

COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES

980 NINTH STREET, SUITE 300
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
PHONE: (916) 323-3562
FAX: (916) 445-0278
E-mail: csminfo@csm.ca.gov



March 27, 2009

Ms. Nancy Gust
County of Sacramento
711 G Street
Sacramento, Ca 95814

Ms. Ginny Brummels
State Controller's Office
Division of Accounting & Reporting
3301 C Street, Suite 500
Sacramento, CA 95816

And Affected State Agencies and Interested Parties (See Enclosed Mailing List)


RE: Adopted Statewide Cost Estimate
Racial Profiling: Law Enforcement Training (01-TC-01)
Statutes of 2000, Chapter 684
County of Sacramento, Claimant

Dear Ms. Gust and Ms. Brummels:

On March 27, 2009, the Commission on State Mandates adopted the statewide cost estimate of \$9,175,357 for the above-named program. This amount will be included in our next Report to the Legislature.


Please contact Nancy Patton at (916) 323-8217 if you have questions.

Sincerely,


PAULA HIGASHI
Executive Director

Enclosure

J:mandates/2001/01tc01/corres/adoptscetrans



Adopted: March 27, 2009

STATEWIDE COST ESTIMATE

Penal Code Section 13519.4
Statutes 2000, Chapter 684

Racial Profiling: Law Enforcement Training
01-TC-01

County of Sacramento, Claimant

Test Claim Filed: August 13, 2001

Reimbursement Period for this Estimate: July 1, 2000 through June 30, 2005

Eligible Claimants: Any city, county, or city and county,

The statewide cost estimate includes five fiscal years for a total of **\$9,175,357** for the *Racial Profiling: Law Enforcement Training* program. Following is a breakdown of estimated total costs per fiscal year:

Fiscal Year	Number of Claims Filed with SCO	Estimated Cost
2000-2001	1	\$ 4,292
2001-2002	10	\$ 70,053
2002-2003	68	\$2,764,216
2003-2004	95	\$6,210,441
2004-2005	13	\$ 126,355
TOTAL	187	\$9,175,357

Summary of the Mandate

This test claim statute prohibits law enforcement officers from engaging in racial profiling and establishes racial profiling training requirements for law enforcement officers, with the curriculum developed by the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST).

The Commission on State Mandates (Commission) adopted the Statement of Decision for the *Racial Profiling: Law Enforcement Training* program (01-TC-01). The Commission found that the test claim statute constitutes a new program or higher level of service and imposes a state-mandated program on local agencies within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6, of the California Constitution and Government Code section 17514.

The Commission further found that Penal Code section 13519.5, subdivision (i), which requires the two-hour refresher racial profiling training, does not impose a reimbursable state-mandated program on local agencies within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution and Government Code section 17514, because it does not impose "costs mandated by the state."

The claimant filed the test claim on August 13, 2001. The Commission adopted a Statement of Decision on October 26, 2006 and the parameters and guidelines on March 28, 2008. Eligible claimants were required to file initial reimbursement claims with the State Controller's Office (SCO) by October 1, 2008, and late claims by October 1, 2009.

Reimbursable Activities

The Commission approved reimbursement for *up to five hours* of initial racial profiling training for incumbent law enforcement officers under the following conditions.

1. the training is provided to incumbent law enforcement officers who completed basic training on or before January 1, 2004;
2. the training is certified by POST;
3. the training is attended during the officer's regular work hours, or training is attended outside the officer's regular work hours *and* there is an obligation imposed by an MOU existing on January 1, 2001, which requires that the local agency pay for continuing education training; and
4. the training causes the officer to exceed his or her 24-hour continuing education requirement, when the two-year continuing education cycle that included the initial five-hour racial profiling training occurs between January 1, 2002 and July 2004, and the continuing education for that cycle was attended *prior to* the initial racial profiling course.

Statewide Cost Estimate

Staff reviewed the claims data submitted by 100 cities and 18 counties and cities and compiled by the SCO. The actual claims data showed that 187 claims were filed between fiscal years 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 for a total of \$9,175,357.¹ Based on this data, staff made the following assumptions and used the following methodology to develop a statewide cost estimate for this program.

Assumptions

1. *The actual amount claimed for reimbursement may increase if late or amended claims are filed.*

There are 480 cities and 58 counties in California. Of those, only 118 filed reimbursement claims for this program. If other eligible claimants file reimbursement claims or late or amended claims are filed, the amount of reimbursement claims may exceed the statewide cost estimate.

However, under this program, reimbursement is only authorized for training incumbent peace officers who completed the training between 2002 and 2004. No reimbursement claims have been filed for any fiscal years after 2004-2005. Therefore, it is unlikely that further claims will be filed.

2. *Non-claiming local agencies did not file claims because: (1) they did not incur more than \$1000 in increased costs for this program; (2) did not have supporting documentation to file a reimbursement claim; or (3) did not complete the training within the prescribed time period.*

This program limits reimbursement for incumbent peace officers who complete basic training prior to 2004, and who complete their 24-hour education requirements including racial profiling training, between 2002 and 2004. Therefore, while many local agencies may have provided racial profile training to all of their peace officers, only a limited number of local

¹ Claims data reported as of December 8, 2008.

agencies met these narrow criteria and were eligible for reimbursement for a select number of peace officers.

