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Background

The following provides an overview of the Pierce County Sheriff’s Department (PCSD) - Law Enforcement Study, the County, and the Sheriff’s Department.

In July 2015, the Pierce County Sheriff's Department contracted with Public Safety Strategies Group LLC (PSSG) to review the operations of the policing component of operations. PSSG worked with an internal Steering Committee (the Committee) consisting of members of the command staff and administration who participated in the selection of PSSG, provided data and documents for review, and coordinated interviews.

The objective of the project was to review the staffing of the law enforcement operations’ department and make recommendations for the future of policing in regard to deployment and efficiencies.

After the initial review of the patrol staffing and discussions related to the impact of increasing the number of patrol deputies in the department on the administrative staff and specialized services such as investigations, these additional areas were included in the study process. To further ensure optimum deployment and use of resources, the PCSD has been working on a strategic plan that includes defining organizational efficiencies, refining and finalizing the mission statement, developing a vision and defining the values of the department, and developing action steps to ensure the highest level of service delivery.

While this report represents a “moment in time” snapshot of observations made by PSSG and shared with the department during a series of meetings. As appropriate and as resources allow the PCSD has been working toward making changes. In 2018, PSSG will work with the PCSD to monitor progress and issue quarterly updates.

About Pierce County Washington

Pierce County (the County) covers approximately 1,806 square miles of land and 137 square miles of water. Multiple freeways cross the county bringing those who live, work, and visit the area to both the populated and rural areas throughout. The area is also home to many colleges and cultural and recreational attractions.

The estimated 2014 United States Census reported that there were 831,928 residents in the county and in 2016 that estimate increased to 861,312. Additional growth is anticipated in the coming years as evidenced by the fact that there were 3,865 building permits issued in 2016. The County contains both incorporated areas with independent government systems and unincorporated areas that rely on the services of the county for public safety. Twenty-three cities and towns make up the county ranging in size from a few hundred to nearly 200,000.
According to the U.S. Census for 2016, there were 338,560 households in Pierce County, bringing the population density at the time to approximately 476 people per square mile. The racial makeup of the County was 75.6% White, 7.5% Black or African-American, 1.7% Native American, 6.6% Asian, 1.6% Pacific Islander, and 7.0% from two or more races.

Of the total households, 35.90% had children under the age of 18 living with them, 52.80% were married couples living together, 11.80% had a female householder with no husband present, and 30.90% were non-families. Single individuals accounted for 24.30% of all households, and 7.60% of those living alone were 65 years of age or older.

The age range of those in the county included 23.7% under the age of 18 and 13.4% who were 65 years of age or older. The median household income was $59,953. Twelve percent of the county lived in poverty. The per capita income for the county was $28,824. Approximately 7.50% of families and 10.50% of the population were below the poverty line. Of the total living below the poverty line, 13.20% were under age 18 and 7.20% were age 65 or over.

About the Pierce County Sheriff’s Department

The PCSD has responsibility for both the policing and corrections functions in the County. This report is limited to the law enforcement component and does not include a review of corrections operations or staffing.

The supervisory structure of the law enforcement component includes a sheriff, undersheriff, and two bureau chiefs along with two captains and seven lieutenants at the division level assigned to patrol, investigations, special investigations, and training.

The patrol area contains specific geographic areas called the Foothills, Mountain, and Peninsula Detachments, the South Hill and the Parkland/Spanaway Precincts. Within some detachments and in South Hill, there are small geographic patrol areas established. While the PCSD provides coverage to unincorporated areas in the County, it also contracts separately with communities to provide additional services. These areas are commonly known as “Contract Cities.”

In addition to general patrol services, the PCSD has the responsibility of providing specialized services for investigations, search and rescue, high-risk responses such as hostage negotiations or active shooter scenarios, rescue diving, school resource officers, and other related functions.

The maps on the next five pages show the various patrol areas and highlight the drive times within each area. The calculation of drive time was determined using the police

1 There is an eight lieutenant in a contract city.
station as the starting point. While it is not a typical occurrence to have deputies respond from the station location, the drive time analysis was constructed in this manner in order to provide readers of this report with a perspective of the vast territory that the department covers. In reality, a deputy may be responding to a call in one corner of a precinct or detachment with the next call being in the opposite direction.

The size of the detachments and the distance between calls lead to longer response times. The long drive times present an issue related to officer and community safety, as responding officers must travel lengthy distances to answer calls for services. It is reasonable to expect that with increased population density and congestion; drive times could be affected. Further, there are times when only one officer is available for a call, which, depending on the type of call, can be unsafe.
Map 1: Foothills Detachment
Map 2: Mountain Detachment
Map 3: Peninsula Detachment
Map 4: South Hill Precinct
Map 5: Parkland Spanaway Precinct
Methodology

PSSG conducted its review of the PCSD through internal and external interviews, review of internal reports and records, staffing, deployment, and analysis of calls for service/incident data, all supplied by the department. An additional component of data collection included conducting tours of all patrol areas and direction observations of operations.

The data analysis and review of records included organizational charts, shift/deployment schedules, overtime, contracts, property crime unit proposals, department rosters, Guild Agreements, mission/vision statements, and other material as presented by the department.

In addition to providing records and data, the department assigned a member to act as a liaison to the project to coordinate meetings and site visits, provide outreach to external partners, and answer any questions that arose during the study. PSSG also worked with an internal steering committee to clarify any issues that arose through the data analysis and review process as well as to discuss findings. This process was important as it allowed PSSG to work around data issues and errors that were found and to come to agreements on how to recode much of the information.

