



Towns of Ashby and Townsend

Police & Communications Regionalization Analysis

Division of Local Services / Technical Assistance Section

March 2010

Table of Contents

Introduction..... 2

Ashby Current Operations 3

Townsend Current Operations 6

Establishing a Regional Department 9

Proposed Regional Department Structure 12

Regional Department Projected Savings 16

Regional Department Cost Allocation..... 21

Governance and the Legal Means to Regionalize 23

Conclusion 25

Appendix..... 26

Acknowledgements..... 30

Introduction

At the request of the Ashby and Townsend Boards of Selectmen, the Department of Revenue's Division of Local Services (DLS) has completed this Police & Communications Regionalization Analysis. Our analysis was based on site visits by a technical assistance team consisting of staff from the DLS Municipal Data Management & Technical Assistance Bureau. During these visits and in subsequent conversations, the team interviewed and received information from each community's town administrator, police chief and others. A full list is available in the Acknowledgements. The team from DLS also examined such documents as annual operating budgets, expenditure reports, payroll warrants, summary dispatch call data, staffing schedules and collective bargaining agreements.

As part of this report, we discuss the current status of the police department and communications center in each town, as well as the operating environment within which each provides services. We describe existing staffing levels, relative departmental workloads, and the demographic characteristics for each town.

Then we turn to the conditions that exist that might facilitate or serve as an impediment to a successful effort to fully regionalize the police department and communications center of each town. Vacancies in key leadership positions, the need for costly capital investment and the comparability of current collective bargaining agreements are among the issues studied. Analysis of current workloads, the road network connecting the towns, the existence of topographical features or other barriers affecting response time and whether existing facilities are suitable for a regional operation are also reviewed. We then explore the opportunity for Ashby and Townsend to regionalize police and share communication services.

The remaining sections cover our proposed staffing structure for a regional police department and communication center and how to assign patrol officers, dispatchers and supervisory staff. We then include a summary analysis of potential savings with a regional department, and propose a methodology to allocate costs between the two towns. Finally, we provide a discussion on regional governance and outline the available legal means to regionalize the police department and communications center through an inter-municipal agreement (M.G.L. c. 40, §4A).

It is our intent that this report, and the analysis and observations it contains, serve as a guide for Ashby and Townsend officials as they formulate overall strategies to regionalize the police and communications departments.

Ashby Current Operations

Police

The Town of Ashby has a police department with five full-time uniformed officers and an interim chief of police who works two days per week. Included in the department's FY2010 budget are the interim chief and four patrol officers. The additional full-time patrol officer is paid through Federal stimulus grant funding rather than the department's appropriation. In FY2010, this officer was laid off as a result of budget cuts, but returned in January 2010 because of the department's success in securing the Federal stimulus funding. Department staffing is further supplemented on an as needed basis by a single reserve officer. Due to the lack of available shifts for reserve officers, this supplementary force has been scaled back from as many as nine in the late 1990s.

Excluding the interim chief, the department is staffed by patrol officers that average nine years of service with the town and over 15 years of total law enforcement experience. Except for the chief, all full-time, uniformed officers belong to the International Brotherhood of Police Officers, Local 385. None of the positions are subject to the provisions of civil service. The department operates under M.G.L. c. 41, §97A, the local option statute adopted by the town in 1988, which establishes a "strong chief" to supervise the department and determine its operating procedures, subject to the approval of the selectmen.

The department provides police services to a rural population. The town's population of 2,927 is spread across 23.80 square miles, yielding a very low population density of 123 people per square mile. The town's relatively sparse population is spread fairly evenly over the town's area (See map in Appendix showing population density). This is well below the Middlesex County average of 1,593 people per square mile and the state average (towns) of 491 people per square mile. Resident incomes are also below the state average. Ashby's income per capita of \$27,486 is 30 percent below the state average of \$39,436. In addition, centerline road miles in Ashby totaled 64.72 miles, including road miles owned by Mass Highway, as well as accepted and unaccepted town roads. By comparison, communities in Middlesex County averaged 103.75 total road miles, while municipalities across the state averaged 88.6 total road miles. Table 1 in the Appendix is a list of comparison communities.

According to statistics published by the State Police Crime Reporting Unit, Massachusetts had a crime rate that was substantially below the national average in 2006 (the most recent year this comparative data is available).¹ The state ranked 42 among the 50 states in total crime rate in 2006. The rate of crime in Ashby is well below that of the Massachusetts average for both violent crimes (murder, rape, aggravated assault and robbery) and for property crimes (burglary, larceny and motor vehicle theft). Included in the Appendix, Table 2 identifies comparison community crime rates.

More recent data reported by the town indicates that the department responded to 5 assaults, 15 breaking and enterings, 29 motor vehicle breaking and enterings, 23 larcenies, 2 motor vehicle thefts, and 1 sexual offense during calendar 2009. Of course, department activity includes many more

¹ Crime Reporting Unit of the Massachusetts State Police, *Crime in Massachusetts, 2005-2006*, Commonwealth Fusion Center, January, 2010.

incidents and calls than those represented by these more serious crimes. Calls as measured by the communication center totaled 1,838, after routine informational calls, internal communications, and calls related to traffic and directed patrols are eliminated.

In Ashby, patrol officers work a seven day schedule, five days on and two days off. It is current department practice to schedule patrol officers to cover the day (8:00am-4:00pm), evening (4:00pm-12:00am) and night shifts (12:00am-8:00am). Typical coverage in 2009 was to schedule two officers on the day shift, when court appearances, training sessions and other meetings occur, and two during the evening shift. Coverage for the night shift (12:00am-8:00am) is provided by the officer funded by the Federal stimulus grant. Actual shift coverage is somewhat less than this, however, to accommodate contractual leave. More recently the department has relied on substantial overtime and the reserve officer to backfill shifts, although this is beginning to moderate in order to reduce costs. The interim chief is present at the station two days per week.

The police department in Ashby is headquartered in a surplus trailer that previously functioned as a temporary classroom in the 1970's. Located behind town hall, the trailer is situated along Route 119 in Ashby town center and is approximately 7.0 miles from the center of Townsend. The trailer provides workstations for officers, a kitchenette, a pair of restrooms for staff and detainees, a temporary evidence storage area, and limited space for all bookings, processing and interviews. There is no lockup, but one is not required under state law when the population is below 5,000. Individuals in custody are processed and transported for lock up to a neighboring community for a fee.

From our discussion with the interim chief of police, it appears that the trailer is well past its useful life. Though attempts have been made to replace the trailer over the past several years, due to fiscal constraints these efforts have been unsuccessful to date.

Communications

In FY2010, the Town of Ashby approved a budget that provides for a separate communications department. The communications spending plan includes three full-time staff, one of whom is the dispatch manager, and a part-time member. The communications staff does not belong to a collective bargaining group.

The communications department takes incoming calls for police, fire and EMS services, as well as requests for mutual aid. In calendar 2009, the department handled 1,838 calls when routine information calls, internal communications and directed patrols are eliminated. Total call volume however equaled 3,546, and reported calls to 911 totaled 563 in 2008. In addition to their call center duties, communications staff also handles walk-in traffic to the police trailer.

