

Potential Temporary Cost Avoidance from Delayed New Staff Hiring

Option 1. assumes all new positions can be delayed in being filled for six months. The total savings shown at the bottom of the chart shows amounts saved if positions were left unfilled for one, two, three, four, five or six months.

Option 1

		Saving for every month's delay in hiring new staff					
		1 Mon.	2 Mon.	3 Mon.	4 Mon.	5 Mon.	6 Mon.
Park and Recreation							
Administration							
Parks/Facilities Mgr.		Originally Budgeted for only 6 months					
Admin. Asst.		\$ 2,979	\$ 5,958	\$ 8,937	\$11,916	\$14,895	\$ 17,874
Parks and Grounds Maint.							
Maint Technician		Originally Budgeted for only 6 months					
Subtotal		\$2,979	\$ 5,958	\$ 8,937	\$11,916	\$14,895	\$17,874
LIBRARY							
Assistant Librarian		\$2,258	\$4,515	\$6,773	\$9,031	\$ 11,288	\$13,546
Police Operations							
2007-08 Approved							
Sergeant		Will be promoted based on Civil Service Exam					
Police Officer (5)		\$17,301	\$34,602	\$51,903	\$69,204	\$86,505	\$106,150
2008-09 Proposed							
Police Sergeant		Will be promoted based on Civil Service Exam					
Police Officer (6)		\$20,761	\$41,522	\$62,283	\$83,045	\$103,806	\$124,567
Police - Support Serv.							
Dispatcher (2)		\$6,184	\$12,368	\$18,552	\$24,737	\$30,921	\$37,105
Prop. Inventory Control Spe.		\$2,883	\$ 5,766	\$8,649	\$11,531	\$14,414	\$17,297
		\$9,067	\$18,134	\$27,201	\$36,268	\$45,335	\$54,402
PUBLIC WORKS							
PW - Street							
Street Superintendent		Originally Budgeted for only 6 months					
Equipment Operator I		Originally Budgeted for only 6 months					
Total Savings		\$52,365	\$104,732	\$157,097	\$209,463	\$261,829	\$316,539

Note that in Option 1 and all other options, the new Police Sergeant's position has been traded for an additional Police Officer's position. Since under Civil Service, one existing Police Officer will be promoted to the Sergeant's slot, we will be recruiting for an additional Police Officer to fill the slot of the "promotee" rather than a Sergeant.

Potential Temporary Cost Avoidance from Delayed New Staff Hiring

Option 2. assumes that the five vacant Police Officer positions from 2007-08, can be filled relatively quickly, by the end of December. Setting up the Civil Service Rules including testing is on a fast track that will allow for hiring the first set of Officers well before six months. It also assumes that the 2 new dispatchers and Property Inventory control Specialist will be hired by the end of October. These are easily reachable goals if recruitment efforts start once the decision is made to add these positions for next year's budget. If it is agreed that staffing for two full-time dispatchers per shift is a minimum requirement for safety considerations, most savings from a delay in hiring the new positions, would be eaten up by increased overtime to keep two dispatchers on 24/7.

Option 2

Park and Recreation

Administration

Parks/Facilities Mgr.
Admin. Asst.

Parks and Grounds Maint.

Maint Technician

Subtotal

LIBRARY

Assistant Librarian

***Police Operations
2007-08 Approved***

Sergeant

Police Officer (5)

2008-09 Proposed

Police Sergeant

Police Officer (6)

Police - Support Serv.

Dispatcher (2)

Prop. Inventory Control Spe.

