

2018
SC Highway Patrol
Personnel Allocation Study



South Carolina
Department of Public Safety

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PERSONNEL ALLOCATION MODEL EXECUTIVE SUMMARYPAGES 3 - 11

APPENDIX A - STATEWIDE PERSONNEL ALLOCATION MODEL.....PAGES 12 - 14

APPENDIX B - STATEWIDE PERSONNEL ALLOCATION COMPARISON.....PAGE 15

TROOP 1 PERSONNEL ALLOCATION MODEL SUMMARY.....PAGES 16 - 20

TROOP 2 PERSONNEL ALLOCATION MODEL SUMMARY.....PAGES 21 - 25

TROOP 3 PERSONNEL ALLOCATION MODEL SUMMARY.....PAGES 26 - 31

TROOP 4 PERSONNEL ALLOCATION MODEL SUMMARY.....PAGES 32 - 37

TROOP 5 PERSONNEL ALLOCATION MODEL SUMMARY.....PAGES 38 - 43

TROOP 6 PERSONNEL ALLOCATION MODEL SUMMARY.....PAGES 44 - 48

TROOP 7 PERSONNEL ALLOCATION MODEL SUMMARY.....PAGES 49 - 54

TROOP 8 PERSONNEL ALLOCATION MODEL SUMMARY.....PAGES 55 - 58

TROOP 9 PERSONNEL ALLOCATION MODEL SUMMARY.....PAGES 59 - 62

TROOP 10 PERSONNEL ALLOCATION MODEL SUMMARY.....PAGES 63 - 67

TROOP 11 PERSONNEL ALLOCATION MODEL SUMMARY.....PAGES 68 - 87

TROOP 11 - TRAINING UNIT.....PAGES 68 - 70

TROOP 11 - CRO/RECRUITING UNIT.....PAGES 71 - 73

TROOP 11 - SPECIAL OPERATIONS UNIT.....PAGES 74 - 76

TROOP 11 - EMPLOYMENT UNIT.....PAGES 77 - 80

TROOP 11 - TELECOMMUNICATIONS UNIT.....PAGES 81 -83

TROOP 11 - EMERGENCY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT UNIT.....PAGES 84 - 85

TROOP 11 - RESOURCE MANAGEMENT UNIT.....PAGES 86 - 87



South Carolina Highway Patrol

Personnel Allocation Study

August 13, 2018

Executive Summary

The South Carolina Highway Patrol (SCHP) has historically determined the need for and assignment of personnel in direct relationship to supporting its core mission of ensuring public safety through traffic law enforcement and collision investigation. To gauge the need for personnel, the SCHP tracks critical data that is linked to driving behavior – i.e. collision totals, traffic violations, enforcement trends, etc. – and compares this against existing personnel allocation within its Troops and Units; for example, personnel needs are considered greatest in operational areas where demands for services are high and staffing levels are low. In promoting the effective use of personnel resources, the Patrol manages work expectations of individual employees by establishing and assessing performance based job requirements through the state’s Employee Performance Management System (EPMS). The work objectives outlined in the EPMS not only represent expectations for individual performance, but, more importantly, establish priority of effort in achieving the Patrol’s overarching goals of promoting highway safety.

In assessing both driving trends and the allocation of work effort among SCHP personnel, recent data illustrates five distinctive patterns:

- Total population, licensed drivers, registered motor vehicles, and road miles are increasing statewide on average.
- Total time spent investigating collisions is increasing.
- Total time spent on special duties is increasing.
- Total work effort associated with collision investigation and special duties is detracting from work effort directed towards traffic enforcement.
- Required staffing levels based on work load must be effectively determined to offset the difference in effort applied to collision investigation and special duties with traffic enforcement.

These factors clearly demonstrate that personnel allocations must be periodically reassessed to maintain the intended priority of effort.