Interviews

The PSSG team conducted over 70 interviews with members of the PCSD as well as interviews with County and Contract City government officials and members of the Sheriffs’ Advisory Committee. Listening sessions were held with community members and business owners in each of the detachments and precincts.

Data Analysis

PSSG reviewed the calls for services/incident data for a period from January 2010 through December 30, 2016 as well as investigative records for 2016.

Sheriff Department Records

Below is a representative list of materials provided by the PCSD and reviewed by PSSG:

- Overtime Reports
- Specialty Team Call Outs
- Contracts with Cities
- Strategic Plan (outdated and not implemented)
- Employee Staff Listings
- Assignments
This project did not include a review of comparison community information because comparisons only allow for the development of general assumptions. Specific conclusions are impossible as the level of information required for comparison is not readily available.

Further complicating comparisons between comparable communities are the varying levels of publicly available data and information. Without consistency in the data, benchmarks cannot be accurately drawn and comparisons cannot occur. PSSG cautions that the ability to compare staffing between communities or counties is limited, and it will be impossible to gather all the required information unless a full study is conducted on the comparison communities as well.

Often, studies on policing and staffing refer to ratios, or the “officer per 1,000” method of calculating staffing. PSSG rejects this strategy for several reasons. First and foremost, the use of a ratio does not take into account the approach to policing, special enforcement strategies, community-based programming, use of civilian staffing, community demographics, tourism, industry and business located in the community, and the geographic features of a community.
Strategic Planning, Mission, Vision, and Values

Prior to its most recent effort, the department had not undertaken a strategic planning process in several years, did not have a vision statement, and the stated values did not have descriptions. The study process identified that a new strategic plan was needed to guide the changes in staffing as well as future investments and activities of the department. The department lacked a strategic plan and did not have a mission statement, articulated values, or goals. In addition, there were gaps discovered with record keeping, consistency, training, organizational structure, and other areas. The subsections below describe the findings and provide recommendations to improve efficiencies and operations.

Before launching the development of a strategic plan, the department focused on its mission, vision, and values.

Mission, Vision, and Values

The following sections describe the mission, vision, and values that were developed and the process used to establish them.

Mission

The department had an established mission that was created over a decade ago. The Strategic Planning Steering Committee reviewed and updated the mission statement to reflect the current climate of the department and county.

As part of the strategic planning process, the department refined its mission to the following:

The mission of the Pierce County Sheriff’s Department is to protect life and property, uphold rights, and work in partnership to build strong, safe communities.

Vision

The department did not have a vision statement, so the Strategic Planning Steering Committee developed a vision statement to help guide future efforts of the department. The vision statement provides focus to how the department views itself and how it hopes to be viewed by others. The newly developed vision statement is:

The Pierce County Sheriff’s Department is a values-driven public safety leader trusted to provide excellent service to the region.
Values

While the department had values that were listed on boards and coins, the values were not defined, resulting in department members having different interpretations of them. A cross section of the department worked together to define the existing values as follows:

**Integrity:** We conduct ourselves honestly, legally, morally, and ethically at all times. The department ensures integrity by holding employees accountable to maintain public trust.

**Respect:** We treat everyone fairly, impartially, and with dignity.

**Responsibility:** We carry out our mission, perform our duties, and fulfill our obligations, all with excellence.

**Courage:** We stand up to physical and moral challenges, and take action when difficult decisions are required.

**Compassion:** We conduct ourselves with humility and empathy.

Strategic Plan Development

Without a strategic plan that includes universally adopted mission, vision, and values statements, there can be different perceptions of the organization and stakeholders' expectations. To increase buy-in to the new plan, the strategic planning process included a cross section of internal and external stakeholders in order to develop strategies that strike a balance in expectations while simultaneously ensuring attainable goals are appropriately structured. The updated plan incorporated the ideas discussed with department members and community stakeholders, and presents a clear path for future service delivery.

The PCSD also assembled a Strategic Planning Steering Committee of external stakeholders. This group met to review the needs of the department and strategize about methods for improving operations. In addition to the external Strategic Planning Steering Committee, a series of meetings was held on each of the main goals with over 70 representatives from the department.

The Strategic Planning Committee and Action Planning Groups will continue to meet as a group in order to gauge the progress of the subgroups that will continue to work on the action plans associated with each of the goals listed in the next section.

Externally, PSSG conducted listening sessions with community and business members from across the County, conducted a countywide survey, and then met with various members to review the goals. As the department continues to work on the action items, it will continue to engage the community as appropriate.
 Goals

In keeping with several recommendations from the 21st Century Policing Report, the PCSD develop several operational goals. The goals are as follows:

**Accountability and Transparency**
- PCSD will operate in a manner that allows stakeholders to understand department functions and activities while upholding standards and expectations.

**Trust and Legitimacy**
- The PCSD will create a culture of trust that supports its enforcement efforts.

**Communication**
- PCSD will exchange information with internal and external stakeholders in a timely and consistent manner.

**Department Member Wellbeing**
- PCSD will support members in efforts to stay safe, remain physically fit, and resilient.

**Accreditation**
- PCSD will enhance, adopt, and implement best practices of police policy through a formal accreditation process.

**Regionalization/Contracting**
- PCSD will be the trusted partner to provide police and corrections services.

**Technology**
- PCSD will use cutting edge, interoperable technology and software that meets the needs of the Sheriff’s Department and supports internal and external operations.

**Community Engagement and Quality of Life**
- PCSD will collaborate with stakeholders to identify and resolve public safety issues.

**Hiring and Recruiting**
- PCSD will recruit and hire quality candidates.

**Retention**
- PCSD will provide an environment that fosters commitment to the agency.
Diversity

- PCSD will promote diversity at all levels of the department.