The communications center operates 24 hours a day, seven day a week. Like police, dispatchers work a seven day schedule, five days on and two days off. It is department practice is to have one dispatcher on per eight hour shift. Therefore, one dispatcher is scheduled for the day, one for the evening, and one for the night shift. Both full-time and part-time staff fill-in during absences. In the

event of an unscheduled absence, current practice dictates that the individual on duty must remain at their workstation until a replacement arrives or the next scheduled shift change occurs.

Dispatch is located in the same surplus trailer as the police department. Space is limited and the trailer can only accommodate one dispatcher per shift. Security in the trailer is also a concern.

The communication center in Ashby is equipped with two Public Safety Answering Points (PSAP), or workstations, that receive 911 emergency calls. However, only one of the workstations is outfitted with radio equipment. The center also does not have a reliable backup system in place, requiring 911 services to be rerouted to Ashburnham in the event of a failure. In addition, the communication staff operates without computer aided dispatch (CAD) to prioritize and manage calls more efficiently, and relies on address description manuals to reference the location of street addresses. Lastly, patrol cars are not equipped with mobile computers, so officers must rely on portable radios for all communication, though there are some locations in town where radio communication from dispatch to cruisers is not possible. One officer has purchased his own computer.

Townsend Current Operations

Police

In FY2010 the Town of Townsend approved a budget that provides for a police department with 15 uniformed officers. Included in the department's spending plan are a chief, lieutenant, three sergeants, a detective and eight patrol officers. One position is vacant. Supplementing full-time department staff is a reserve force with eight members. In general, department superior officers (excluding the chief) average 21.25 years of service to the town, while the patrol officers average 15 years of service. The chief of police has 32 years of service. The department is also supported by a full-time administrative assistant and administrative coordinator who average 24 years of service, as well as a part-time custodian.

Townsend has accepted M.G.L. c. 41, §97A, the "strong chief" statute that places responsibility and control of the department more squarely in the hands of the police chief. None of the positions in the department are subject to civil service provisions. All uniformed officers except the chief and the lieutenant are in the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFSCME Council 93, Local 3470 collective bargaining unit. Both the chief of police and lieutenant have three year personal service contracts that are negotiated separately with the town. The lieutenant's contract extends through June 30, 2010, while the chief's will expire after June 30, 2011.

The department provides police services to a population of 9,400 that is spread across 32.87 square miles. This represents a low population density of 286 people per square mile that is well below the Middlesex County average of 1,593 people per square mile and the state average (towns) of 491 people per square mile. Though the town's population density is low it is more than twice that of Ashby's and it is more concentrated in a couple of areas such as Townsend Harbor and the neighborhoods around the town center (See Appendix for map with population density). Townsend's income per capita of \$26,854 is also about 30 percent below the state average of \$39,436. Centerline road miles in Townsend total 95.07 miles, including road miles owned by Mass Highway, as well as accepted and unaccepted town roads. As identified earlier, communities in Middlesex County average 103.75 total road miles, while cities and towns across the state average 88.6 total road miles.

Similar to Ashby, Townsend's crime rate is low and well below the Massachusetts average for both violent crimes (murder, rape, aggravated assault and robbery) and property crimes (burglary, larceny and motor vehicle theft). Recent data indicates that there were 5 assaults, 48 breaking and enterings, 34 motor vehicle breaking and enterings, 62 larcenies, 8 motor vehicle thefts, 1 sexual offense and 1 robbery. Departmental activity includes many more incidents than those represented by these more serious crimes. Calls as measured by the dispatch system totaled 5,927 when routine informational calls, and calls related to internal communication, traffic duties and directed patrols are eliminated.

In Townsend, patrol officers work a six day schedule, four days on and two days off. Department practice has been to schedule at least two officers on duty for each of the three shifts. Two patrol officers cover the day, evening and night shift, while typical coverage is to assign one sergeant to

the day shift and another to a split 6:00pm to 2:00am shift. The chief, lieutenant and detective work on a seven day schedule. The detective typically covers the evening shift, while chief and lieutenant work during the day.

Police services in Townsend are based out of a police station built in 1989. The station is located on Route 13 about a mile from the center of town and eight miles from Ashby's police trailer. The building measures over 6,200 square feet in area, has gender specific cells, a sally port for unloading and loading detainees, evidence and equipment storage, and ample space to accommodate additional personnel and equipment. Overall the building has been well maintained and is in good shape.

Communications

In FY2010, the Town of Townsend approved a budget that provides for a communications center with four full-time dispatchers and four part-time dispatchers. Though the chief of police holds the title of department director and is paid a nominal annual stipend, day-to-day operations are overseen by a senior dispatcher. The full-time dispatch staff average 16 years of service with the town. The communications personnel in Townsend belong to the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFSCME Council 93, Local 3470.

The communications center in Townsend handles calls for police, fire, EMS, water and highway departments, as well as requests for mutual aid from neighboring communities. In calendar 2009 the department processed 5,927 calls when directed patrols, routine information, and internal communication are eliminated. Total call volume was 16,954 in 2009, while reported 911 calls totaled 1,593 in 2008. In addition to their regular call center duties, communication staff monitors walk-in traffic to the police station's front desk.

Like Ashby, the center operates 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Current practice is to schedule one dispatcher per each eight hour shift. In general, all but one shift on Saturdays is covered by full-time staff. The communications center is based out of the first floor of the Townsend police station. In 2009 the communication center underwent significant renovations in which computer equipment was updated, reverse 911 services were installed, and building security was increased. The space appears adequate and operates as a modern communications center.

Townsend's communications center is equipped with a Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) software system. The CAD system assists with receiving, managing and dispatching emergency calls to the appropriate public safety personnel, including police, fire and EMS. Its capabilities include computer controlled emergency vehicle dispatching, vehicle status, incident reporting and information management. Among other abilities, the system has mapping functionality, can interface with patrol officers mobile computers, and network with other local, state, and federal information databases. The primary advantage of the CAD system is that it allows dispatchers to efficiently handle incidents to shorten response times, improve first responder safety and better protect the community.

Townsend police cruisers are also outfitted with Global Positioning Systems (GPS) or AVL (automatic vehicle location). The system displays the location of police vehicles in real-time at the

communications center, which enables the center to precisely locate vehicles at any given time and dispatch incidents more rapidly and efficiently. It also improves officer safety by continually tracking personnel and equipment. Patrol cruisers in Townsend also are equipped with mobile computer terminals that are used for record keeping and accessing law enforcement databases. The computers reduce radio traffic, thereby cutting down on the total workload of the communications center.

Establishing a Regional Department

The most comprehensive approach to sharing police and communication services between Ashby and Townsend is to establish a regional department. To determine if this is feasible, it is best, early in the process, to examine and analyze several important factors. These factors include the workloads in each community, vacancies in key leadership positions, the need for major capital expenditures on the horizon, collective bargaining considerations, technology and equipment considerations and any topographical or other barriers that may affect response time. We also include discussion of some other factors that may impact a decision to regionalize such as state financial incentives, department accreditation and expanded opportunities for access to regional resources.