Developing a Personnel Allocation Model

Prior to outlining the methodology for assigning current resource needs, it is important to acknowledge past efforts in establishing the Patrol's personnel requirements. According to the *SCHP Field Operations Manpower Allocation Plan (2002)*, the Patrol utilized variations of the Traffic Institute of Northwestern University (NUTI) model to establish an accurate mathematical calculation for staffing needs "based on an analysis of workload requirements and performance objectives, measured in time, associated with major field activities." These efforts, which were conducted at various points from the late 1990's through the early 2000's, resulted in projected staffing requirements between 1,156 total commissioned officers and 1,355 total commissioned officers.¹ Although this approach to identifying personnel needs relied heavily on precise quantifiable measures, the same plan acknowledged a number of notable limitations that included:

- The model cannot account for inaccurate or incomplete data.
- The model cannot operate in the absence of managerial direction especially in prioritizing desired services.
- The model cannot predict future work demands.
- The model cannot anticipate fiscal limitations.

With these limitations in mind, a review was conducted in 2017 that utilized a qualitative based approach that relied on the collective experience of senior Highway Patrol leadership to analyze and interpret critical data sets (i.e. work times, enforcement activity, collisions worked, population trends, etc.) and use this information to give context to their experiential understanding of public service demands and associated resource requirements within their respective areas of operation. This study focused on effectively distributing a fixed number of personnel based on available budget. According to information originally developed by the SCHP's budget office in 2015, the Patrol's staffing levels were primarily determined by appropriated funding from the General Assembly. The SCHP budget office determined the Patrol's average annual budget could reasonably support 850 total personnel, which was based on the standard annual expenditures associated with paying and equipping all uniformed personnel in FTE's. It was assumed that this remained a sustainable number given budgetary conditions and priorities. For the purpose of maintaining operational continuity and given past reliance on budgeted funds for determining personnel availability, the number of 850 total FTE's was used to assign a consistent number of available personnel among the respective Troops.

A similar process of qualitative analysis served as the basis for conducting this PAM study. However, the fixed number of FTE's was not considered and the outcome of this approach provided exact numbers of enforcement personnel required to perform critical work tasks in each of the SCHP's Troops, Posts and Units.²

PAM Study Methodology

The SCHP is committed to the reduction of highway fatalities through the systematic analysis of crash data and the orchestrated implementation of law enforcement countermeasures to address the

¹ It must be noted that the most recent calculation of Patrol staffing requirements utilizing similar methodology was done in 2014 and resulted in a projected need of 1,082 commissioned officers.

² This model relied on the use of specific enforcement and demographical data in determining the number personnel assigned to Troops 1-7 tasked with law enforcement work functions as detailed by their EPMS. The required number of administrative and support personnel assigned to Troops 8-11 was determined by the same methodology, but data specific to their work requirements as outlined in the 2017 SCHP Annual Report was employed to support these outcomes.

most common contributors to fatal crashes: Driving Under the Influence (DUI), speeding, and seatbelt noncompliance. The Highway Patrol, which is primarily responsible for the enforcement of South Carolina's traffic laws, is organized in conglomerates of counties (or Posts) divided among the seven geographical regions (or Troops). This organization allows for the efficient use of available staffing by directing resources to areas that are proven, through systematic data analysis, to have the highest calls-for-service and the highest incidents of both high risk driving behavior and motor vehicle fatalities. Troop Commanders are responsible for conducting regular assessments of fatality trends within their areas of operation and comparing these movements against the enforcement countermeasures employed during the same period. This information is compiled into reports that are presented at periodic briefings among the Patrol's Command Staff for the purpose of collectively considering effectiveness and for discussing alternative and/or innovative tactics. In addition, this process allows for the identification of staffing requirements and deficiencies relative to enforcement needs.

For the purpose of both establishing work related objectives and managing personnel expectations, the Patrol utilizes the EPMS. The current EPMS for SCHP personnel primarily assigned to enforcement duties outlines the ideal priority of effort into what can be defined as three broad categories:

- Traffic Enforcement
- Collision Investigation
- Other Duties (i.e. Court, Training, Administrative, etc.)

It must be noted that the work duties assigned by the Patrol's EPMS are not derived from a validated job task analysis, but are supported by the collective experience of the Patrol's supervisory personnel. Therefore, assigned weights will not be correlated with staffing deficiencies; however, the objectives will be used in defining the shifting trends in priority of effort (e.g. more time spent in collision investigation and special duties than traffic enforcement).