Subtotal

PUBLIC WORKS

PW - Street

Street Superintendent

Equipment Operator I

Saving for every month's delay in hiring new staff

1 Mon. 2 Mon. 3 Mon. 4 Mon. 5 Mon. 6 Mon.

Originally Budgeted for only 6 months

\$ 2,979 \$ 5,958 \$ 8,937 \$ 11,916 \$ 14,895 \$ 17,874

Originally Budgeted for only 6 months

\$ 2,979 \$ 5,958 \$ 8,937 \$ 11,916 \$ 14,895 \$ 17,874

\$ 2,258 \$ 4,515 \$ 6,773 \$ 9,031 \$ 11,288 \$ 13,546

Will be promoted based on Civil Service Exam

\$17,301 \$34,602 \$ 51,903 \$ 51,903 \$ 51,903 \$ 51,903

Will be promoted based on Civil Service Exam

\$20,761 \$41,522 \$ 62,283 \$ 83,045 \$103,806 \$124,567

\$ 6,184 \$ 6,184 \$ 6,184 \$ 6,184 \$ 6,184 \$ 6,184

\$ 2,883 \$ 2,883 \$ 2,883 \$ 2,883 \$ 2,883 \$ 2,883

\$ 9,067 \$ 9,067 \$ 9,067 \$ 9,067 \$ 9,067 \$ 9,067

Originally Budgeted for only 6 months

Originally Budgeted for only 6 months

Total Savings \$52,365 \$95,664 \$138,963 \$164,961 \$190,959 \$216,957

This savings translates to about 1.5 cents on the 2008-09 tax rate but would have to be made up in the following and subsequent years.

**PROPOSED MKT ADJUSTMENTS 2007-08
BASED ON SURVEY DATA**

	Actual	Average of Participating Cities	% Difference from Avg.	Proposed Up to 10% Max	Dollar Amt. Eligible Increase	Remaining \$ difference After Increase	% Increase Proposed	Remaining % difference After Increase
ADMINISTRATION								
Exec.								
City Manager	1 \$ 110,250	\$122,529	-11%	\$ 121,275	\$ 11,025	\$ (1,254)	10%	-1%
Assistant City Manager	1 \$ 71,575	\$101,453	-42%	\$ 78,733	\$ 7,158	\$ (22,721)	10%	-22%
City Secretary	1 \$ 47,000	\$50,339	-7%	\$ 50,339	\$ 3,339	\$ (0)	7%	0%
Director of Comm.	1 \$ 56,237	\$55,103	2%	\$ 56,237	\$ -	\$ 1,134	0%	2%
IT Manager	1 \$ 47,000	\$69,208	-47%	\$ 51,700	\$ 4,700	\$ (17,508)	10%	-25%
Executive Assistant	1 \$ 29,033	\$43,385	-49%	\$ 31,936	\$ 2,903	\$ (11,449)	10%	-26%
Receptionist	1 \$ 28,434	\$24,769	13%	\$ 28,434	\$ -	\$ 3,665	0%	15%
Receptionist	1 \$ 22,880	\$24,769	-8%	\$ 24,769	\$ 1,889	\$ -	8%	0%
	8 \$ 412,409	\$ 491,555		\$ 443,423	\$ 31,014			
Finance								
Finance Director	1 \$ 75,154	\$87,340	-16%	\$ 82,669	\$ 7,515	\$ (4,671)	10%	-5%