Police workloads and operating environments – A review of crime statistics as submitted to the Massachusetts State Police over a four year period reveals that violent crime occurs infrequently in both Ashby and Townsend and at a pace well below the state average.² Property crimes also occur at a less frequent rate than the state average. Resident calls for service are moderate and represent similar levels of activity relative to population, with Ashby reporting 1,838 calls in 2009 and Townsend reporting 5,927 during the same period. Similar workloads or service demands relative to population is generally advantageous to a regionalization effort since dissatisfaction may arise if one town demands a disproportionate amount of service from a regional department.

Vacancies in key leadership positions – The police chief position in Ashby is currently being held by an interim chief of police while the town conducts a search for a permanent chief. Although there have been efforts to fill the position, they have been unsuccessful to date. A vacancy in the chief's position represents an opportune time to consider regionalization of police services.

Facility size and quality – The station in Townsend offers a favorable work environment and is outfitted for a modern police force. In contrast, the station in Ashby is in such poor condition that it is not conducive to professional police work, may impact employee morale, and will need to be replaced in the near future. The cost of building a new police station in Ashby would have a significant impact on the town's limited budget and may be prohibitively expensive in the current economic climate. The station in Townsend is sufficient to accommodate a regional department and sharing this space with a smaller town like Ashby could provide budgetary relief to both communities.

Available technology and equipment – Over the last year Townsend has invested a substantial amount of resources into technology and other related equipment for both the police department and communications center. The Townsend communications center underwent an extensive renovation which, among other elements, enhanced the ability of dispatchers to manage and handle calls and displays the location of police vehicles in real-time at the communications center. Ashby does not benefit from the communication and service advantages of this technology.

Parity of salaries and benefits, and collective bargaining agreements – In a collective bargaining environment, the host community of a regional department will need to bargain around the changes in working conditions involved with regionalization. In this case, a likely scenario is that the relatively few

² Crime Reporting Unit of the Massachusetts State Police, *Crime in Massachusetts, 2005-2006*, Commonwealth Fusion Center, January, 2010.

Ashby officers that would become part of the Townsend labor union and their salaries and benefits will be raised to those of the Townsend officers. Since this involves relatively few officers and the cost of this equalization will be relatively manageable, the prospect for successful labor negotiations improves. Additional bargaining will also be necessary around the impact of regionalization on the Townsend employees as well.

Road network, topographical features or other barriers affecting response time – Ashby and Townsend are both rural communities whose topography is characterized as rugged, hilly terrain with open fields, woodlands and wetlands.³ The towns combine to cover over 56 square miles and have over 160 public road miles. More challenging, however, is that travel between the two communities is limited to Route 119, which is the only major throughway to bisect the towns. The Wheeler Road Bridge that connects Ashby and Townsend via Turnpike Road is also closed indefinitely. Travel times between the two towns therefore can be lengthy.

Other Considerations

Certification by the Massachusetts Police Accreditation Commission (MPAC) – The Townsend police department is currently undergoing a rigorous self-initiated evaluation process in which the department must meet professional standards to receive certification as established by MPAC. The 151 standards are based on nationally recognized public safety best practices. These standards encompass management, policy development, response planning, communications, training, as well as operations and technical support activities, evidence handling, among other law enforcement practices. In addition to establishing a professional police force and standardizing the delivery of services, limited reimbursements may be available to help defray the costs associated with achieving certification by MPAC.

Available communications grant funding – In 2010 the state introduced a regional communications center grant program.⁴ Through the grant, which is funded from wireless surcharges pursuant to M.G.L. c. 6A, §18H, the state allocated a total of \$3.1 million for incentives to regional Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) and emergency communications centers in 2010. A primary purpose of the grant is to provide ongoing financial support to regional communications centers that receive 911 calls and dispatch, transfer or relay emergency responses. To be eligible, two or more municipalities must attest to their intent to regionalize. With the formation of a two-town emergency communications center, the department would be eligible for a share of the two percent of the phone surcharge revenue as an incentive to regionalize. Total incentive funding for the two town regional communications center may be in the area of \$100,000. An Ashby-Townsend regional communications center could use this annual grant funding to augment communications staffing or for eligible equipment upgrades. We encourage local officials to schedule a meeting with staff from the State 911 Department to discuss these grant opportunities in more detail.

³ Ashby Open Space and Recreation Plan, Environmental Inventory and Analysis

⁴ State 911 Department, www.mass.gov/e911

Expanded opportunities to ensure comprehensive emergency response and training – Townsend is a member of the North Eastern Massachusetts Law Enforcement Council (NEMLEC), a consortium of law enforcement agencies in Middlesex and Essex Counties. Membership provides the Townsend police department with expanded access to regionally coordinated resources including personnel, experts with specialized skills, and planning and training opportunities. Operating under an interagency mutual aid and assistance agreement, NEMLEC members commit resources to assist fellow member departments in order to enhance local capabilities and provide better law enforcement throughout the region. An additional fee maybe required to incorporate Ashby.

Proposed Regional Department Structure

Police

At the onset of our review of a proposed regional department, we sought to document and compare the existing levels of service in the two towns. In its FY2010 budget, Ashby provides for four patrol officers, with two assigned to the day shift and two to the evening shift. Actual coverage is somewhat lower due to contractual leave, but is augmented by overtime and reserve shifts. Supplemental night coverage is now provided through a federal grant, but this grant funding ends in January of 2011. Therefore, this coverage was not included in our analysis as the town is not currently paying for this coverage in its FY2010 budget.

Townsend currently staffs each of the three daily shifts with at least two patrol officers on each shift. The department's three sergeants split their time between the day shift and a split shift covering the hours from 6:00pm to 2:00am. The chief, lieutenant and detective work a Monday through Friday schedule with the chief and lieutenant working the day shift and the detective working the evening shift. The department divides the town into two patrol sectors with Route 13 as the dividing line. The FY2010 budget provides for fifteen officers but only fourteen positions are filled, so the funding for the unfilled position was backed out of the Townsend FY2010 police department baseline costs.

Given current staffing levels and the different patrol coverage patterns in each town, it was difficult to configure patrol sectors for a regional department that were equitable and preserved current service levels in each town. For example, Ashby does not currently provide for night shift patrols in its FY2010 budget, so any night patrols provided to Ashby by a regional department would probably result in lower levels of service to Townsend. Another complicating factor is that access between the two towns is basically limited to Route 119, thus limiting opportunities for economies of scale for patrol staffing.

Consequently, we decided that a better approach would be for the towns to agree that Ashby would purchase the same number of patrol shifts that it currently funds in its FY2010 budget from the regional department, with supervision coming from the existing structure in the Townsend department. The regional department would be hosted by Townsend and operate out of the existing Townsend police station. This would ensure that each town retains at least the same, or better, levels of service. Ashby would be free to decide when it wanted its patrol shifts deployed so that, for example, the town could decide to cover the night shift on Friday and Saturday night, but not on other nights. When there is no patrol presence in Ashby, the regional department would respond to calls that occur, providing a more timely response and a higher level of service than the previous practice of relying on the State Police to respond.