An analysis of the data associated with time spent by Highway Patrol personnel in performing the listed duties from FY 2013 through FY 2017 shows that the number of patrol hours has consistently declined while the number of accident investigation hours has increased; in addition, the number of special duty hours, which are not explicitly assigned by the EPMS, have also increased. In order to restore a desired balance between efforts expended in collision investigation and special duties with the effort expended in traffic enforcement, the number of personnel assigned to the Highway Patrol must be effectively determined. The process for calculating these resources consisted of a review by SCHP command level personnel to assess the needs of the individual Troops based on current staffing and available staffing and the capacity of the respective Troops for delivering essential services given current trends in time allocation to critical areas: patrol, collision investigation, and special duty. This process represented the means for constructing and maintaining the SCHP's official personnel allocation model (PAM) and, for the purpose of this study, was supported by the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) THIRA/SPR process.

THIRA/SPR

The Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA) is a tool developed and utilized by FEMA to assist local communities in better understanding their vulnerabilities to likely threats in comparison to their capabilities to respond. There are three essential questions that guide the THIRA process:

- What threats and hazards can affect our community?
- If they occurred, what impacts would those threats and hazards have on our community?
- Based on those impacts, what capabilities should our community have?

The Stakeholder Preparedness Review (SPR) is used by FEMA to guide communities in analyzing their response capabilities against established Federal standards and, as a result, identify capability gaps.³

Applying THIRA/SPR to PAM

In providing for a more systematic application of the Patrol's experienced based methodology for identifying priority of effort and allocating required resources for delivering essential traffic safety and law enforcement services, a modified version of the THIRA/SPR process was applied. The THIRA/SPR portion of PAM development consisted of the following steps:

- **Identify Threats and Hazards of Concern:** Groups of subject matter experts – Troop Commanders, Troop Lieutenants, and Post First Sergeants/Sergeants – from each Troop and Unit were assembled to assess critical data relative to calls for service, enforcement activity, etc. and identify the most significant threats to their respective Troops (i.e. increased fatalities against decreased enforcement).
- **Give Threats and Hazards Context:** The groups were asked to explain how the identified threat(s) impact their Troop or Unit and the challenges for adequately meeting those threat(s) (i.e. increased collisions have economic and emotional impacts on the community and lack of personnel undermines the ability to respond with this threat with both enforcement and education initiatives).
- **Establish Capability Targets:** The groups were asked to identify the desired capabilities to adequately address the threat (i.e. an increase of 25 personnel for the Troop will decrease response times and increase enforcement activity).
- **Assess Capabilities:** The groups were asked to evaluate the current capabilities of their respective Troops and Units and establish context with past capabilities (i.e. current staffing levels are significantly below historic staffing levels especially in light of increased demands of calls for service, requirements for training and special assignments, etc.).
- **Identify Capability Gaps and Intended Approaches to Address Them:** The groups were asked to determine the extent of the capability gap and identify the required resources to fill that gap (i.e. the current complement of personnel provides for this level of staffing during a typical shift – accounting for leave, training, specials, etc. – and this level of staffing will provide adequate coverage). This included the specific number of personnel required to effectively staff the entire Troop by Post as well as each Unit.
- **Describe the Impacts of Funding Sources:** Based on the total number of required personnel, an estimated cost for additional personnel will be developed by SCDPS Office of Finance and Budget.⁴

³ Federal Emergency Management Agency (2018): Retrieved from <https://www.fema.gov/threat-and-hazard-identification-and-risk-assessment> and <https://www.fema.gov/stakeholder-preparedness-review>

⁴ Federal Emergency Management Agency: *Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA) and Stakeholder Preparedness Review (SPR) Guide Comprehensive Preparedness Guide (CPG) 201 3rd Edition (2018).*

In conducting the THIRA/SPR assessment, the respective groups utilized data provided in the attachments to this document.⁵ It must be noted, however, that groups were not limited to these data sources and were encouraged to utilize all available and applicable data.

Study Outcomes

Adhering to the THIRA/SPR process, meetings were conducted with each of the Highway Patrol's Troops and Units. The meetings included command level personnel – primarily Captains, Lieutenants, and First Sergeants – and were facilitated by a Highway Patrol Major with a Captain or Lieutenant serving as the recorder. Each meeting began with the facilitator explaining the purpose and format of the meeting and preceded with the participants first being asked to individually consider and formulate responses to each portion of the THIRA/SPR and then engaging in a facilitated group discussion of their responses. The recorder maintained detailed minutes of each meeting that are provided in the included attachments to this document. The following represents a summary of the key findings from the Troops 1-7 meetings and the Troops 8-11 meetings.