Training

- PCSD will provide training that prepares new employees for their jobs and provides career development to its members

The operational goals are supported with action steps. There will be regular action planning group meetings to work on the action steps, refine as needed, and report on the progress of implementation to the Strategic Planning Steering Committee.
Organizational Structure and Staffing

The PCS is a very lean organization in terms of both supervisory structure and the number of deputies available to answer calls and conduct proactive community engagement strategies. This presents challenges to organizational effectiveness and creates a higher level of risk and liability. While the deputy sheriffs are dedicated to delivering high-quality police services, there are simply not enough of them assigned to the patrol function. Unlike many agencies of similar size, the PCSD is not “top heavy” in terms of supervisors, and very few sworn members perform functions that are more suited to civilian personnel.

As the PCSD command staff is small, the workload and span of control is high (meaning command staff members have too many direct reports). Due to a limited number of lieutenants, the PCSD relies on the sergeants and deputy sheriffs to make important decisions in the field. Unfortunately, the practice of operating such a lean organization creates a high level of risk and liability while at the same time limiting the ability of the organization to work with the community.

PSSG strongly recommends the appointment of an additional chief. Currently, the operations division includes patrol operations and criminal investigations division. There is a great deal of activity and too many staff members for one person to supervise. There should be a patrol division under operations that is separate from the criminal investigations division with separate leadership.

During the study, PSSG recommended the position of chief of staff to replace the policy and outreach coordinator position. The sheriff was already using the policy and outreach coordinator position in a chief of staff capacity. Changing the position title and adding responsibilities also helped to balance the workload and streamline operations. The chief of staff position now oversees the business unit, creating a tie into the contracting and special projects (to include grants) that this position oversees. The new structure also places all the administrative staff reporting to the chief of staff. Prior to this change, the administrative staff were under a variety of positions. While day-to-day reporting will be to an immediate supervisor, having the administrative staff under one umbrella will streamline areas such as cross-training and career development. Additionally, there is an administrative position that is classified as an Office Assistant 3 (OA3); however, the responsibilities of this position outpace the other OA3 positions. PSSG suggests a reclassification of this position.
The Corrections chief is also a direct report to the undersheriff which is reflected on the Corrections Organization Chart.
The Corrections chief is also a direct report to the undersheriff which is reflected on the Corrections Organization Chart.
The staffing numbers for patrol deputies decreased from 2008 through 2014, after which staffing began to increase following the recession. The graphs that follow show the number of patrol deputies each year from 2008 - 2016. It is important to note that not all of the deputies represented in the graph are assigned to patrol, as there are other functions within the PCSD that require deputies to complete.

**Graph 1: Deputy Sheriffs 2008-2017**

Retention of civilian staff has remained fairly consistent from 2008 through 2014. The department had been approved for new positions for personnel to complete public records requests. While the overall number has remained consistent, the workload increased, therefore diminishing the impact of the increases in staffing.

**Graph 2: Civilian Employees 2008 017²**

²The civilian employee total prior to 2011 did not include animal control, from 2011 to present, these positions are included
To address response time concerns, improve safety, and provide for enhanced service delivery, PSSG recommends hiring a mix of commissioned and civilian staff. The table below shows the suggested staffing enhancements.

**Table 1: Recommended Staffing Increases and Progress to Date**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patrol/Deputies</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeants (12 minimum to 18 ideal)</td>
<td>12 – 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenants (3 minimum to 7 ideal)</td>
<td>3 – 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau Chief</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Employees/Background Unit</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Responders</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Policing / Engagement Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Office / Data</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total New Hires (Range)</td>
<td>75-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Allocations to Date</td>
<td>18*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*2 lieutenants, 1 sergeant, 13 deputies, 1 community coordinator, and 1 co-responder)

The following are additional overall recommendations related to organizational structure:

- Continue to civilianize functions that do not require sworn personnel.
- Eliminate the rank of captain through attrition.
- Increase the number of administrative staff to support operations.
- Increase deputy-level staffing to improve officer safety and service delivery.
- Increase supervisor staffing to minimize risk and decrease liability.
- Increase forensic support staff to facilitate evidence processing.
- Add civilian staff in a co-responder capacity to ensure service delivery and address community need (discussed further in the next section).

---

3 Please refer to appendix A for a table of the recommendations by position.
• Outsource the polygraph examinations to free up detective time for cases.
• Decentralize the Public Information Officer (PIO) function, having lieutenants in the field act as liaisons with the media and provide a connection to the specific area of patrol while keeping major events (like officer-involved shootings) and overall direction under a single umbrella. This position could be civilianized in order to move the detective in the position back to the Criminal Investigation Division.
• Add professional staff to oversee community engagement and research.

At this time, PSSG does not recommend additional commissioned positions in the Criminal Investigation Division (CID). A time study revealed that a significant amount of time was spent on report writing and ancillary duties. In addition, there were tasks being completed by commissioned personnel that can be performed by professional staff. Before changing the staff model in CID with additional position, PSSG recommends integrating a talk to text or transcription process to CID as well as adding professional staff to assist with processing paperwork and data analysis.

The integration of additional staff should be phased in so that the department can manage the training and onboarding process effectively. While the department will continue to increase the number of personnel, the rate of attrition from those that retire or move to other jobs, also must be addressed. It takes approximately one year for the department to recruit and train a deputy which needs to be factored into the hiring process. In order for the department to be fully staffed and fill all open positions, the County Council would need to approve additional funding to “over hire” to have personnel ready to fill the positions vacated.