To this end, we developed a methodology that simply carries forward the existing patrol presence (i.e. the number of shifts) budgeted in Ashby. After determining the number of shifts that a given patrol officer actually works (approximately 201), we calculated the number of shifts the overtime budget covers. This is accomplished by dividing the total overtime budget by the overtime rate. Excluding reserve shifts, we estimate that Ashby provides overtime for approximately 264 additional

shifts to cover holiday and other contractual leave, as well as other situational staffing needs that arise. Although we realize that not all of the overtime results in additional patrol presence, for example court overtime, the calculation of the amount of leave used to determine the 201 regular shifts each officer works is conservative enough so that total patrol shifts of approximately 1,068 is a reasonable estimate. The table below quantifies the total number of shifts Ashby is providing for in its FY2010 budget.

Ashby Total Number of Available Shift (Based on 5-2 Work Schedule)

A	Number of Work Weeks - 5 Workday Schedule (365 / 7)	52
B	Number of Work Days (A x 5 Work Days)	260
C	Total Number of Work Hours (B x 8):	2,080
<u>Minus:</u>		
D	Vacation Time (20 Days)	160
E	Holiday Time (12 Days)	96
F	Sick/Personal Time (12 Days)	96
G	Training/Other Time (15 Days)	120
H	Net Available Hours per Officer (Rounded):	1,608
I	Number of Available Shifts per Officer (H / 8)	201
J	Total Number of Shifts for Ashby (I x 4 officers):	804

Ashby Total Overtime Shifts Calculation (Rounded)

A	Total Patrol Overtime Shifts	119
B	Additional Overtime Shifts	89
C	Holiday Shifts	56
D	Total Overtime Shifts:	264
<hr/>		
Total Number of Shifts:		1068

E	Total Reserve Shifts	52
---	----------------------	----

Therefore, based on this methodology, the regional department we propose includes all 18 uniformed officers currently employed by the two towns. This configuration includes a chief of police, a lieutenant, three sergeants, a detective and twelve patrol officers. Absent is the interim police chief for Ashby and the vacant position in Townsend that we leave unfilled. As stated earlier, we also made the decision not to include the Federal stimulus grant position in Ashby because of the temporary nature of funding. In this model, we ensure that the service levels budgeted within each town are maintained as part of the regional department.

While it is conceivable that a regional department could be operated with fewer than the eighteen uniformed officers as proposed above, we have made a conscious decision to build-in enough officers to sustain the existing levels of service. We recognize, as well, the ongoing time commitment that it takes to support a well-trained, professional police force where officers receive close supervision and guidance to ensure that departmental procedures are enforced in a consistent and even-handed manner. It is also easier to provide a comprehensive, in-service training program to officers in a larger

department. In smaller departments, training opportunities often require that shifts go unfilled or that they be filled by overtime.

Lastly, as stated earlier, the regional department we proposed would be hosted by Townsend. Under this structure, management responsibilities of the regional department will to be vested in Townsend’s chief of police, with a lieutenant continuing to serve as the second in command. The lieutenant in Townsend, the second highest ranking officer in either town, has sufficient experience and training to assume the role of acting chief when the chief is absent. We expect that both of these officials will continue to have personal service contracts, and will not be members of the new or expanded regional police collective bargaining group.

To benchmark our findings, we have identified comparison communities that have populations similar to the two towns combined. These results were further refined by identifying those that have similar operating budgets and levels of property wealth. The table below displays police department staffing levels from comparable municipalities. The average number of uniformed officers in the eight comparable towns was 18.75.

Comparison Community Police Staffing:

Municipality	Chief	Deputy Chief/ Captains	Lieutenant	Sergeants	Detectives	Patrolmen	Total Uniformed Officers
Ashby	1	0	0	0	0	4	5
Townsend	1	0	1	3	1	8	14
Ashby-Townsend	1	0	1	3	1	12	18
ATHOL	1	0	1	3	1	12	18
CARVER	1	0	0	4	0	11	16
CHARLTON	1	0	1	4	0	13	19
PALMER	1	0	1	4	0	14	20
PEPPERELL	1	0	1	4	1	9	16
RAYNHAM	1	1	2	4	4	12	24
REHOBOTH	1	0	2	3	0	14	20
SPENCER	1	0	0	3	0	13	17
Comp Average	1.00	0.13	1.00	3.63	0.75	12.25	18.75

*Staffing figures for Ashby do not include the grant paid patrol officer

Communications

Like police, we propose that Townsend host a shared communications center for the two towns. It is our judgment that for these two communities the staffing level necessary in a regional department is driven more by coverage requirements than actual call volume as it is in larger operations. As a result, we determined that the current configuration of staff in Townsend, in a regional communication center, could absorb the total number of calls currently dispatched by both towns.

To confirm that the level of staffing in Townsend was sufficient for the regional communication center, we reviewed available data on staffing levels and 911 call volumes in several comparison communities. In addition, we focused on the experience in Townsend and that of the chief of police,

who reinforced that their current level of staffing could handle the projected call volume to be received by a regional center.

Our determination of staff for the regional communications center is consistent with the experience of comparable communities that have characteristics, including population, operating budgets and property wealth similar to Ashby and Townsend combined. The table below includes data for these municipalities and displays the staffing levels in their communication centers along with the total volume of 911 calls. Staffing level data is from a survey conducted by the Massachusetts Communications Supervisors Association (MCSA). The average number of full-time dispatchers in the eight comparable towns was four (rounded), which is equivalent to the existing compliment in Townsend. In addition, six of the eight communities had more 911 calls than the combined total for Ashby and Townsend that is projected for the regional department.

Comparison Community Communications Call Volume & Staffing:⁵

Municipality	Calendar 2008 911 Calls*	Dispatchers Non-Sworn		
		Full-time	Part-time	Supervisory
Ashby	563	2	4	0
Townsend	1,593	4	4	1
Ashby-Townsend	2,156	4	4	1
ATHOL	2,190	4	2	0
CARVER	2,171	3	2	1
CHARLTON	3,111	3	10	0
PALMER	3,623	6	0	1
PEPPERELL	1,503	5	4	2
RAYNHAM	3,716	6	4	1
REHOBOTH	1,693	4	6	1
SPENCER	3,696	4	6	0
Comp Average	2,713	4.38	4.25	0.75

*Includes all Police, Fire and EMS Calls to 911

⁵ January 2003 phone survey by MCSA: <http://ma911.org/Funding/Dispatcher%Survey.htm>; Calendar 2008 911 Call Data: http://www.mass.gov/Eeops/docs/setb/2008_Call_Volume.pdf

Regional Department Projected Savings

Regional Police

We arrived at our estimate of a total regional budget by examining the FY2010 budgets, year-to-date spending and FY2009 actual spending provided by both Ashby and Townsend.