Sr. Acct.(Acct. Manager	1 \$ 52,498	\$61,569	-17%	\$ 57,748	\$ 5,250	\$ (3,821)	10%	-6%
Staff Accountant	1 \$ 50,406	\$45,242	10%	\$ 50,406	\$ -	\$ 5,164	0%	11%
	\$ 178,058	\$ 194,152		\$ 190,823	\$ 12,765			
Utility Billing								
Utility Billing Superviso	1 \$ 38,220	\$46,751	-22%	\$ 42,042	\$ 3,822	\$ (4,709)	10%	-10%
Utilities Clerk	1 \$ 24,565	\$27,916	-14%	\$ 27,022	\$ 2,457	\$ (894)	10%	-3%
Utilities Clerk	1 \$ 27,040	\$27,916	-3%	\$ 27,916	\$ 876	\$ (0)	3%	0%
	\$ 89,825	\$ 102,583		\$ 96,980	\$ 7,155			
Municipal Court								
Municipal Court Judge	1 \$ 44,990	\$59,459	-32%	\$ 49,489	\$ 4,499	\$ (9,970)	10%	-17%
Court Administrator	1 \$ 35,620	\$48,962	-37%	\$ 39,182	\$ 3,562	\$ (9,780)	10%	-20%
Court Clerk	1 \$ 22,974	\$29,727	-29%	\$ 25,271	\$ 2,297	\$ (4,455)	10%	-15%
Court Clerk	1 \$ 23,920	\$29,727	-24%	\$ 26,312	\$ 2,392	\$ (3,415)	10%	-11%
	\$ 127,504	\$ 167,874		\$ 140,254	\$ 12,750			
PARKS & RECREATION								
Parks & Rec. Dir.	1 \$ 56,670	\$77,332	-36%	\$ 62,337	\$ 5,667	\$ (14,995)	10%	-19%
Program Coordinator	1 \$ 36,000	\$48,825	-36%	\$ 39,600	\$ 3,600	\$ (9,225)	10%	-19%
Pool Manager	1 \$ 37,920	\$35,013	8%	\$ 37,920	\$ -	\$ 2,907	0%	8%
Parks Foreman	1 \$ 37,586	\$43,530	-16%	\$ 41,344	\$ 3,759	\$ (2,185)	10%	-5%
Maint. Tech. Parks	1 \$ 26,208	\$25,017	5%	\$ 26,208	\$ -	\$ 1,191	0%	5%
Maint. Tech. Parks	1 \$ 19,510	\$25,017	-28%	\$ 21,461	\$ 1,951	\$ (3,556)	10%	-14%
Maint. Tech. Parks	1 \$ 19,656	\$25,017	-27%	\$ 21,622	\$ 1,966	\$ (3,395)	10%	-14%
Maint. Tech. Parks	1 \$ 21,840	\$25,017	-15%	\$ 24,024	\$ 2,184	\$ (993)	10%	-4%
Maint. Tech. Parks	1 \$ 19,510	\$25,017	-28%	\$ 21,461	\$ 1,951	\$ (3,556)	10%	-14%
Maint. Tech. Parks	1 \$ 18,720	\$25,017	-34%	\$ 20,592	\$ 1,872	\$ (4,425)	10%	-18%
	\$ 293,620	\$ 354,802		\$ 316,570	\$ 22,949	\$ (38,232)		
Maintenance and Beautification								
Foreman- Maint	1 26,208	\$32,592	-24%	\$ 28,829	\$ 2,621	\$ (3,763)	10%	-12%
Maint-Tech -Buildings/g	1 19,760	\$23,710	-20%	\$ 21,736	\$ 1,976	\$ (1,974)	10%	-8%
Maint-Tech -Buildings/g	1 21,840	\$23,710	-9%	\$ 24,024	\$ 2,184	\$ 314	10%	1%
Custodian	1 20,800	\$21,900	-5%	\$ 21,808	\$ 1,008	\$ (92)	5%	0%
	\$ 88,608			\$ 96,397	\$ 7,789			

