



Legislation Text

File #: 24-1522, Version: 1

Department: Management and Budget  
Department Head/Elected Official: Daniel Ramos

Regular or Supplemental RCA: Regular RCA  
Type of Request: Policy

Project ID (if applicable): n/a  
Vendor/Entity Legal Name (if applicable): n/a

MWDBE Contracted Goal (if applicable): n/a  
MWDBE Current Participation (if applicable): n/a  
Justification for 0% MWDBE Participation Goal: N/A - Goal not applicable to request

Request Summary (Agenda Caption):  
Request for approval of the Contract Patrol rates for FY 2025.

Background and Discussion:

The County annually reviews and, if necessary, updates contract patrol rates to reflect actual costs in accordance with Local Government Code 351.062 which requires the contract fees to recover 100% of the county’s cost. Historically, the contract rate has been based on the county’s direct cost of salary, benefits, vehicles, fuel, equipment and supplies with no indirect cost recovery for support services provided by departments such as Universal Services, the County Attorney, County Auditor, and Facilities. In keeping with past practice, OMB is proposing FY25 rates based on the County’s direct costs which increased 6.6% vs. the prior year. The proposed FY25 rates are:

	FY24 Cost	FY25 Cost	% Change	Contract %	FY25 Rate
Direct Cost	\$116,400	\$124,100	6.6%	100%	\$124,100
Indirect Cost	0	0	--	80%	\$99,280
Total Cost	\$116,400	\$124,100	6.6%	70%	\$86,870

Of the 1,201 contract officers at the start of FY24, 875 are contracted at 70%, 189 are contracted at 80% and 137 are contracted at 100%. The total cost of these officers is \$140M in FY24, of which \$105M is paid by customers and \$35M is covered from general revenue.

Expected Impact:

It is unknown whether the proposed rate increase will affect the total number of patrol contracts. Assuming the same number of contracted officers, customer revenue will be \$111.6M in FY25, an increase of \$6.9M.

**Alternative Options:**

The Court could increase rates up to an additional 7% to cover the County’s indirect costs.

Or the Court could freeze rates and absorb the \$6.9M in additional costs.

**Alignment with Goal(s):**

- Justice and Safety
- Economic Opportunity
- Housing
- Public Health
- Transportation
- Flooding
- Environment
- Governance and Customer Service

**Prior Court Action (if any):**

Date	Agenda Item #	Action Taken
11/15/2022	34	Passed

**Location:**

Address (if applicable): n/a

Precinct(s): Countywide

Fiscal and Personnel Summary				
Service Name	Current Fiscal Year Cost			Annual Fiscal Cost
	Labor	Non-Labor	Total	Recurring Expense
<b>Funding Sources</b>				
<b>Existing Budget</b>				
Choose an item.	\$	\$	\$	\$
Choose an item.	\$	\$	\$	\$
Choose an item.	\$	\$	\$	\$
Total Current Budget	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>Additional Budget Request (Requires Fiscal Review Request Form)</b>				
Choose an item.	\$	\$	\$	\$
Choose an item.	\$	\$	\$	\$
Choose an item.	\$	\$	\$	\$
Total Additional Budget Request	\$	\$	\$	\$

<b>Total Funding Request</b>	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>Personnel</b> (Fill out section only if requesting new PCNs)				
Current Position Count for Service	-	-	-	-
Additional Positions Request	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Personnel</b>	-	-	-	-

**Anticipated Court Date:** March 26, 2024

**Anticipated Implementation Date (if different from Court date):** October 1, 2024

**Emergency/Disaster Recovery Note:** Not an emergency, disaster, or COVID-19 related item

**Contact(s) name, title, department:** Daniel Ramos, Executive Director, Office of Management and Budget

**Attachments** (if applicable): none