Using the proposed staffing configuration described earlier, together with the opportunities to consolidate other station expenses, we quantify the estimated savings that are possible with a regional police department. Given the expectation that the interim chief of police in Ashby is temporary and our earlier decision to maintain existing patrol service levels, no layoffs are necessary for police. The need for only one police chief and other opportunities to consolidate operations yields a total estimated saving of \$38,510. In the table below we quantify the estimated savings that are possible through the regionalization of the Ashby and Townsend police department.

Police Department – Comparison of Current vs. Regional Costs:

	<u>Ashby</u>	<u>Townsend</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Regional</u>	<u>Savings</u>
FY2010 Police					
Salaries & Wages	273,588	1,062,084	1,335,672	1,307,262	28,410
Overtime, Reserve & Holiday	93,562	172,187	265,749	304,997	-39,248
Subtotal Salaries & Wages:	367,150	1,234,271	1,601,421	1,612,259	-10,838
Equipment & Supplies	27,713	58,843	86,556	77,244	9,312
Maintenance & Repair	20,035	47,750	67,785	62,375	5,410
Technical & Professional Services	17,820	1,000	18,820	2,300	16,520
Other Services, Supplies & Charges	3,773	19,042	22,815	20,014	2,801
Capital Outlay	0	52,500	52,500	52,500	0
Subtotal Other Charges & Expenses:	69,341	179,135	248,476	214,433	34,043
Indirect Costs					
Health Insurance	37,839	153,659	191,498	192,343	-845
Pension	14,450	49,154	63,604	58,551	5,053
General Liability Insurance & Other	20,064	51,758	71,822	60,725	11,097
Subtotal Indirect Costs:	72,353	254,571	326,924	311,619	15,305
Total Police:	508,844	1,667,977	2,176,821	2,138,311	38,510

To determine these estimates, we began by analyzing the pay scales provided in each town's police department collective bargaining agreement and raising the total compensation of the Ashby officers to be consistent with the higher pay scale in Townsend. As there were numerous differences in the contracts, we relied on total compensation and other pay, including regular base wages, longevity, uniform allowance, holiday pay and college education/Quinn Bill stipends.

Another issue is that the regular patrol officers in Townsend who work the evening or night shift are paid a four percent shift differential. In addition, sergeants in Townsend, who have regular patrol responsibilities, are paid fifteen percent higher than patrol officers. In Ashby, a night shift differential of

\$1 per hour is provided and there is no separate pay scale for senior officers. For the purposes of our analysis we also factored up Ashby officers to reflect Townsend’s pay scale for shift differential.

Since we recognize that ultimately all of these issues are subject to collective bargaining and reaching agreement on a new contract, we have also added an additional \$20,000 in salary costs to account for the natural give and take that will occur during contract negotiations. This may include issues such as relative seniority of staff and how to dovetail the seniority list for a regional department. Seniority can be an important issue for things like bidding on work schedules and the timing of vacations.

We also assume that the regional department will continue to need the services of a full-time administrative assistant and full-time administrative coordinator, and factor their salaries into the regional department budget. The part-time custodian is also included. The table below details how much each town has appropriated for base wages and other compensation.

Current Police Base Wages & Other Compensation:

FY2010	Ashby	Townsend	Total	Regional
Base Salaries & Wages	\$270,469	\$879,328	\$1,149,797	1,099,174
Uniform Allowance	3,119	17,250	20,369	21,450
Longevity	n/a	13,800	13,800	15,800
Stipends & Education Incentive	n/a	151,706	151,706	170,838
Total:	273,588	1,062,084	1,335,672	1,307,262

To project the potential savings for a regional department, we compare this total of \$1,335,672 with the compensation necessary in a regional department. Our projected salaries and wages for the regional police department total \$1,307,262. As previously described, this number reflects the projected savings associated with the chief’s position in Ashby (\$69,519), the additional cost to equalize Ashby officer salaries to Townsend is \$21,109, plus the additional \$20,000 estimate to reconcile and resolve contract issues. When the total regional department budget is compared with the total amount budgeted by the two towns in FY2010, this yields a savings in salary and wage compensation of \$28,410.

We then examined the total cost for overtime pay and reserve officers. Given their relatively small size, each department has relied fairly extensively on overtime and reserves to supplement scheduled shifts and to maintain staffing complements as illness, vacations or injuries occur.

The table below outlines the current budgeted cost of overtime and reserves for each town.

Current Overtime & Reserve Appropriations:

FY2010	Ashby	Townsend	Total	Regional
Overtime	\$59,476	\$118,871	\$178,347	224,949
Reserves	5,645	9,577	15,222	16,491
Holiday Pay	28,441	43,739	72,180	63,557
Total:	93,562	172,187	265,749	304,997

To determine the cost of overtime and reserve pay for the regional department we began by examining the total number of hours each town currently budgets. The total number of overtime and

reserve hours was calculated by dividing the amount budgeted in Ashby and Townsend by each town's overtime and reserve rate. Next, we applied Townsend's rate for overtime and reserve pay to the calculation of Ashby's total overtime and reserve hours. To be conservative, we used an overtime rate in these estimates based on the average pay scale between patrol officers and sergeants in Townsend. We also factored in additional overtime costs to cover the reduced number of shifts the Ashby officers will cover when converted to a four days on and two days off schedule. This impact, along with the higher overtime rate in Townsend, produces an increase in overtime costs of \$39,248. When combined the total cost for overtime and reserves for the regional department is \$304,997.

We also looked at whether it would be cost effective for the regional department to offset overtime costs by employing an additional officer. Generally, the direct salary costs, along with the indirect health and pension costs associated with hiring an additional officer, make this option as expensive as overtime. Nevertheless, a balanced approach must be taken with respect to overtime so patrol officers are not working an inordinate amount of shifts.

We then calculated savings that accrue directly from closing Ashby's police trailer. To develop the regional police expense budget, we added the expense line items together for the two towns and eliminated duplicative or redundant expenses that are not expected to carry forward. Most of the eliminated costs relate to facility maintenance, but include lock-up fees, memberships, as well as internet and phone service. There may be more savings in some of these areas with the formation of a regional department, but we expect them to be a relatively small percentage of the total budget. Total savings on expenses and other charges are projected to be \$34,043.

Lastly, we factored in police related costs that appear outside each department's budget, such as health insurance premiums, pension assessments, general liability insurance and employer Medicare contributions. Though there is a projected cost of \$845 to bring Ashby officers into Townsend's health insurance plans, this is offset by savings associated with pension obligations and discontinuing duplicative property & casualty and other liability related insurance policies. We estimate indirect cost savings of \$15,305.

Combining the savings in salaries and wages of \$28,410, in expenses of \$34,043 and indirect costs of \$15,305, with the additional overtime and reserves cost of \$39,248, results in an estimated total savings of \$38,510.

Regional Communications

To quantify the projected savings that are possible with a shared communications center hosted by Townsend, we compared the FY2010 budgeted amounts in each town to the projected budget for the regional department. Again, we assume that the communications center in Ashby will close and that Townsend would absorb the additional workload associated with a combined operation. The department we propose mirrors the current configuration of staff in Townsend and includes four full-time and four part-time dispatchers. This is compared to the seven full-time positions the combined towns provided for in their individual FY2010 budgets.