Troops 1-7

Meetings among the geographically assigned enforcement sections of the Highway Patrol (Troops 1-7) were conducted at the respective Troop Headquarters. The participants of these meetings had an average of 23 years of service with the Highway Patrol and an average of 11.56 years of experience as supervisors. The most dominant concerns expressed by participants from the enforcement Troops were the increasing demands for traffic enforcement services against the backdrop of lower staffing levels. There was significant agreement among the groups that the major threats facing the enforcement Troops are increasing population, greater levels of traffic congestion, growing volumes of calls for service, more demands from special assignments, and inadequate staffing numbers. As a result of these issues, the participants consistently emphasized that they are confronted by the following challenges:

- An inability to provide a timely response to calls-for-service especially in more remote and less populated areas of their Troops and Posts.
- An increase in traffic congestion and secondary collision frequency due to longer response times to Interstate collisions.
- Diminished Interstate coverage especially with regard to providing timely assistance to disabled motorists.
- An inability to conduct proactive traffic enforcement throughout their Troops and Posts.
- Diminished quality of collision investigations due to demands associated with increased response times.
- Concerns for officer safety resulting from fewer personnel covering large geographic areas.

Retrieved from https://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/1527613746699-fa31d9ade55988da1293192f1b18f4e3/CPG201Final20180525_508c.pdf

⁵ The data provided in the included attachments is taken from the 2015, 2016 and 2017 SCHP Annual Reports.

- An increase in dangerous driving behaviors due to a diminished perception of risk among the public particularly in more remote and less populated areas of their Troops and Posts.
- Loss of public confidence due to longer response times and less enforcement visibility.
- Needs for higher staffing levels in order to fill gaps and restore a sufficient level of traffic enforcement services.

While not captured in the data provided for their consideration during the meetings, concerns offered by the groups regarding increased traffic congestion, longer response times, and greater collision severity are supported by other quantitative data. Higher traffic volumes are commonly experienced throughout South Carolina. The South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT) data relative to Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) from the years 2013 to 2017 shows a 16% increase in VMT on Interstate highways alone.⁶ As for longer response times, data gathered from the SCDPS's Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) system reflects a consistent increase in collision response times from a low of 17 minutes to a high of 19 minutes during the five year period from 2013 to 2017.⁷ (Although this increase is seemingly small, the practice among Highway Patrol supervisors of assigning personnel to more populated areas with higher call volumes likely minimized the increase against much longer response times to calls in more remote areas.) The issue of greater crash severity – especially in less populated and more remote areas with a diminished Highway Patrol presence – is supported by data from the SCDPS Office of Highway Safety, which indicates that the fatality rate relative to VMT in small counties is often higher in comparison to larger counties.⁸

The groups assessed and discussed their effectiveness in meeting these concerns and challenges with their current staffing levels. They focused on their daily experiences in managing a typical work schedule and from this identified shortfalls and determined the most effective staffing level for bridging these operational gaps. Although some consideration was given to historic peaks in staffing numbers within the various operational areas, there was significant consensus among the respective groups that more efficient resource management and greater accountability in personnel supervision as well as advancements in computer technology limits the needed increases in personnel.

Troops 8-11

Meetings among the Headquarters Troops of the Highway Patrol (Troops 8-11) were conducted at SCDPS Headquarters. The participants of these meetings had an average of 23.47 years of service with the Highway Patrol and an average of 12.58 years of experience as supervisors. The most dominant concerns expressed by participants from these Headquarters Troops were the increasing demands for specialized enforcement services and the anticipated need for greater support to the enforcement Troops.

- Troop 8 – which is assigned responsibility for specialized enforcement through work zone safety, targeted enforcement along high fatality highways, motorcycle enforcement, and criminal interdiction – outlined the need for increased staffing in anticipation of expanded road

⁶ SCDOT Traffic Engineering Road Data Services, Interstate Mileage (Existing) VMT and DMVT by Route: 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017

⁷ SCDPS Computer Aided Dispatch, CAD Average Response Times by Call Type by Troop: 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017.