**PROPOSED MKT ADJUSTMENTS 2007-08
BASED ON SURVEY DATA**

	Actual	Average of Participating Cities	% Difference from Avg.	Proposed Up to 10% Max	Dollar Amt. Eligible Increase	Remaining \$ difference After Increase	% Increase Proposed	Remaining % difference After Increase
LIBRARY								
Library Director	1 \$ 42,724	\$62,851	-47%	\$ 46,996	\$ 4,272	\$ (15,854)	10%	-25%
Assistant Director Head	1 \$ 35,934	\$46,808	-30%	\$ 39,527	\$ 3,593	\$ (7,281)	10%	-16%
Asst. Librarian	1 \$ 21,064	\$25,366	-20%	\$ 23,170	\$ 2,106	\$ (2,195)	10%	-9%
Admin. Clerk- Library C	1 \$ 23,317	\$25,366	-9%	\$ 25,366	\$ 2,049	\$ (0)	9%	0%
	\$ 123,039			\$ 135,060	\$ 12,021			
POLICE								
Chief of Police	1 \$ 69,059	\$91,279	-32%	\$ 85,000	\$ 15,941	\$ (6,279)	23%	-7%
Police Captain	1 \$ 59,756	\$74,363	-24%	\$ 65,732	\$ 5,976	\$ (8,631)	10%	-12%
	\$ 128,815			\$ 150,732	\$ 21,917			
Sergeant	1 \$ 53,082	\$55,057	-4%	\$ 55,057	\$ 1,975	\$ 0	4%	0%
Sergeant	1 \$ 42,162	\$55,057	-31%	\$ 46,378	\$ 4,216	\$ (8,679)	10%	-16%
Sergeant	1 \$ 40,768	\$55,057	-35%	\$ 44,845	\$ 4,077	\$ (10,212)	10%	-19%
	\$ 136,011			\$ 146,280	\$ 10,268			
Detective	1 \$ 42,016	\$48,241	-15%	\$ 46,218	\$ 4,202	\$ (2,023)	10%	-4%
Detective	1 \$ 40,928	\$48,241	-18%	\$ 45,021	\$ 4,093	\$ (3,220)	10%	-7%
	\$ 82,944			\$ 91,239	\$ 8,294			
Police Officer	1 \$ 41,226	\$41,365	-0.34%	\$ 41,365	\$ 139	\$ 0	0%	0%
Police Officer	1 \$ 41,579	\$41,365	0.52%	\$ 41,579	\$ (0)	\$ 214	0%	1%
Police Officer	1 \$ 38,563	\$41,365	-7.27%	\$ 41,365	\$ 2,802	\$ (0)	7%	0%
Police Officer	1 \$ 37,814	\$41,365	-9.39%	\$ 41,365	\$ 3,551	\$ (0)	9%	0%
Police Officer	1 \$ 37,232	\$41,365	-11.10%	\$ 40,955	\$ 3,723	\$ (410)	10%	-1%
Police Officer	1 \$ 35,818	\$41,366	-15.49%	\$ 39,399	\$ 3,582	\$ (1,966)	10%	-5%
Police Officer	1 \$ 35,335	\$41,366	-17.07%	\$ 38,869	\$ 3,534	\$ (2,497)	10%	-6%
Police Officer	1 \$ 34,986	\$41,366	-18.24%	\$ 38,484	\$ 3,499	\$ (2,882)	10%	-7%
Police Officer	1 \$ 34,048	\$41,366	-21.49%	\$ 37,452	\$ 3,405	\$ (3,914)	10%	-9%
Police Officer	1 \$ 35,144	\$41,366	-17.71%	\$ 38,658	\$ 3,514	\$ (2,708)	10%	-7%
Police Officer	1 \$ 35,499	\$41,366	-16.53%	\$ 39,049	\$ 3,550	\$ (2,317)	10%	-6%
Police Officer	1 \$ 33,216	\$41,366	-24.54%	\$ 36,537	\$ 3,322	\$ (4,829)	10%	-12%
	\$ 440,459	\$440,459	91%	\$ 475,078	\$ 34,619	\$ 0		
Head Dispatcher	1 \$ 29,935	\$42,015	-40.35%	\$ 32,929	\$ 2,994	\$ (9,087)	10%	-22%
Dispatcher	1 \$ 27,500	\$29,055	-5.66%	\$ 29,055	\$ 1,555	\$ (0)	6%	0%
Dispatcher	1 \$ 27,500	\$29,028	-5.66%	\$ 29,055	\$ 1,555	\$ 27	6%	0%
Dispatcher	1 \$ 29,182	\$29,029	0.53%	\$ 29,182	\$ -	\$ 153	0%	1%
Dispatcher	1 \$ 28,820	\$29,029	-0.72%	\$ 29,029	\$ 209	\$ 0	1%	0%
Dispatcher	1 \$ 28,475	\$29,029	-1.95%	\$ 29,029	\$ 554	\$ (0)	2%	0%
	\$ 171,412			\$ 178,279	\$ 6,867			
Admin Assistant Police	1 \$ 23,712	\$33,423	-41%	\$ 26,083	\$ 2,371	\$ (7,340)	10%	-22%
Admin Assistant Police	1 \$ 22,225	\$33,424	-50%	\$ 24,448	\$ 2,223	\$ (8,976)	10%	-27%
	\$ 45,937			\$ 50,531	\$ 4,594			
Animal Control Officer	1 \$ 28,392	\$26,455	7%	\$ 28,392	\$ -	\$ 1,937	0%	7%

