



COUNTY OF SAN MATEO
Inter-Departmental Correspondence
SHERIFF'S OFFICE



DATE: November 5, 2010
BOARD MEETING DATE: December 14, 2010
SPECIAL NOTICE/HEARING: None
VOTE REQUIRED: Majority

TO: Honorable Board of Supervisors
FROM: Sheriff Greg Munks *GM*
SUBJECT: COPS Funding for School Resources Officers

RECOMMENDATION:

Accept this report-back regarding COPS funding for School Resource Officers.

BACKGROUND:

On September 28, 2010, the Sheriff's Office provided a report-back regarding determining if funding from Sheriff's discretionary programs, including community schools, or grant funding can be used to restore the Crisis Management Unit Deputy Sheriff position. The report stated that 1) reducing the funds allocated to the School Resource Officer program in order to restore the Crisis Management Unit Deputy has the potential to result in increased delinquent behavior and a diminished ability to provide early intervention dealing with youth within San Mateo County; 2) although the Crisis Management Unit Deputy Sheriff position was eliminated, the Sheriff's Office continues with Crisis Intervention Training (CIT) which is a voluntary program designed to help law enforcement deal with people with mental illness in our community; and 3) the Sheriff's Office will continue to search for grant funding that may be used to restore the Crisis Management Unit Deputy Sheriff position.

Upon accepting the report back, the Board requested another report-back concerning COPS funding for School Resource Officers.

DISCUSSION:

In 2009, the US Department of Justice announced the COPS Hiring Recovery Program (CHRP). CHRP grants provided 100 percent funding for approved entry-level salaries and fringe benefits of full time officers for 36 months of grant funding. These funds could have been used to hire new officers, rehire officers that were laid off due to state and local funding cuts and to retain officers that were scheduled to be laid off at a future date.

The Sheriff's Office did not apply for CHRP funding for two primary reasons. First, the

funding was for entry-level officers. If we applied in hopes of retaining positions that were scheduled to be eliminated, the funding would only pay for the entry-level portion of salaries and benefits. The difference between the Deputies budgeted salary and entry-level salary would have to be paid through the Sheriff's Office budget and in order to fund the difference, reductions would have had to be made in other areas to meet Net County Cost targets. Second, the grant included a 12 month retention requirement with certification of funds availability. This meant that the County would be required to fund the position for one full fiscal year after the 36 months of federal funding. Due to the County's projected fiscal deficit, it was determined that meeting this requirement would be implausible.

According to the US Department of Justice COPS Office, there was extremely high demand for COPS hiring grants during fiscal year 2009, and the COPS Office retained 6,147 of FY 2009's unfunded applications in pending status. For the 2010 COPS Hiring Program grant, COPS invited the agencies with pending applications to update their application data and submit for funding. Since the County did not apply in 2009, it was not eligible to apply in 2010.

The Sheriff's Office will continue to look for opportunities such as the COPS Hiring Program to fund positions that were eliminated to meet Net County Cost targets. We must consider non-supplanting requirements when reviewing grant programs. Supplanting is defined as a State or unit of local government reducing State or local funds for an activity specifically because federal funds are available (or expected to be available) to fund that same activity. When supplanting is not permitted, federal funds must be used to supplement existing State or local funds for program activities and may not replace State or local funds that have been appropriated or allocated for the same purpose.

A potential supplanting violation would occur if it appears that the only reason a jurisdiction cut its budget is because it anticipated receiving grant funding. To avoid the appearance of supplanting, budget decisions about sworn officers have to be made without considering the availability of federal funding.

Approval of this report contributes to the Shared Vision 2025 outcome of a Healthy Community by continuing to provide first-line prevention by proactively working with schools and youth to build healthy and trusting relationships with law enforcement.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no fiscal impact associated with accepting this report. Staff will continue to review grant announcements as they become available to determine if opportunities exist to restore positions eliminated in order to meet Net County Cost targets.

RECOMMENDED
.....
[Signature]
.....
COUNTY MANAGER