⁸ South Carolina Traffic Collision Fact Book 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016. Retrieved from http://www.scdps.gov/ohsjp/stat_services.asp

construction, higher fatality rates with population growth and increased traffic volumes, greater need for motorcycle enforcement on more heavily congested highways, and more demand for criminal interdiction especially with the Opioid epidemic.

- Troop 9, which oversees collision reconstruction, anticipated the need for expanded support to complex investigations as the number of registered motor vehicles increases and the level of congestion grows.
- Troop 10 (Insurance Enforcement Unit) expected a corresponding increase in uninsured motorists as the population and number of vehicles increases and a need for more personnel to address this issue.
- Troop 10 (Central Evidence Facility) expected an increase in evidence collected/seized as enforcement efforts increased with population growth and a need for more personnel to address this issue.
- Troop 11 (Training Unit) anticipated an increased need for permanently assigned instructors in order to accommodate basic, in-service, and advanced training requirements with a growing Highway Patrol.
- Troop 11 (Community Relations Office) expected a need for additional personnel as the demand for traffic education and media services grows with an expanding population and the corresponding market growth in traffic information.
- Troop 11 (Special Operations) explained a need for expanded staffing based on population growth and the expectation that such growth will likely include a need for civil disturbance response capabilities. In addition, it is expected that, as the Highway Patrol expands, requirements for specialized training – patrol rifle, active shooter response, mobile field force, etc. – will also expand.
- Troop 11 (Employment Unit) anticipated required staffing growth with the expectation of having to process a larger number of applicants to accommodate an expanding Highway Patrol.
- Troop 11 (Telecommunications Unit) outlined a need for more Telecommunications Operators in order to effectively handle anticipated increases in call volumes due to population growth and increase radio traffic resulting from more enforcement personnel assigned to increased calls-for-service. **(The personnel requirements for the Telecommunications Unit included 204 civilian employees – Telecommunication Operators and administrative personnel – which are not represented in the totals of this PAM.)**
- Troop 11 (Emergency Traffic Management Unit) anticipated a need for more emergency planners in order effectively address expanded evacuation requirements as populations grow around existing hazards – coastal areas, fixed nuclear facilities, dams, etc. – and as increasing traffic congestion necessitates more aggressive traffic incident management strategies.
- Troop 11 (Resource Management) outlined a need for additional personnel to support the equipment needs – radios, weapons, vehicles, facilities, etc. – of a growing Highway Patrol.

- Troop 11 (Liaison Unit), which has traditionally included the Department of Education Liaison and the Executive Protection Detail, was not identified as requiring additional personnel.
- Troop 11 (Executive Command Staff) consists of the Colonel, Lt. Colonel, Region I Major, Region II Major, Operations Support Major, and Administrative Support Major. These positions are fully staffed and were not identified as needing additional personnel.

State Level Review

After the Troop/Unit meetings, a final review of the estimated personnel allocation number was conducted by the SCHP Executive Command Staff. The purpose of this review was to assess the PAM study from the perspective of statewide common operating picture and ensure the consistent and efficient distribution of personnel. This state level review specifically considered the following factors:

- Consistent assignment of personnel among Posts of similar size and other similar enforcement activity and calls for service;
- Efficient application of enforcement, investigative, and administrative resources from Troops 8, 9, and 10 to more effectively support the enforcement troops and to enhance statewide operational coordination.
- Impacts of technology – especially from increased computer capabilities such as individually issued laptops, mobile CAD, and case management software – on field operations.
- Likely budgetary limitations associated with expanding staffing levels.

As a result of this review, the following adjustments were made to the PAM study and are represented in the Statewide Personnel Allocation Model (Appendix A).

- The numbers of personnel assigned to Posts of similar size and with similar work demands were adjusted to comparable staffing levels.
- The geographic distribution of Troops 8, 9, and 10 personnel was changed from regional to Troop based allocations in order to promote greater responsiveness to and cooperation with the enforcement Troops. However, these personnel remain under the operational control of Troops 8, 9, and 10 commanders.
- Adjustments were made to Troop 11 units to ensure a more efficient delivery of support requirements – training, logistics, and public information – to the field Troops.