**PROPOSED MKT ADJUSTMENTS 2007-08
BASED ON SURVEY DATA**

	Actual	Average of Participating Cities	% Difference from Avg.	Proposed Up to 10% Max	Dollar Amt. Eligible Increase	Remaining \$ difference After Increase	% Increase Proposed	Remaining % difference After Increase
PUBLIC WORKS								
Admin./Streets								
Director of P.W.	1 \$ 60,943	\$80,326	-32%	\$ 67,037	\$ 6,094	\$ (13,289)	10%	-17%
Street Construction & Rt	1 \$ 38,500	\$43,888	-14%	\$ 42,350	\$ 3,850	\$ (1,538)	10%	-4%
Maint. Technician -Street	1 \$ 24,086	\$25,258	-5%	\$ 24,747	\$ 661	\$ (511)	3%	-2%
Maint. Technician -Street	1 \$ 24,086	\$25,259	-5%	\$ 24,747	\$ 661	\$ (512)	3%	-2%
Admin Asst	1 \$ 28,025	\$33,423	-19%	\$ 30,828	\$ 2,803	\$ (2,596)	10%	-8%
	\$ 175,640	\$ 208,154		\$ 189,709	\$ 14,069	\$ (18,446)		-9%
				Total GF				\$ 207,071
UTILITY FUND								
Water								
Superintendent								
Foreman- Utility System	1 \$ 46,151	\$32,592	29%	\$ 50,766	\$ 4,615	\$ 18,174	10%	56%
Maint Tech. - Water	1 \$ 21,632	\$28,846	-33%	\$ 23,795	\$ 2,163	\$ (5,051)	10%	-18%
Maint Tech. - Water	1 \$ 23,088	\$28,847	-25%	\$ 25,397	\$ 2,309	\$ (3,450)	10%	-12%
Maint Tech. - Water	1 \$ 24,357	\$28,847	-18%	\$ 26,793	\$ 2,436	\$ (2,055)	10%	-7%
	\$ 115,228			\$ 126,751	\$ 11,523			
Sewer								
Maint Tech. - Sewer	1 \$ 37,440	\$28,846	23%	\$ 41,184	\$ 3,744	\$ 37,440	10%	43%
Maint Tech. - Sewer	1 \$ 25,064	\$28,846	-15%	\$ 27,570	\$ 2,506	\$ (1,276)	10%	-4%
	\$ 62,504			\$ 68,754	\$ 6,250			
				Total Utility				\$ 17,773
BUILDING & INSPECTION								
Building Official	1 \$ 52,339	\$61,773	-18%	\$ 57,573	\$ 5,234	\$ (4,200)	10%	-7%
Building Permits Coord.	1 \$ 21,050	\$35,767	-70%	\$ 23,155	\$ 2,105	\$ (12,612)	10%	-35%
Building Inspector	1 \$ 34,826	\$40,919	-17%	\$ 38,309	\$ 3,483	\$ (2,611)	10%	-6%
Building Inspector	1 \$ 34,826	\$40,919	-17%	\$ 38,309	\$ 3,483	\$ (2,611)	10%	-6%
Building Inspector	1 \$ 34,826	\$40,919	-17%	\$ 38,309	\$ 3,483	\$ (2,611)	10%	-6%
Admin. Asst.	1 \$ 22,880	\$33,423	-46%	\$ 25,168	\$ 2,288	\$ (8,255)	10%	-25%
Code Enforcement Offic	1 \$ 31,514	\$35,114	-11%	\$ 34,665	\$ 3,151	\$ (448)	10%	-1%
	\$ 232,261			\$ 255,487				
				Total Bldg Inspection				\$ 23,226
PLANNING/ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT								
Economic Development	1 \$ 50,400	\$82,084	-63%	\$ 55,440	\$ 5,040	\$ (26,644)	10%	-32%
Director of Planning	1 \$ 55,016	\$79,256	-44%	\$ 55,016	\$ -	\$ (24,240)	0%	-31%
	\$ 105,416			\$ 110,456				
				Total Planning				\$ 5,040
				Total All Funds				\$ 253,110

Tom Mattis

From: Kerry Urbanowicz [kerryu@cityofkyle.com]
Sent: Monday, August 18, 2008 11:29 AM
To: 'Charles Cunningham'
Cc: 'Tom Mattis'
Subject: RE: Questions for Council

Charles,

To speak directly to the question #9 on page 16 about replacement vehicles, the current vehicles are beyond repair and do not run. They are pieces of junk. As the parks and maintenance staff grew from 1 in 2003 to 13 today, we only purchased 5 new trucks during that time. The others are hand-me-downs.