Co-Responders

In June 2016, the staffing study report to the County Council highlighted the need for a co-responder program. Across the county, it is estimated that 7-10% of all interactions involve those with mental illnesses (VERA Institute, Police Conduct Oversight Commission of Minneapolis, 2016, p.3). Based on a review of the Computer Aided Dispatch in Pierce County, calls related to or involving those with mental illness and substance abuse issues and the demand for support services have risen. Moreover, estimates of those with mental health issues in jail are also significant. To address these issues, in the fall of 2016 the County Council sought to enact the one-tenth of 1% tax to fund mental health services; unfortunately, since that time, this measure has failed. In order to fund the program, the County Council has provided seed funding to launch the effort and the department has received a federal grant to develop protocols around information sharing and deployment.

PSSG recommends an embedded model so that there is a close working relationship with mental health professionals and the deputies deployed in the communities. Having
these mental health professionals imbedded provides community members with a high level of service while at the same time ensuring a safe environment for response personnel. The process will require a collaborative approach and involved stakeholders from the community. Training, policies and procedures, and Memoranda of Understanding will need to be created.

Like with the overall staffing, PSSG has suggested a phased-in approach.

The following are overall recommendations related to the co-responder program:

- Incrementally deploy a co-responder in each precinct and detachment, one floater, and one supervisor for a total of seven.
- Develop a Memoranda of Understanding, data sharing protocols, and operational standards.
- Hold collaboration meetings with providers and stakeholders.
- Monitor calls for service.

**Community Liaison Deputies**

During listening sessions, PSSG learned that the community appreciated the former program called the Neighborhood Patrol Deputies. This program assigned one person to an area to work with citizens on issues. The problem with this model was that it was resource-dependent, did not have any performance measures in place, and did not involve the larger group of deputies assigned to patrol. When overly specialized teams are established without integrating them with patrol, it creates a divide in the service delivery model. With the addition of deputies to the field, the County Council desired a program-based approach. To address this request while at the same time addressing operational needs, PSSG worked with the PCSD to structure a modified process. The assigned deputies and a sergeant will be part of a team. The team, along with the community, detachments, and precincts, will address issues from across the county. Deputies deployed to the field will have opportunities to rotate in as part of the team, and the CLD deputies will cover patrol calls as needed. This will allow the deputies to take ownership of any issues occurring in their patrol areas while simultaneously developing additional skills in problem-solving that go beyond just answering a call for service.

The detachments and precincts will have sergeants assigned to act as liaisons with the sergeant in the CLD unit. Through this relationship, problems will be identified and solved. The strategy will allow the process of problem-solving to be institutionalized throughout the agency. Having more people involved in the process will increase the number of deputies involved with the community. Further, the ability for deputies in the
field to attend community meetings will allow trust and relationships to be built with multiple department members rather than a single deputy.

In order to be most effective, the team needs the resources of a civilian coordinator to set up meetings, research resources, coordinate services, write up case studies, and perform other administrative tasks. Training will also be required to ensure that all deployed deputies understand the problem-solving methodologies and tracking of efforts.

The following are overall recommendations related to community liaison deputies:

- Deputies should be part of an overall team.
- Patrol deputies need to be integrated into the process.
- Training on problem-solving and tracking of efforts is required.
- A civilian coordinator is needed to assist with scheduling, researching, and reporting.

**Patrol District Integrity**

Currently, the PCSD does not have patrol district integrity. While some adjustments have been made, the patrol areas are not fully defined based on calls for service or community need. Deputies are assigned on a random basis and there is not any consistency in the deployment strategy. The model needs to change so that deputies are assigned in a manner that gives them ownership over their beat and provides them the opportunity to be connected to the community. Further modeling is required to assess each patrol district and then research should be conducted to construct the most efficient patrol districts.

The following are overall recommendations related to beat integrity:

- Analyze and map calls for service, and adjust to rebalance call loads while at the same time considering neighborhood needs.
- Make permanent/long-term assignments of deputies to beats to increase community involvement.
Operational Observations and Recommendations

As PSSG reviewed department operations, it learned that the department had been working with less than the optimum number of employees. While this had not caused the department to lose its focus on providing service, it was clear that there were operational areas within the department that needed improvement. Addressing these areas will help with accountability and transparency, as well as improving operations and efficiencies.

Organizational Culture

The department, despite not having an up-to-date and comprehensive strategic plan to guide operations, does believe in enhancing service delivery. PCSD members are proud and have a desire to provide a high level of service to the community. Despite challenges due to decreased staff over a number of years, the overall attitude of department members is positive with a commitment to improving operations. As is to be expected when organizational change is suggested, there was some level of apprehension toward making structural changes, but there was a willingness to listen and hear different perspectives. With the recommended growth in staff, PSSG advises that careful attention be paid to maintaining the positive aspects of the organizational culture and ensuring that new members are appropriately socialized into the department.

There appears to be an issue of trust between the administration and the command staff. One theme expressed at meetings with department members was the perception of preferential treatment/favoritism in promotional selections. While the department is working to address these concerns through groups working on action steps, the progress requires monitoring to ensure change.

The following are overall recommendations related to culture:

- Continue to support department members in their effort to provide quality service.
- Increase attention given to fairness and diversity.

Internal Investigations and Complaints

Currently, the Internal Investigations Unit/Professional Standards does report directly to the sheriff.

The following are overall recommendations related to investigations and complaints:
• Create a higher level of accountability for complaints raised both from the public and from department members by having the Internal Affairs (IA) lieutenant report directly to the sheriff.

• Review and update of the current IA policy, which should include a monthly reporting process. The reporting should contain the number and type of complaints in process.

• Create and post a yearly IA report.

• Create a process that allows an employee to go to the Pierce County Human Resources Department should they feel there is an issue of harassment or bias related to gender, ethnicity, or sexual orientation.