3. *Claimants will not need to train new peace officers employed after January 1, 2004 under this program, because racial profiling training was included as part of their basic training on that date.*
4. *There is a wide variation in costs among claimants.*

There is a wide variation in costs among claimants. For example, the City of Fairfield with 127 peace officers claimed approximately \$8,000, while the City of Orange, with 167 peace officers, claimed almost \$60,000. Following is a table showing a sample of claimants and their claimed amounts:

Table 1. COMPARISON OF COSTS CLAIMED

City or County	Number of Peace Officers Employed	Amount of Reimbursement Claim
City of Fairfield	127	\$ 8,041
City of Orange	162	\$ 59,928
City of Los Angeles	9,538	\$3,817,668
County of Los Angeles	9,278	\$1,569,364
City of Corona	181	\$ 9,199
City of Hayward	194	\$ 41,388
County of Santa Barbara	309	\$ 59,570
County of San Joaquin	296	\$ 94,195

The amount claimed for reimbursement varied among claimants with like numbers of peace officers because:

- Claimants had varying numbers of peace officers who completed the training prior to 2004.
- Claimants had varying numbers of peace officers who completed their continuing education requirements between 2002 and 2004.
- According to claimant representatives, some claimants chose not to train all peace officers.

5. *Because of the wide variation in costs claimed, an SCO audit of this program may be conducted.*
6. *The total amount of reimbursement for this program may be lower than the statewide cost estimate, because the SCO may reduce any reimbursement claim for this program.*

If the SCO audits this program and deems any reimbursement claim to be excessive or unreasonable, it may be reduced.

Methodology

Fiscal Years 2000-2001 through 2004-2005

The statewide cost estimate for fiscal years 2000-2001 through 2004-2005 was developed by totaling the 187 unaudited actual reimbursement claims filed with the SCO for these years.

No projections for future fiscal years were included because this program should have been completed on or before fiscal year 2004-2005.

The statewide cost estimate includes five fiscal years for a total of \$9,175,357. This averages to \$1,835,071 annually in costs for the state for this five-year period.

Conclusion

The Commission adopted the statewide cost estimate of **\$9,175,357** for costs incurred in complying with the *Racial Profiling: Law Enforcement Training* program.

Commission on State Mandates

Original List Date: 8/13/2001
Last Updated: 4/26/2007
List Print Date: 03/27/2009
Claim Number: 01-TC-01
Issue: Racial Profiling: Law Enforcement Training

Mailing Information: Notice of Adopted SCE

Mailing List

Related Matter(s)

02-TC-05 Racial Profiling: Law Enforcement Training (K-14)

TO ALL PARTIES AND INTERESTED PARTIES:

Each commission mailing list is continuously updated as requests are received to include or remove any party or person on the mailing list. A current mailing list is provided with commission correspondence, and a copy of the current mailing list is available upon request at any time. Except as provided otherwise by commission rule, when a party or interested party files any written material with the commission concerning a claim, it shall simultaneously serve a copy of the written material on the parties and interested parties to the claim identified on the mailing list provided by the commission. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 1181.2.)

Mr. Jim Spano

State Controller's Office (B-08)
Division of Audits
300 Capitol Mall, Suite 518
Sacramento, CA 95814

Tel: (916) 323-5849

Fax: (916) 327-0832

Ms. Jean Kinney Hurst

California State Association of Counties
1100 K Street, Suite 101
Sacramento, CA 95814-3941

Tel: (916) 327-7500

Fax: (916) 441-5507

Ms. Susan Geanacou

Department of Finance (A-15)
915 L Street, Suite 1280
Sacramento, CA 95814

Tel: (916) 445-3274

Fax: (916) 449-5252

Mr. Dan Metzler

Sacramento Co. Sheriff's Department
711 G Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Tel: (916) 874-5350

Fax: (916) 875-0082

Mr. David Wellhouse

David Wellhouse & Associates, Inc.
9175 Kiefer Blvd, Suite 121
Sacramento, CA 95826

Tel: (916) 368-9244

Fax: (916) 368-5723

Mr. Allan Burdick

MAXIMUS
3130 Kilgore Road, Suite 400

Tel: (916) 471-5538

Fax: (916) 366-4838

Mr. Leonard Kaye
County of Los Angeles
Auditor-Controller's Office
500 W. Temple Street, Room 603
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Tel: (213) 974-9791
Fax: (213) 617-8106

Ms. Annette Chinn
Cost Recovery Systems, Inc.
705-2 East Bidwell Street, #294
Folsom, CA 95630

Tel: (916) 939-7901
Fax: (916) 939-7801

Ms. Nancy Gust
County of Sacramento
711 G Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Tel: (916) 874-6032
Fax: (916) 874-5263

Mr. J. Bradley Burgess
Public Resource Management Group
895 La Sierra Drive
Sacramento, CA 95864

Tel: (916)595-2646
Fax:

Mr. Glen Everroad
City of Newport Beach
3300 Newport Blvd.
P. O. Box 1768
Newport Beach, CA 92659-1768

Tel: (949) 644-3127
Fax: (949) 644-3339

Ms. Juliana F. Gmur
MAXIMUS
2380 Houston Ave
Clovis, CA 93611

Claimant Representative
Tel: (916) 485-8102
Fax: (916) 485-0111

Ms. Jolene Tollenaar
MGT of America
455 Capitol Mall, Suite 600
Sacramento, CA 95814

Tel: (916) 712-4490
Fax: (916) 290-0121

Ms. Carla Castaneda
Department of Finance (A-15)
915 L Street, 12th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

Tel: (916) 445-3274
Fax: (916) 323-9584

Ms. Marianne O'Malley
Legislative Analyst's Office (B-29)
925 L Street, Suite 1000
Sacramento, CA 95814

Tel: (916) 319-8315
Fax: (916) 324-4281

Ms. Ginny Brummels

State Controller's Office (B-08)

Division of Accounting & Reporting

3301 C Street, Suite 500

Sacramento, CA 95816

Tel: (916) 324-0256

Fax: (916) 323-6527