The need for only one communication center yields a total estimated cost saving of \$187,294. Of this amount, \$142,802 is derived from salaries and wages, \$1,618 is from other charges and expenses, while \$42,874 is from indirect costs associated with health insurance and pension obligations. These calculations do not factor in unemployment or any potential severance related to closing Ashby's communications center. In the table below, we quantify the estimated savings in other charges and expenses that are possible through a shared communications center.

Communications Center – Comparison of Current vs. Regional Costs:

	<u>Ashby</u>	<u>Townsend</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Regional</u>	<u>Savings</u>
FY2010 Dispatch					
Salaries & Wages	121,796	177,065	298,861	177,065	121,796
Overtime, Reserve & Holiday	21,006	31,448	52,454	31,448	21,006
Subtotal Salaries & Wages:	142,802	208,513	351,315	208,513	142,802
Equipment & Supplies	895	8,000	8,895	8,000	895
Maintenance & Repair	186	4,350	4,536	4,350	186
Technical & Professional Services	n/a	750	750	750	0
Other Services, Supplies & Charges	537	1,300	1,837	1,300	537
Capital Outlay	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Subtotal Other Charges & Expenses:	1,618	14,400	16,018	14,400	1,618
Indirect Costs					
Health Insurance	34,752	47,280	82,032	47,280	34,752
Pension	6,356	6,599	12,955	6,599	6,356
General Liability Insurance & Other	1,766	2,567	4,333	2,567	1,766
Subtotal Indirect Costs:	42,874	56,446	99,320	56,446	42,874
Total Dispatch:	187,294	279,359	466,653	279,359	187,294

To determine these estimates, we began by carrying over the total salaries, wages and other compensation for the existing staff in Townsend. The table below details how much each town has appropriated for base pay and other compensation.

Current Communication Base Salaries, Wages and Other Compensation

FY2010	Ashby	Townsend	Total	Regional
Base Wages	\$121,723	\$171,315	\$293,038	171,315
Longevity	n/a	3,750	3,750	3,750
Uniform Allowance	73	2,000	2,073	2,000
Total:	\$121,796	\$177,065	\$298,861	177,065

The combined total that the two towns budgeted for FY2010 amounts to \$298,861. When compared to the compensation necessary in a regional department, we arrive at a total savings for salaries and wages of \$121,796.

Next, we factored in the current amount of overtime pay in Townsend for the regional department. Similar to police, each communication center has relied heavily on overtime to backfill shifts and maintain staffing complements when illness, vacations or other leave occurs. The combined

total for overtime in the two budgets for FY2010 is \$52,454. Our decision to maintain the current staffing configuration in Townsend for the regional center produces savings in overtime of \$21,006. The table below details how much each town is projected to spend on overtime in FY2010.

Current Overtime Appropriations:

FY2010	Ashby	Townsend	Total	Regional
Overtime	\$21,006	\$31,448	\$52,454	\$31,448

We then quantify the regional department’s expense budget by mirroring the current appropriations captured in Townsend. Because Ashby’s communication center operates out of the same facility as police, most building and maintenance related savings are captured within the regional police department budget discussed earlier. Together we project a total estimated savings of \$1,618.

Lastly, like police, we also reviewed communication related costs that appear outside the department’s budget for health insurance premiums, pension assessments, and employer Medicare contributions. By eliminating annual health insurance, pension assessment costs and Medicare contributions for Ashby dispatchers we project a total savings of \$42,874.

Combining the savings in salaries and wages of \$121,796, in overtime of \$21,006, in other charges and services of \$1,618, and indirect costs of \$42,874, we arrive at an estimated total savings of \$187,294 for a regional communications center.

In the Appendix we include Table 3 which details the total projected savings associated with a regional police department and shared communications center for Ashby and Townsend.

Regional Department Cost Allocation

A methodology that fairly distributes projected savings among the towns is a reasonable starting point to reaching consensus on the allocation method of the regional department budget. A good allocation method should also yield relatively stable and predictable results from year to year and not increase the operational cost to either town. Though there are numerous models to consider, the methodology we developed allocated the total costs of the regional department by using the variables of population, equalized valuation (EQV), and 911 call volume (equally weighted) to calculate the proportionate share of the regional budget to be borne by each town. Though this method divides the potential savings in a favorable manner for each town, this method may lack flexibility if either town wants to change its service levels in the future.

Population – Based on 2008 estimated population by the U.S. Census Bureau, population can be a good method for allocating costs between the two towns provided demand is proportionate to population. In this case, demand for service as measured by call volume is similar on a per capita basis.

Equalized Valuation (EQV) – An estimate of the 2008 full and fair cash value of all taxable property in a town, EQV is widely recognized as a measure of relative wealth for a community and is used in numerous state aid formulas. EQV is updated every two years by the Department of Revenue.

911 Call Volume – The volume of 911 calls received is an approach tied to the level of service in each town. This method allocates costs relative to the use of police services within each community. Call volume may not be as stable as the other variables from year to year.

When combined, these individual factors reasonably distribute the cost of the regional department between the two towns. In the table below, we calculate the ratio for population, EQV, and total 911 call volume for the two towns.

Factor	Values			Percent	
	Ashby	Townsend	Total	Ashby	Townsend
2008 EQV	378,287,300	1,023,754,100	1,402,041,400	27.0%	73.0%
2008 Population	2,927	9,400	12,327	23.7%	76.3%
2008 911 Call Volume	563	1,593	2,156	26.1%	73.9%
			Average	25.4%	74.6%

Next, we allocated the regional department’s total budget using the average ratio for population, EQV, and 911 call volume calculated above. The table below illustrates the allocation of costs between the two towns. Based on the comparison of Ashby and Townsend’s FY2010 budget to the proportional cost of the regional department, we project annual savings to Ashby of \$82,947 and to Townsend of \$142,857.

	Ashby	Townsend	Combined	Regional	Savings
Total Police & Dispatch Budget	696,138	1,947,336	2,643,474	2,417,670	225,804
Proposed Budget Allocation	613,191	1,804,479			
Savings Allocation:	82,947	142,857			225,804

Ultimately, as part of their regional agreement, both communities will need to negotiate an approach they feel is equitable. Outside of the cost allocation described, each town should also consider the following:

Debt Service – Neither Ashby or Townsend have debt service obligations related to their police or communications operations. As such, there is no requirement to allocate these costs between the two departments in a regional operation. However, if the departments are to regionalize, consideration must be given as to what allocation method will be employed if new debt is issued.

Operating and maintenance costs – Facility costs, including direct capital outlays will have to be allocated. Methods for sharing costs for routine repairs or major improvements including the roof, HVAC, septic and other systems will also have to be determined.

Unexpected or emergency expenses – The towns should consider a methodology for splitting the costs of emergency repairs or purchases.