• Document all complaints in a tracking/early warning software program.

• Post the complaint process on the website in a manner that makes it accessible by community members.

• Consider external review of all IAs.

Training

Currently, the department does not have a training or career development plan. Records for training are poorly tracked. PSSG reviewed the records for CID and found a lack of consistency with naming the classes. If a supervisor were to research training by class name, they would receive inaccurate information. In reviewing the courses, there was not any consistency on which members were receiving what type of training. There were instances in which members went to an instructor course, yet had not taught the class for the department, which is a waste of resources.

Training budgets for both commissioned and noncommissioned staff were limited. The noncommissioned staff received little training; this includes the forensic investigators.

The importance of consistency with the Field Training Officers was discussed. Members expressed that greater emphasis on the mission, vision, values, and goals was required during the training. In addition, members felt that not enough was being done to reinforce the department “brand” during field training.

A goal for the department is regionalization; however, little is done to host regional training programs.

Management and supervisory training is not consistent. Sergeants receive training, but it could be months after their appointment. Lieutenants and above do not attend a specified training program. Previously, the department trained members in the Leadership in Police Organization (LPO) course, and there are still trainers working at the department.
The following are overall recommendations related to training:

- Conduct a full training inventory
- Correct all the errors and inconsistent records.
- Produce quarterly training bulletins for supervisors to show who received what training.
- Track training by person, class name, number of hours, and cost to ensure equity in training and that training goals are met.
- Determine if the LPO program (or another) should be used consistently within the department.
- Define an overall training plan.
- Host regional training programs.
- Ensure that the FTO program is updated to include the revised mission and the vision, values, and goals of the department.
- Increase the budget for training (after these other steps are completed).

**Communication**

Department members expressed concern over communication. Given the decentralization of department members, this is not an unexpected finding. Members at the headquarters locations did believe that they were fairly well informed (this differed between commissioned and noncommissioned department members).

Department members shared that there were many sources of information and places they needed to access in order to gain information.

Chief meetings are held routinely to share information; however, department members did not feel that the information flowed down to the patrol level.

The department does not produce an annual report. Much of the external communication from the department is done through the use of social media (Facebook and Twitter). The webpage is out of date.

During listening sessions, many community members expressed the desire to see more members at community events, and while they enjoy presentations and appearances from the sheriff, they would like to get to know other department members as well. Listening sessions and input from community members on the goals of the department also revealed the desire to have more two-way communication and follow-up after events.
At the beginning of the project, the Public Information Officer (PIO) function was limited to a single person operating from headquarters. Members expressed that this should be decentralized and more autonomy given to supervisors in the detachments and precincts to share information with the community.

During the course of the staffing study, efforts have been made to inform members as progress is made; however, there can never be too much communication.

The following are overall recommendations related to communication:

- Develop a communications plan to share information internally.
  - Create a “members only” portal to gather information in one place.
  - Post news worthy information by category to allow easier access for retrieval of information and so that department members do not always need to track social media to learn of information.
- Ensure commissioned and noncommissioned members are equally informed.
- Have an outside review of the website and refresh the information.
- Create opportunities to gather external feedback.
- Increase the number of personnel that can act as PIOs so that ownership is developed in the precincts and detachments for information sharing.

**Community Policing/Community Engagement**

One area lacking in the PCSD is the development and implementation of a strategy that includes the use of the community policing model and active community engagement. The lack of focus in these areas is related to inadequate staffing. Personnel—both commissioned and noncommissioned—are required to fully develop and execute a plan that focuses efforts on problem-solving and increasing the quality of life in the County.

Efforts are placed on the development of a Citizens’ Police Academy; however, this program only reaches a limited audience. To increase the efforts, topics should be defined, informational sessions developed, and information disseminated to a broader audience than just the limited enrollment of the Academy.

The following are overall recommendations related to community policing:

- Increase community engagement and problem-solving through collaborative efforts.
- Redesign the Citizens’ Police Academy to a program that provides outreach and information to more community members.
Changes in these broad areas will improve department operations, contribute to a safer Pierce County, and enhance the quality of life for those who live, work, and/or travel in and to the County.

**Hiring, Recruiting, and Diversity**

Currently, the PCSD does not have an articulated hiring and recruiting plan. The advertisements that are in circulation are outdated and do not reflect the best practices in hiring for a diverse workforce. Furthermore, the process of the oral boards is not defined in a manner that allows oral board participants the ability to understand the type of candidate the PCSD is seeking or the range of questions and anticipated answers, nor does it judge the emotional intelligence of an individual. Updates to the process are needed, revamping the questions asked during the oral board process as well as developing a profile of the ideal type of candidate to join the PCSD.

Training needs to be developed for the oral board members. Involving everyone in the training and ensuring consistency during the oral board process will enhance the experience for those applying and will yield the best candidates. The PCSD also needs to develop a plan for recruitment that goes beyond social media. The recruiting plan must include community stakeholders, especially those representing diverse populations. As a profession, police agencies need to look beyond the typical criminal justice field to attract candidates with a variety of skillsets.

The material used to recruit candidates should not just be a picture with a few words, but rather should include a narrative about the quality of life in Pierce County, expectations of the position, and what a career path might look like. Currently, the advertisements are not inclusive and do not separate the PCSD from other agencies.

The following are overall recommendations related to hiring and recruitment:

- Ensure consistency with oral board staff participants.
- Include emotional-intelligence based questions.
- Solicit community agencies to help with recruiting.
- Evaluate recruiting material.
- Develop a full recruiting plan.