I have a spread chart that shows the fleet assigned to the PARD. I have attached that chart and cut & pasted the fleet assignments. As you can see, to make this work we took a 2003 Ranger from the Building Department. The Public Works has given us 2 trucks to help us out over the years, but these no longer run and are cost-prohibitive to fix. The 02 Explorer that is assigned to me is actually used by everyone in the office and recreation division. The yellow space below my name indicates the new position of Facilities & Maintenance Manager and the vehicle he will need to do his job. My Crew leaders and field supervisors have a vehicle assigned to them individually, but all others have 2 assigned to a vehicle. The yellow space below truck #G2 in Grounds Maintenance Division is the new truck proposed in the budget. This will get 3 workers out of 1 truck.

The main thing missing from the number of staff and trucks assigned are the daily community service workers we have. On any given day, we have between 1 and 18 working with us. Currently we are having them ride in the backs of these trucks along with all the gas cans, tools and equipment needed to complete the job assigned. Without these Community Service Workers, we could not do the level of service we currently do without adding 4-6 additional full-time employees. We are saving the City a lot of money by using these workers, yet we have no means to carry them to their areas except for riding in the back of a pick up truck. That is why we are going with Crewcab trucks.

Division

Administration						
Vehicle Number	Last 5 of VIN	Year Make	Model	Color	Miles as of Aug 1st	Assigned Driver
A1		02 Ford	Explorer	White	47,754	Kerry

Parks Maintenance						
Vehicle Number	Last 5 of VIN	Year Make	Model	Color	Miles as of Aug 1st	Assigned Driver
P1		05 Ford	F150 RC	Green	17,692	Tony & Michael B
P2		06 Ford	F150 RC	Green	16,079	Amado & Joe
P3		07 Ford	F150 SC	Green	10,103	David & JP
P4		07 Ford	F150 SC	Green	11,313	Arthur

Grounds Maintenance						
Vehicle Number	Last 5 of VIN	Year Make	Model	Color	Miles as of Aug 1st	Assigned Driver
G1		02 Ford	F150 SC	White	43,949	Max
G2		08 Ford	F250 CC	Red	5,115	Bret, Jesse & Robert

Facilities Maintenance						
Vehicle Number	Last 5 of VIN	Year Make	Model	Color	Miles as of Aug 1st	Assigned Driver
F1		03 Ford	Ranger	White	30,436	Nathan & Michael S

One thing while reading through the questions, one of the replies stated that the Parks Facility Maintenance Manager position was being put off for 6 months. At one time I thought it was changed to being filled on October 1. Have we gone back to April 1?

Kerry

*Kerry B. Urbanowicz - Director
 City of Kyle Parks & Recreation
 City of Kyle Maintenance & Beautification
 (512) 262-3939
 (Fax) 262-3933
 "Improving your quality of Life"*

From: Charles Cunningham [mailto:ccunningham@cityofkyle.com]
Sent: Monday, August 18, 2008 10:13 AM
To: 'Kerry Urbanowicz'
Subject: Questions for Council

Please find attached a report I have been working on to address the Council's concerns in several areas. On page 16, there was a question about deleting some trucks that are scheduled for replacement. There are only two that I can find with one being your ¾ ton truck for Parks- Facilities Maint. Could you send me the number of pick-up trucks these two divisions currently have between them and the number of employees per truck. I am thinking they may think everyone has a vehicle and we need to disabuse them of that notion.

Thanks,

Chas

Charles L. Cunningham
Director of Finance

City of Kyle
 100 W. Center St.
 PO Box 40
 Kyle, TX 78640
 (512) 262-3952
finance@cityofkyle.com



Kyle Police Department

Memorandum

Date: August 21, 2008

To: Mr. Tom Mattis
City Manager

From: Michael Blake
Chief of Police

Re: Fleet Replacement Plan

Pursuant to your request, I am forwarding you this memorandum regarding the department's current fleet replacement cycle.

As you are aware, the police department has established the mileage target of 100,000 for its police fleet.

In my past experience with the National Fleet Administrators Association, a special segment of this association specializes in bringing special-purpose police fleet manufactures and national user groups together on an annual basis for the purpose of information sharing and problem-solving.

According to police fleet reliability and repair data, the 100,000 mileage mark for police vehicles is typically viewed as an accepted best-practice of the police industry due to these types of vehicles being subjected continuous service of often extreme conditions and high engine idle hours. This replacement target is especially valid for areas of the country subjected to an extreme temperature climate which often adversely impacts electrical components and vehicle transmissions.