Other transition related costs – Moving to a regional department will also involve upgrading and standardizing service equipment. Most of these transition costs are not likely to be substantial and it is possible that they could be spread over more than one year. However, there may be some significant costs associated with providing full radio and computer communication access in Ashby, outfitting cruisers with GPS and making sure radio equipment is compatible. This could involve installing a new repeater in Ashby to improve radio coverage and the purchase of 911 mobile computers. To the extent that these communications upgrades are necessary, the regional department could apply for a development grant. Administered by the State 911 Department, these competitive grants can be used to offset start-up costs for regional communications centers, including the purchase of this type of equipment.

At a minimum though, it may be necessary for Ashby to buy a new cruiser if the existing fleet does not yield a sufficient number of serviceable cruisers with sufficient remaining useful life to retrofit with the necessary communications equipment. A new cruiser, comparably equipped to Townsend specifications, would cost approximately \$31,000.

It may also be useful to establish a small substation within Ashby town hall to provide office space, a computer and restroom facilities for patrol officers. This could probably be done with a very modest capital outlay.

Governance and the Legal Means to Regionalize

Outside of special legislation, an inter-municipal agreement (IMA) under M.G.L. c. 40, §4A is a possible vehicle to create a regional police department and communications center. The inter-municipal agreement can be executed with the majority approval of each board of selectmen. Once lawfully executed, the agreement is binding on the towns notwithstanding any by-law or charter provision to the contrary. While there are some distinct advantages to an inter-municipal agreement, there are also obstacles that must be overcome to negotiate a successful agreement.

One advantage of an inter-municipal agreement is that it allows the towns to develop a governance structure appropriate to their situation. As we proposed earlier, Townsend will serve as the host community for the regional police and shared communications center. The department would function as part of Townsend's government under the supervision of the chief of police. However, there are several issues that need to be considered in the development of a governance structure for the regional department. In general, these issues involve the level of input and control that Ashby might exercise in a regional department.

A formal process should be designed through which Ashby can voice service concerns, provide input into the budget, or even change the level of service received. The board of selectmen in each town could appoint the town administrator, or another designee to serve as the focal point of communication with the regional department. Decisions will need to be made about other areas where the town might have input such as in the selection of a new chief or the decision to undertake a major capital improvement. When services level issues arise, procedures should be in place as to how they are communicated and resolved by the regional department. The agreement should also establish how either town may terminate the regional agreement.

An inter-municipal agreement also affords the towns the opportunity to customize a cost allocation methodology that suits their situation. For example the towns could share costs based on the relative proportions of population, equalized property value and 911 call volume, as we suggest earlier in the report. Although this formula seems reasonable now, it may not be flexible enough if the towns wish to change the level of service they receive. However, it may be possible to use the suggested formula as a base and add additional service costs to the base. For example, if Townsend wanted to bring on an additional officer, it could pay for this separately over and above the baseline assessment. Alternatively, another allocation method could be developed and agreed to in the IMA. The general framework of the formula should be one that produces relatively stable results from year to year.

With an inter-municipal agreement, one community would serve as the host community. The department would be part of its government and all financial transactions would be processed through the established financial systems in that town. This is probably preferable to setting up a police district where there would need for separate accounting and treasury functions.

The most significant problems with an inter-municipal agreement may involve the succession of employees to the new regional department and the associated collective bargaining issues. Again, we assume that one town would serve as the host community and would agree to become the employer for the purposes of M.G.L. c. 150E, the state's collective bargaining statute. In this instance, Townsend as

the host town, or employer, would agree to hire the police officers of Ashby and file documents with the Division of Labor Relations to dissolve the former bargaining unit and reorganize the larger employee group as a single bargaining unit. The communications center in Ashby would be dissolved.

Before either involved union would agree to this scenario, a substantial amount of work would be necessary to compare and reconcile existing collective bargaining agreements and to propose a new, unified labor contract that all parties can respond to. For this effort to succeed, the new agreement must preserve current employee rights and benefits so that no employees are harmed by the new contract. Taking the best provisions from each individual contract might be cost prohibitive, so it is important to understand existing contract details to arrive at equity for all employees.

Another issue that must be dealt with in an inter-municipal agreement is the orderly transfer of existing investigations, evidence, records and pending criminal cases to the newly formed shared department, as well as the transition requirements for the communications center. These and other issues will have to be addressed specifically in an inter-municipal agreement. Dissolving an existing communications center, police department and labor union will be necessary, but a union's willingness to merge will only happen if agreement is reached on the terms and conditions of a new labor contract.

Forming a Regional Police District under M.G.L. c. 41, §§99B-99K

As an alternative, there is an existing Massachusetts statute that can be used by two or more towns to establish a regional police district. This statute, deals with many, though not all, of the issues that may arise in merging police services. For example, it establishes a process for the towns to vote at their annual elections to adopt a regional department and decide whether the department will be under the control and supervision of a "strong chief." The statute establishes a January 1st start date for the regional district, dissolves the existing town police departments and moves pending prosecutions to the new district.

While the police district statute provides a legal framework for a merged police department, it is significantly deficient in several ways so as to make it close to unworkable. For example, it creates a separate district that seems to operate on a calendar rather than a fiscal year, it requires the use of a rigid formula for assessing costs and provides no recourse if the member communities don't approve of their assessment. To the best of our knowledge, this regional police statute has never been used. In all likelihood then, communities seeking to regionalize police service should consider an inter-municipal agreement which is a more suitable means to create a regional police department.

Conclusion

In small to medium sized communities such as Ashby and Townsend, the concept of forming a regional police and shared communications center represents a significant opportunity for cost savings. These savings are primarily attributed to the elimination of the interim chief of police and closing Ashby's combined police and communications facility. In addition, more savings are associated with indirect costs related to health insurance, pension obligations and general insurance.

When combined, we project that the regionalized department could operate on a total budget of \$2,417,670. In comparison to the \$2,643,474 that the two towns appropriated in FY2010, this represents a total annual savings of \$225,804. Using the allocation methodology derived earlier using the average of each town's EQV, population and 911 call volume, we project an annual savings to Ashby of \$82,947 and to Townsend of \$142,857. However, possible transition costs might include a one time buy-in fee for Ashby to purchase a full-equipped police cruiser (about \$31,000), upgrades to the communications infrastructure in Ashby to allow for full radio and computer communication with cruisers and standardization of weapons, uniforms, and department seals.

While reaching agreement with the respective police and communication collective bargaining agents may seem to be a challenging task, it can be done. It requires that the parties initiate a thorough analysis of the existing contracts so that significant differences in contract language can be understood and reconciled. A complete grasp of the contract provisions makes it more likely that areas of compromise can be identified so that all of the most costly provisions from each contract do not have to be incorporated.

Beyond the need to reach agreement with labor unions, both communities will have to come together on a number of factors to be outlined within an intermunicipal agreement. Outlined within our report, these include the allocation of future debt and capital outlays, unforeseen expenses, transition costs, contract termination, and potential changes in desired service levels, among others.

Therefore, to regionalize services, we envision the formation of a police and communications planning committee which would begin work on the issues discussed. Once analysis has been completed, and an inter-municipal agreement drafted, implementation of a regional police and communications center can begin. We would expect that this transition could take upwards to a full year to complete.