**Accreditation**

The PCSD has adopted the Lexipol policies. At this time, the department needs to focus on reviewing each policy, evaluating it for application in the agency and developing the policies to match best practices. A person needs to be assigned to the process to oversee the work. This would be best suited to one of the captains to undertake or if
needed hire a consultant to assist with the process. The process will require input from all areas of the department. In addition, the department may want to consider outside support who has experience with policy and procedure development and accreditation in order to prepare for the accreditation process within a 12-18-month timeframe.

The following are overall recommendations related to hiring and recruitment:

- Ensure the adopted polices from Lexipol are all relevant.
- Assign a ranking member of the department to oversee the process.
- Evaluate the need for outside assistance to prepare for accreditation.
- Establish a timeline for completion (between 12-18 months)

**Compensation**

Concerns were raised during the study regarding the compensation for department members as they progressed through their careers. For commissioned members concerns were raised over the compensation for supervisors and command staff members as there is a narrow span of rates between some positions. In some cases, individuals with a high number of direct reports receive compensation close to those with more limited responsibilities.

Professional staff member compensation was raised as a concern based on work loads within the classifications.

A separate review of compensation is warranted to further explore these issues. As the agency grows it is important for compensation to be commensurate with responsibilities in order to encourage talented members to strive to promote through the positions.

The department should complete compensation review to determine appropriate pay scales.

**Information Systems/Record Keeping**

Data collection is a weak area for the department. Many systems are out-of-date, not used to their full potential, and not integrated with one another.

**Case Management**

The case management program used in the criminal investigation division (CID) is lacking. The program in use was created in-house a number of years ago and was cutting-edge for its time; however, it is now outdated and does not provide supervisors the tools needed to easily track cases and monitor workload.
**Scheduling**

For important functions, such as scheduling, there was not a program in place for tracking work schedules and assignments. At the start of the project, for example, supervisors did not have basic information on which staff members were working, the location they were assigned to, and the duration or time they were assigned/stationed. The department instead relied on Excel spreadsheets; however, their use varied from location to location. Realizing the importance of scheduling software, a new system has been purchased and is being pilot-tested in the jail before transitioning the entire department to the program.

**Records Management**

The department changed to a new Computer Aided Dispatch system when the project started. This could cause complications with data tracking. As an outcome of the project, PSSG will continue to tracked monitor, and analyze the information to see if there is an effect on data and the analysis of trends.

**Payroll Tracking**

The department also recently updated its payroll tracking system. The changeover was met with much resistance, as revealed during interviews and meetings. This is unfortunate because the new system has an improved capacity to track and categorize expenses. At the end of this year, there will be two full years of data that will assist with tracking overtime and making adjustments to staffing and operations as needed. In addition, the department will be able to more accurately track the reasons for overtime by categories such as grants, specialty team call outs, community events, backfill for training/sick time/vacations, and other related issues.

While it is encouraging that the department is investing in technology, it is important that a plan be developed to understand all the technology needs and to determine how to make the different programs interoperable. It would benefit the department to conduct a complete technology audit in order to determine the sequence for updating software and the related costs. While there will need to be a fiscal investment to update systems, there will be many improved efficiencies as a result.

Below are some action items for the department to consider:

- Conduct a full technology audit.
- Ensure consistency with data collection.
- Create a complete database of staffing information such as name, date of hire, current rank, title, assignment, deployment location, and shift.
- Assign quality control for records management to the sergeants reviewing reports and crime research analysts.
• Ensure a process is implemented that creates common definitions to allow consistent comparisons before switching information collection software.

_Roster, Employee Tracking, and Associated Records_

The department tracks several items related to personnel, but the reports lack a level with respect to tracking the date of hire, and dates of promotion.

With the number of new hires in the department it will be important for the department to track information related to each budget request detailing the hiring and to which location the new hires were deployed. This will help the department with its reporting efforts to the County Council on the impact of the budget allocations.

The report document itself is divided into several worksheets in an Excel workbook. It would be helpful for the department to have one main worksheet with all the information and then create reports as needed.

The information contained in the report should be mirrored in other reports such as the training and scheduling reports. Each type of report is set up differently, for example, some reports have “first name, last name” in one column, others “first name” “last name” in two columns and others “last name, first name”. Reports also vary in terms of listing someone with their full first name and middle initial and other reports use nicknames. The variations, hamper efforts to merge information for analysis.
Community Perceptions

PSSG conducted a countywide survey to learn more about the issues raised during the listening sessions and to allow more community members to offer feedback regarding the services provided by the PCSD. There was a total of 2,198 responses to the survey.

Table 2: Priority Level of Quality of Life Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>High Priority</th>
<th>Medium Priority</th>
<th>Low Priority</th>
<th>Not a Priority</th>
<th>Don't Know / No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Disputes</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeding Cars</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loud Motorcycles/Cars</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underage Drinking</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Use</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truancy</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Issues</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Issues</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Sales</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen items from your house or business</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car break-ins</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen Car</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gun Violence</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Trafficking</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please rate, from your perspective, the priority level of the following quality of life issues that occur in Pierce County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>High Priority</th>
<th>Medium Priority</th>
<th>Low Priority</th>
<th>Not a Priority</th>
<th>Don't Know / No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scams</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows the results of the community survey for those who provided answers rating the priority level of quality of life issues in Pierce County. The highest rated categories are in boldface font for emphasis. The top five quality of life issues rated as “high priority” were: 1) Drug Use (53%), 2) Gun Violence (50%), 3) Drug Sales (48%), 4) Domestic Violence (47%), and 5) Assault (46%). Respondents rated the following quality of life issues as “medium priority”: (a) Fraud (34%), (b) Speeding Cars (34%), (c) Juvenile Issues (33%); respondents rated the following categories equally: (d) Scams (31%), (e) Car Break-Ins (31%), (f) Vandalism (31%), (g) Stolen Cars (31%). The following are the categories that respondents rated as “low priority”: (a) Loud Motorcycles/Cars (37%), (b) Graffiti (36%), (c) Neighborhood Disputes (35%), and (e) Truancy (34%). Loud Motorcycles/Cars (26%) and Truancy (24%) were also rated as “Not Priority.”

