the municipalities decision to police the public, it is important for local officials to assure that the officers exercising their police power be quality police officers, properly prepared to do their job, and adequately equipped for the protection of the officer, as well as the safety of the public.

A. Reviewing the Options
One of the obligations connected to providing police services is the determination of how to do it. The options available to provide services were discussed previously in this
report and this section will discuss how those options should be evaluated to determine which method is best for a particular community.

The community not currently providing police services and relying on the State Police for service has chosen that option by default. However, if the officials of that community, for whatever reason, have decided it is time to provide local police protection, they should thoroughly consider the remaining three options with the objective of obtaining the best possible police services available. The areas which usually generate the most concern for the local government official and which should be reviewed are:

1. **Range of Services and Resources**
   What resources and services are available from the department? Does or will the department have speed timing devices for traffic enforcement, specialists who investigate crimes, crime prevention programs, school crossing guards and child safety programs? Are the police vehicles adequate in number, well maintained and appropriately equipped and are there enough officers and civilian employees to do the work? Will the officer responding to calls for service be capable, adequately equipped and prepared to handle the matter?

2. **Enforcement**
   Will the department have the ability to enforce local, state and federal law at all times and at level which will be satisfactory to the governing body and the residents of the community?

3. **Coverage**
   Will the department providing service be able to patrol the community effectively and as frequently as necessary to dissolve problems and prevent crime? Will calls for service be responded to within a reasonable period of time?

4. **Cost and Cost Effectiveness**
   Will the department providing service do so at a cost that is reasonable and within the means of the community? Will the community be receiving the level of services it should be for the tax dollars expended? What will the per capita cost be, how much will it cost per hour of service and what percentage of the municipal budget will go for police services? Could we provide services at a lower cost, without reducing effectiveness, by choosing another manner of providing police services?

5. **Control and Input into Operations**
   How much of a role will the community have in deciding the policies and procedures under which police services will be applied. Will the community decide the hours of work and when patrols will be conducted? Will it have input into the selection and promotion process and who is selected as chief of
police? Will the community have a say in what will be included in the budget, how many police vehicles will be used and what specialized services will be provided? Will it have input into how ordinances will be enforced and the manner of dealing with domestic issues?

An in depth review and evaluation of the these factors, as they relate to the option for police services under consideration, will provide the necessary insight to make a sound decision.

Appendix C provides an evaluation of the four options available to municipalities, using the criteria just discussed, and on a state-wide basis. The evaluation clearly demonstrates that the regional policing concept has much to offer communities if viewed from the standpoint of addressing the concerns of the three major groups, the public, the police and the elected officials. The evaluation of the four options was conducted from a broad perspective and some may not agree with our conclusions. For example, there are surely exceptions to the conclusion that traditional policing is more costly, especially if the department under consideration is one which uses a part-time officer at minimum wage, who must provide his/her own vehicle and equipment. In this case, our conclusion may not be as valid. The review also addresses only smaller departments, ten officers or fewer in size. Therefore, our conclusion that traditional policing is lacking in providing coverage may not be acceptable to those administering a ten officer department, as opposed to those with less than five officers. On the whole, however, the conclusion is valid.

Additionally, the same type of review and evaluation should be conducted periodically by every municipality in the Region with police services and not currently policed by a full service police agency. A full service police agency for our purposes, is one which is able to field patrol units on a full-time basis with communications and back-up support. Police agencies are able, or unable to address the needs of the citizens and the local governments they serve, based upon their size.

For example, one cannot expect to have a police officer respond to calls for service when they are needed unless there is an officer on duty at all times. A policing method that requires an "on call" officer to respond to a serious incident from his home at 3 AM, as opposed to being out there ready to go to work, is not acceptable by many people in today's society. Although "bigger is not necessarily better" as is often heard, when it comes to policing there are definite advantages in being "bigger". However, larger size is no guarantee that service will improve. How well a department performs when it is large enough to provide a full range of services depends upon how it is administered and how well it applies sound police management procedures. If, because of size, a department is unable to provide the basic function for which it exists, to answer calls for service, then it should not exist in that form. The ability of a police department to perform certain functions and provide certain services, based on its size is listed below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function or Service</th>
<th>Under 5 Officers</th>
<th>5 to 10 Officers</th>
<th>11 to 25 Officers</th>
<th>Over 26 Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide crime prevention/safety programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time response to calls for service</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time patrol coverage</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign officers based on workload</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide full-time shift supervision</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create full-time specialist positions</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign staff by specialized units</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate staff by divisions</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Phases of Development of Regional Police Services

There are specific steps a group of communities go through in the review and development of regional police services which are outlined in this section. Along with the steps are guidelines to follow, pointers, and CAUTIONS where caution is necessary. The guidelines are intended to help municipal officials organize their effort in such a way that every possible area of the process will be covered. Pointers will offer suggestions of things to do that may avoid a problem and are based upon situations that have developed in the past among other groups looking into the regional police concept. CAUTIONS are offered as warnings on issues that can cause problems or failure immediately.