To best provide you a real-time assessment, I conducted personal research with the two nationally premier law enforcement agencies who are both nationally recognized, and nationally published, for their annual police fleet testing evaluations; the Michigan State Police and the California Highway Patrol. Above all others, these two departments are where other police departments go to find out information on police fleet performance.

At the current time, the California Highway Patrol's fleet replacement goal is 100,000 miles. Due to Michigan's assessment and experience history, the Michigan State Police has established a fleet replacement goal for Ford Crown Victoria's to be 80,000 miles, with Chevrolet Tahoe's being retired from service at 125,000 miles.

Locally, it is my understanding that Austin replaces their fleet at 80,000 miles and San Antonio's replacement schedule is 70,000 miles or five (5) years whichever occurs first.

It is my opinion that the department's current replacement cycle is both reasonable and prudent, and I would recommend that we continue replacing our fleet at the 100,000 miles.

Please advise if you wish for me to explore some other replacement schedule.

Tom Mattis

From: Michael Blake [mblake@cityofkyle.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 14, 2008 10:16 AM
To: district4rep@cityofkyle.com
Cc: 'Tom Mattis'; mayormikeinfo@yahoo.com; district1rep@cityofkyle.com; beckydist2@yahoo.com; district3rep@cityofkyle.com; district5rep@cityofkyle.com; district6rep@cityofkyle.com
Subject: Question from Tuesday

Mr. Wilson:

Tuesday evening you made an observation regarding the timeliness of filling of police department vacancies, and mentioned that I may have a response to your inquiry. The opportunity to reply did not avail itself and I wanted to share with you my thoughts between now and the next Council meeting.

Your point was well taken. An attempt to test, screen and hire a 57% increase of personnel in the department within a one year time frame is a significant undertaking for the department. Depending on the candidate pool, such an endeavor can highly tax the limits of our capacity, especially when the current personnel have such limited experience in HR law and the labor-intensive applicant processing requirements associated with Chapter 143, State Civil Service.

As you observed from my presentation of data from the benchmark city comparisons, the City of Kyle and its leadership faces some decision-making challenges over the next few years regarding the actual service level expectations of the PD and the funding requirements necessary to attain those.

In my assessment of the department's staffing and facility needs, I am attempting to position the police department to meet the anticipated needs of the community for the year 2015. Based upon trend projections provided by the city, I am working with the number of 60, 000 residents. If we work under the assumption that Kyle's crime and crash trends will remain low, and that the city's vision for a staffing goal is to at least be at mid-range with our sister cities, we are looking at 90 sworn personnel and probably another 10 civilians. The last agency I headed with a community of 63, 000 residents was staffed with 117 sworn. (And, we needed every last single one of those!)

That being said, the community profile of that particular city was vastly different from what I see here in Kyle so far, so please know that there is no one-size fits all assumption being inferred. All communities are unique.

As it was, and as it still remains, the Dallas-Ft Worth area suburbs wherein I spent my career, faced these same challenges to ramp up their city departments in order to meet some very explosive growth of newly transplanted residents who came to the suburbs demanding better services and a higher quality of life. In my career journey, I have been blessed to possess some degree of depth in my experience in the matters that you and the City of Kyle now face.

Speaking to your specific question, an important variable in our hiring capacity right now is who will actually be our applicant pool.

Right now, I expect us to attract some ratio of untrained lay citizens and a number of currently licensed police officers. For the sake of an example, let's assume that we find a 11 qualified candidates from the estimated 50 -75 applicants who will show up to test, and again say that 50% are experienced and the other 50% are unlicensed and need to attend a regional academy.

The 50% with experience will go through a brief in-house orientation academy and then immediately go through our 16 week Field Training Officer (FTO) program. (We did not have a structured program when I

got here, and none of the Kyle officers who trained Kyle's new officers in the past ever attended the necessary 40 hour FTO trainer's course).

While that experienced 50% is in field training, the other 50% will have to be sent to the academy, and on the city's dime, we will be paying them a salary for five months while they sit in the classroom. At that point, we hope that they pass the state licensing examination, most will, some may not. Those that fail the examination will be terminated and we will start all over again in the hiring process.

Once the newly licensed personnel are ready to come back to the agency, we should have completed the FTO program with the prior-service officers and the newly hired officers should roll right in the FTO program for their 16 weeks of documented field training.

I hope that this information is beneficial to you as you explore city options.