Focusing on the categories identified as “high priority” and “medium priority,” PSSG recommends that the department focus efforts on increased staffing, as well as on strengthening partnerships within the community.

Table 3: Visibility of Pierce County Sheriff’s Department Deputies on Patrol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Based on your observations during the past two years, on average, how often do you see Pierce County Sheriff’s Department Deputies on patrol?</th>
<th>More than once in a single day</th>
<th>Once a day</th>
<th>Several times a week</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>Less than once a week</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Don’t Know / No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In police cars</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On foot</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows the responses of those who provided answers rating the visibility of Pierce County Sheriff’s Department Deputies on Patrol. The highest rated categories are in boldface font for emphasis. The data suggest that PCSD patrol visibility in police vehicles is variable. Approximately 17% of respondents stated that they saw PCSD deputies patrolling in vehicles “more than once in a single day”; however, 17% of respondents also stated that they saw PCSD deputies
patrolling in vehicles “less than once a week.” The overall variability in the distribution of responses may be due to responses from different regions. The majority of respondents, an overwhelming 76%, stated they “never” saw PCSD deputies patrolling on foot.

The data serve to further emphasize the earlier observations made by PSSG on the availability of PCSD deputies to patrol while simultaneously executing functions at the department, as well as the limitations placed on deputies due to the lengthy distances necessary to answer calls for services.

Table 4: Overall Satisfaction with Law Enforcement Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where I live</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I own a business</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I work</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I visit</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where I go to school</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows the responses for those who answered what their overall satisfaction was with law enforcement services provided by PCSD. The highest rated categories are in boldface font for emphasis. Approximately 16% of respondents stated that they were “very satisfied” with law enforcement services where they worked, and 35% of respondents stated that they felt “satisfied” with law enforcement services where they visited. Fifty-four percent of respondents stated that they were “neither satisfied nor dissatisfied” with law enforcement services where they go to school, and approximately 48% stated that they were “neither satisfied nor dissatisfied” with law enforcement services where they own businesses.

The responses to this question support the earlier findings related to perceived visibility. When respondents stated that they do not feel that PCSD deputies are visible, they also were likely to feel less satisfied with the law enforcement services offered.
Table 5: Priority Level of Community Engagement Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Engagement Service</th>
<th>High Priority</th>
<th>Medium Priority</th>
<th>Low Priority</th>
<th>Not a Priority</th>
<th>Don’t Know/No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Safety Presentations</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Safety Presentations</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Programming (not just School Resource Officer patrolling at schools)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Passenger Safety Program</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Association Meeting Attendance</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underage Drinking Prevention</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Sports Programming Participation</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder/Senior Presentations</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Safety Presentations</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Police Academy</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Prevention Strategies</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Meeting Participation</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses for those who provided answers rating their priority of the community engagement services that could be provided by PCSD are shown in Table 5. The highest rated categories are in boldface font for emphasis. Approximately 36% of respondents rated Crime Prevention Strategies as a “high priority” community engagement service that could be provided by PCSD. Respondents rated the following community engagement services as “medium priority”: (a) School Programming (37%), (b) Crime Prevention Strategies (35%), (c) Community Meeting Participation (34%), and (d) Personal Safety Presentations. Community Engagement Services rated as “low priority” were: (a) Business Association Meeting Attendance (38%), (b) Business Safety (37%), and (c) Traffic Safety (35%). Approximately 27% of respondents also rated Business Association Meeting Attendance “not a priority.”

Taking into consideration the responses to the prioritization of quality of life issues in Pierce County (in Table 2), where respondents rated Drug Use, Gun Violence, Drug Sales, Domestic Violence, and Assault as high priorities, while the development of programming low, the PCSD much develop community partnerships to foster an understanding of why
collaboration with community members is an important part of the change process. PSCD building upon community policing strategies, and focusing on engaging community members in more proactive crime prevention measures can help enhance community safety.

Table 6: Nature of Contact with Pierce County Sheriff’s Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please select all answers that describe the nature of any contact(s) with the Pierce County Sheriff’s Department during the past two years:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casual contact in a public or private place</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness to a crime or incident</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim of a crime or incident</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a community event</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for advice or information</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By telephone for general information</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopped for a motor vehicle offense</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 presents the responses for respondents who provided answers to the question inquiring about the nature of the contact that they may have had with PCSD during the past two years. The highest rated categories are in boldface font for emphasis. The two most frequent types of contact with PCSD were: Casual contact in public or private places (44%) and Witness to crime or incident (44%).

PSSG recommends that the department employ the use of Park and Walk programs to increase visibility on foot in areas such as shopping malls.

Table 7: Perceived Time for Pierce County Sheriff’s Department Deputies to Arrive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For your most recent call, how long did it take for the deputy to arrive?</th>
<th>To my home</th>
<th>To a business I own</th>
<th>To my work</th>
<th>To a place I visited</th>
<th>To my school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91 or more minutes</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-90 minutes</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents were asked a series of questions about their most recent call with PCSD. In Table 7, respondents provided information about the length of time it took a PCSD deputy to arrive and the location at which the deputy was requested. The highest rated categories are in boldface font for emphasis. Approximately 24% of respondents stated that during their most recent call to their home, PCSD deputies took approximately 91 or more minutes to arrive. Forty-six percent of respondents stated that PCSD deputies arrived at their school in less than 10 minutes.