1. Interest Assessment Phase.

   a. Plan a meeting of neighboring officials to determine if they too are interested in the concept of regional policing.

   * Make sure there is solid support among your own governing body.
   * Make sure it is a public meeting and that anyone, including police officers, are able to attend.
   * Be cognizant of other governments meeting schedules and other public events to avoid attendance conflicts.
   * Assure that the communities invited have a common interest and be one that would fit well into any regional police compact that may result.
b. Arrange for someone to be at the meeting who has some knowledge of how regional police departments function.

* Invite a chief of police from an existing regional police department.
* Invite a member of a Regional Police Commission.
* Invite a representative from the Center for Local Government Services.

c. Set a deadline for communities interested in pursuing a study of the concept.

* Don’t pressure those not responding, if they are interested you will know

2. Organizing for the Review Phase

a. Contact the interested communities for a planning meeting.

* Again, make it a public meeting.

b. Decide specific approach of review and how it will proceed.

* Ask the Center for Local Government Services to provide assistance.
* Establish a target date for completing the work.
* Require that each municipality officially act on the review upon its completion.
* Determine what agencies will be contacted for information or input.

c. Appoint a study committee to oversee the development of the project and provide feedback to each community.

* Appoint a strong, “take charge” chairperson to guide the process. Someone who has the time and is willing to exert the effort to enforce timetables, schedule meetings and deal with inquiries from the media and the public. Most importantly, appoint a person who is well liked and able to understand local politics.
* Make sure that at least one member from each municipality is a member of the governing body.
* Consider involving organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce, League of Women Voters, and civic organization in the meetings and on the committee to keep the public informed and garner support for the review.
* Consider involving police officers and if not, KEEP THE POLICE INFORMED OF WHAT IS HAPPENING AND THE ELEMENTS OF THE REVIEW PROCESS.

3. The Review Phase
a. Use the Center for Local Government Services to develop the information and data necessary to determine the four factors (what is it, what will it cost, what will our share be and how will it be controlled?).

* Avoid the issues that will be decided if and after a decision is made to implement.
* Assure the police that no officer will lose his job or suffer a loss in wages and that the officers' longevity will be transferred.
* Commit to an open and competitive selection process for the chief and other command positions.

b. Visit existing regional police departments to gain knowledge on how they function and the role and responsibilities of the Regional Police Commission.

* Plan the visit at a time when the Regional Police Commission is holding its regular meeting.
* Include selected members of the police departments in visits.

c. Gather information from whatever sources are necessary to gain knowledge or develop input which will impact the review, or its results.

* Consider the affect a regional police department may have on other public safety or governmental agencies.
* Consider the anticipated growth and development of the area and the individual participating communities.

4. The Follow-up Phase

a. Provide a copy of the study report to each member of each governing body, the police departments from communities participating in the review, and to the agencies or organizations represented on the study committee.

* Prepare a summary of the findings of the review and its high points for the media or provide a copy of the report.

b. After allowing ample time to review the report, members of the study committee should meet with each governing body to address the review, answer questions and provide a full understanding of whatever is proposed.

* If a merger of police departments is recommended, don't try to address questions on issues that have not yet been decided. Simply assure those asking the questions, that the committee is aware of the concern for these issues and that they will be addressed to the satisfaction of the governing bodies.
c. If a merger of police departments is recommended, the study or review committee should schedule a meeting with members of the police departments of each participating municipality, collectively or individually, to address the study findings and answer questions.

* Provide assurances decided upon previously concerning jobs, salaries and benefits but avoid getting into specifics which have not been decided.

d. Consider holding other meetings throughout the area to allow public input and inquiries.

* Make certain the study or review findings and particulars have had ample exposure before holding public information meetings.

e. The committee should follow-up on each municipality failing to vote on its own on the recommendations of the study, to secure its response.

5. The implementation Phase.

a. If not all communities vote to merge police departments, the plans must be adjusted to accommodate the needs of communities participating to their satisfaction.

* Adjustments are usually necessary only in staffing and costs.

b. Municipalities appoint a Regional Police Commission consistent with procedure outlined in study report.

c. Regional Police Commission elects its officers, appoints a Solicitor to draft agreement and review legal issues, implements the process for selecting chief and staff officers and finalizes the selection of a police headquarters facility.

d. Regional Police Commission negotiates merger of salaries and benefits and finalizes labor agreement for first year.

e. Regional Police Commission finalizes first year budget and prepares applications for grants.

f. Regional Police Commission arranges for the merging of police department records and equipment, the installation of telephones, computer and radio equipment and the modification of uniforms and patrol vehicle markings.

g. Regional Police Commission arranges for the joint swearing in of police officers and the opening of the new regional police department.