Appendix

Table 1: Comparison Communities:

Municipality	2008 Estimated US Census	2008 Income per Capita	2008 EQV/2008 US Census	Land Area Square Miles	2008 Public Road Mileage	FY09 Operating Budget	Population per square mile
Ashby	2,927	27,486	129,241	23.80	64.72	5,563,247	122.98
Townsend	9,400	26,854	108,910	32.87	95.07	17,986,622	285.98
Ashby-Townsend	12,327	27,004	113,737	56.67	159.79	23,549,869	217.52
ATHOL	11,570	16,845	77,818	32.57	111.36	19,947,618	355.23
CARVER	11,574	20,398	118,628	37.55	105.54	33,259,763	308.23
CHARLTON	12,585	23,626	139,750	42.53	155.05	24,074,654	295.91
PALMER	12,933	18,664	85,666	31.53	114.88	34,864,347	410.18
PEPPERELL	11,382	25,722	123,750	22.56	84.76	22,842,895	504.52
RAYNHAM	13,566	24,476	171,300	20.50	90.03	33,577,017	661.76
REHOBOTH	11,474	26,467	178,665	46.50	139.59	20,593,857	246.75
SPENCER	11,922	21,017	105,774	32.85	111.47	18,760,885	362.92
Comp Average	12,126	22,152	125,169	33.32	114.09	25,990,130	393.19
State Average (towns)	11,151	39,436	202,000	22.69	88.60	36,999,834	491.45

Table 2: Comparison Community 2006 Crime Rates:⁶

Municipality	Murder	Rape	Total Robbery	Total Aggravated Assault	Burglary	Larceny	Motor Vehicle Theft	Total
Ashby	0	0	0	2	1	6	0	9
Townsend	0	0	1	0	22	82	2	107
Ashby-Townsend	0	0	1	2	23	88	2	116
ATHOL	0	2	1	13	14	20	3	53
CARVER	1	3	2	22	42	62	8	140
CHARLTON	0	1	1	25	34	93	19	173
PALMER	0	4	14	25	86	157	18	304
PEPPERELL	0	0	0	7	31	75	4	117
RAYNHAM	0	4	5	23	61	323	48	464
REHOBOTH	0	4	2	14	33	108	16	177
SPENCER	0	0	4	33	29	112	18	196
Comp Average	0.13	2.25	3.63	20.25	41.25	118.75	16.75	203.00

⁶ Crime Reporting Unit of the Massachusetts State Police, *Crime in Massachusetts, 2005-2006*, Commonwealth Fusion Center, January, 2010.

Table 3: Current FY2010 Appropriations and Projected Regional Department Budget:

	<u>Ashby</u>	<u>Townsend</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Regional</u>	<u>Savings</u>
FY2010 Police					
Salaries & Wages	273,588	1,062,084	1,335,672	1,307,262	28,410
Overtime, Reserve & Holiday	93,562	172,187	265,749	304,997	-39,248
Subtotal Salaries & Wages:	367,150	1,234,271	1,601,421	1,612,259	-10,838
Equipment & Supplies	27,713	58,843	86,556	77,244	9,312
Maintenance & Repair	20,035	47,750	67,785	62,375	5,410
Technical & Professional Services	17,820	1,000	18,820	2,300	16,520
Other Services, Supplies & Charges	3,773	19,042	22,815	20,014	2,801
Capital Outlay	0	52,500	52,500	52,500	0
Subtotal Other Charges & Expenses:	69,341	179,135	248,476	214,433	34,043
Indirect Costs					
Health Insurance	37,839	153,659	191,498	192,343	-845
Pension	14,450	49,154	63,604	58,551	5,053
General Liability Insurance & Other	20,064	51,758	71,822	60,725	11,097
Subtotal Indirect Costs:	72,353	254,571	326,924	311,619	15,305
Total Police:	508,844	1,667,977	2,176,821	2,138,311	38,510
FY2010 Dispatch					
Salaries & Wages	121,796	177,065	298,861	177,065	121,796
Overtime, Reserve & Holiday	21,006	31,448	52,454	31,448	21,006
Subtotal Salaries & Wages:	142,802	208,513	351,315	208,513	142,802
Equipment & Supplies	895	8,000	8,895	8,000	895
Maintenance & Repair	186	4,350	4,536	4,350	186
Technical & Professional Services	n/a	750	750	750	0
Other Services, Supplies & Charges	537	1,300	1,837	1,300	537
Capital Outlay	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Subtotal Other Charges & Expenses:	1,618	14,400	16,018	14,400	1,618
Indirect Costs					
Health Insurance	34,752	47,280	82,032	47,280	34,752
Pension	6,356	6,599	12,955	6,599	6,356
General Liability Insurance & Other	1,766	2,567	4,333	2,567	1,766
Subtotal Indirect Costs:	42,874	56,446	99,320	56,446	42,874
Total Dispatch:	187,294	279,359	466,653	279,359	187,294
Total Police & Dispatch:	696,138	1,947,336	2,643,474	2,417,670	225,804

Stock of Existing Inventory:*Ashby

- 6 Police Cruisers (2 Out-of-Service)
- 1 All Terrain Vehicle & Trailer
- 1 Radar Trailer
- 2 Residential Grade Generators (7000W & 5000W)
- 1 Computer Service
- 10 Computer Workstations
- 4 Printers

Townsend

- 5 Ford Crown Victoria
- 1 Ford Explorer
- 2 Ford 500
- 1 Ford Taurus
- 1 Communications Console
- 4 Mobile Computers
- 1 Kohler Generator
- 1 SMART Radar Enforcement Unit
- 1 Partner Telephone System
- 8 Kenwood Cruiser Radios, 8 Portable, 1 Tower Repeater
- 1 Computer Network, Hardware, Backup
- 2 Data 911 Mobile Units
- 8 IMG Workstations, w/ Software
- 1 All Terrain Vehicle
- 1 Radio Tower
- Write-Line Disp. Console Furniture
- Zetron Dispatch Consoles
- Trans-Core AVL System
- Video/DVR System
- Door Security System
- CJIS System

*As provided by Town Administrator

Acknowledgements

This report was prepared by the
Department of Revenue, Division of Local Services:

Robert G. Nunes, Deputy Commissioner & Director of Municipal Affairs

Frederick E. Kingsley, Bureau Chief
Municipal Data Management and Technical Assistance Bureau

Zack Blake, Project Manager, Technical Assistance Section

In preparing this review,
DLS interviewed or received information from the following individuals and town personnel:

Town of Ashby

Linda Sanders, Former Town Administrator
Edward Drew, Interim Chief of Police
Nancy Hines, Town Accountant
Kate Stacy, Town Treasurer

Town of Townsend

Greg Barnes, Town Administrator
Erving Marshall Jr., Chief of Police
David Profit, Lieutenant
Diane Babineau, Senior Telecommunicator
Donna Souza, Administrative Assistant
Kim Fales, Town Accountant
Kathleen Rossbach, Treasurer and Collector