The PCSD should consider evaluating calls for service by type, location, and response time to determine how to most strategically schedule staffing that would both address community concerns and prevent instances of high response time.

Table 8: Satisfaction with Most Recent Contact with Pierce County Sheriff’s Department Deputies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of time it took to respond</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compassion</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of what will happen next related to your call</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to your questions</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoroughness</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 shows the responses for those who answered what their overall satisfaction was with the service provided by PCSD deputies during their most recent contact. The highest rated categories are in boldface font for emphasis. At its core, this question sought to assess the overall perceived quality of the service; the categories were different facets or elements of “quality service.” Respondents stated they were “very satisfied” and/or “satisfied” across all of the categories. This level of satisfaction is indicative of a department that seeks to provide the utmost level of service to its community.

PSSG commends PCSD on their hard work and encourages them to continue to finalize and operationalize their strategic plan, and to further develop and implement their strategies for community engagement and outreach.

Table 9: Priority Level for Enhanced Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If the current number of deputies is increased, what enhanced services would you like to see? Select a priority level for each service.</th>
<th>More patrols in neighborhoods</th>
<th>More patrols in business areas</th>
<th>More community services/programs</th>
<th>More traffic enforcement</th>
<th>Shorter response times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Priority</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a Priority</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know/No Answer</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 shows the responses for those who provided a rating of the priority level for the types of enhanced services they would like to see offered by PCSD if the number of deputies was increased. The highest rated categories are in boldface font for emphasis. Approximately 45% of respondents stated that having more patrols in their neighborhoods was a “high priority”; additionally, approximately 54% of respondents stated that having shorter response times was also a “high priority.”

When these responses are considered together with the responses in Tables 2, 7, and 3, it appears that the overall perception by respondents is that PCSD deputies are not visible or accessible, and furthermore, that community members may feel unsafe. Interestingly, the responses in Table 8 indicated that when respondents were in contact with PSCD...
deputies, they were all very satisfied, again indicative of a department that strives to provide quality service and of a department that is viewed positively by the community.

In addition to increasing staffing, PSSG recommends that PSCD utilize their newly acquired data and computer aided dispatch system to identify trends and demands. The analysis should be used as the basis for staff placement and scheduling.

Table 10: Willingness to Reprioritize Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In order to free up deputies to focus on high priority calls for services, what services do you feel can change? Select all that apply.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased online reporting for minor calls</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer response times to minor calls</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know/No Answer</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not willing to have any of these services change</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased or no follow-up investigations on crimes that are unlikely to be solved</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No participation in community programs</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response to minor calls</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 shows the responses for those who answered which types of services they would be willing to change in order to allow deputies to focus on higher priority calls for service. The highest rated categories are in boldface font for emphasis. Approximately 44% of respondents indicated that they would be agreeable to increased online reporting for minor calls.

PSSG recommends that the PCSD place emphasis on ensuring that community members can easily use their online reporting tool and that a training program be put into place that informs the community of the tool. The department should also track the increase in use of online reporting.

Table 11: Support of Tax Levy to Increase Staff at the Pierce County Sheriff’s Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In order to fund additional staff in the Pierce County Sheriff’s Department, would you support a tax levy to increase the number of:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deputies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to fund additional staff in the Pierce County Sheriff’s Department, would you support a tax levy to increase the number of:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 shows the responses for those who provided answers to their willingness to support a tax levy to increase the number of additional deputies at PCSD. Approximately 57% of respondents indicated that they would support a tax levy in order to fund additional staff.

PSSG recommends that the PCSD develop, with the Council, talking points on the tax levy and what impact increased hiring would have on community members. While it did not pass in 2016, a starting point would be to reintroduce the mental health tax.
Closing Summary and Future Efforts

The Pierce County Sheriff’s Department is providing services to the community; however, the department operates with fewer members than is required to provide the level of service that the PCSD and the community it serves envisions. Not only does the department want to provide better services, the community wants shorter response times, increased visibility, and more partnerships.

A phased plan to increase staffing is underway to provide proactive services and enhance the service delivery when patrol deputies respond to calls for service. Additional supervisory positions are required to distribute the workload and reduce risk and liability.

Key areas for change over the next year should include the following to support the phased hiring:

- Addition of a bureau chief and the reorganization of the command staff in order to separate patrol and investigations.
- Completion of action steps developed from the strategic plan.
- Updating and monitoring of the Field Training Program to ensure that proper training on the mission, vision, values, and goals occurs for the new hires.
- Enhanced use of data to monitor deployment and decision-making.
- Increased communications and empowerment of more PIOs.
- Improved data collection and tracking systems.

The implementation of the above will support the integration of new hires and expanded service delivery. The hiring of patrol deputies needs to occur over a multi-year period in order to ensure proper field training as well as to monitor the levels of reported crime and community satisfaction. While the PCSD is committed to change, some changes will be delayed as they require additional funding and resources, those that do not require resources could be implemented sooner.

During the next year, the PCSD will be working with PSSG on the action items for the goals outlined in the strategic plan, reviewing data, launching a second countywide survey, researching co-responder models, monitoring deployment and the impact on calls for service, and addressing emerging needs. Quarterly updates will be prepared and shared with the department, the County Council, the Sheriff’s Advisory Board, and the community.
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experts in computer applications such as SPSS, ESRI—ArcView, Maptitude, and GIS to ensure that all projects, reports, and presentations are supported by advanced data analytic capacities.

The strategies developed by PSSG assist law enforcement agencies to increase the efficiencies of operations, enhance the organizational culture, reduce crime, and increase community quality of life while improving the effectiveness of law enforcement services.
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