Based on this PAM process, the following recommended total allocated personnel (1300 uniformed personnel) was developed and agreed upon by the Troop/Unit Commanders and the Executive Command Staff:

- Troop 1 – 167 personnel
- Troop 2 – 98 personnel
- Troop 3 – 214 personnel
- Troop 4 – 144 personnel
- Troop 5 – 177 personnel
- Troop 6 – 131 personnel
- Troop 7 – 108 personnel

Total (Enforcement Troops): 1,039 personnel

- Troop 8 – 121 personnel
- Troop 9 – 33 personnel
- Troop 10 – 37 personnel
- Troop 11 – 70 personnel

Total (Support Troops): 261 personnel

Total (All Troops): 1300 personnel⁹

⁹ A comparison of the personnel allocated based on the budgeted number of 850 FTE's (budget based) and the allocation developed from this PAM study (needs based) is outlined in Appendix B.

Appendix A: Statewide Personnel Allocation Model (FINAL)

ALLOCATED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TROOP 1	136	16	7	4	3	1
A -Sumter/Clarendon	26	4	1	1	0	0
B -Kershaw/Lee	24	4	1	1	0	0
C -Lexington	36	4	2	1	0	0
D -Richland	50	4	2	1	0	0
Troop 1 Headquarters	0	0	1	0	3	1

ALLOCATED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TROOP 2	74	12	5	3	3	1
A -Laurens/Newberry	32	4	2	1	0	0
B -Abbeville/Greenwood	24	4	1	1	0	0
C -Edgefield/McCormick/Saluda	18	4	1	1	0	0
Troop 2 Headquarters	0	0	1	0	3	1

ALLOCATED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TROOP 3	178	20	8	4	3	1
A -Anderson	36	4	2	1	0	0
B -Oconee/Pickens	28	4	1	1	0	0
C -Greenville	68	8	2	1	0	0
D -Spartanburg	46	4	2	1	0	0
Troop 3 Headquarters	0	0	1	0	3	1

ALLOCATED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TROOP 4	114	16	6	4	3	1
A -Cherokee/Union	26	4	1	1	0	0
B -York	36	4	2	1	0	0
C -Chester/Fairfield	24	4	1	1	0	0
D -Chesterfield/Lancaster	28	4	1	1	0	0
Troop 4 Headquarters	0	0	1	0	3	1

ALLOCATED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TROOP 5	146	16	7	4	3	1
A -Darlington/Marlboro	28	4	1	1	0	0
B -Dillion/Florence/Marion	38	4	2	1	0	0
C -Georgetown/Williamsburg	30	4	1	1	0	0
D -Horry	50	4	2	1	0	0
Troop 5 Headquarters	0	0	1	0	3	1

ALLOCATED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TROOP 6	106	12	6	3	3	1
A -Berkeley/Charleston	40	4	2	1	0	0
B -Colleton/Dorchester	36	4	2	1	0	0
C -Beaufort/Jasper	30	4	1	1	0	0
Troop 6 Headquarters	0	0	1	0	3	1

ALLOCATED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TROOP 7	84	12	5	3	3	1
A -Allendale/Barnwell/Bamberg/Hampton	18	4	1	1	0	0
B -Calhoun/Orangeburg	36	4	2	1	0	0
C -Aiken	30	4	1	1	0	0
Troop 7 Headquarters	0	0	1	0	3	1

ALLOCATED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TROOP 8	101	12*	4**	1	2	1
SIT – Troop 1	8	1	0	0	0	0
SIT – Troop 2	4	1	0	0	0	0
SIT – Troop 3	8	1	0	0	0	0
SIT – Troop 4	4	1	0	0	0	0
SIT – Troop 5	8	1	0	0	0	0
SIT – Troop 6	5	1	0	0	0	0
SIT – Troop 7	4	1	0	0	0	0
Target Zero – Troop 1	4	0	0	0	0	0
Target Zero – Troop 2	2	0	0	0	0	0
Target Zero – Troop 3	4	0	0	0	0	0
Target Zero – Troop 4	3	0	0	0	0	0
Target Zero – Troop 5	4	0	0	0	0	0
Target Zero – Troop 6	3	0	0	0	0	0
Target Zero – Troop 7	2	0	0	0	0	0
Motor Units – Troop 1	4	0	0	0	0	0
Motor Units – Troop 2	2	0	0	0	0	0
Motor Units – Troop 3	4	0	0	0	0	0
Motor Units – Troop 4	2	0	0	0	0	0
Motor Units – Troop 5	4	0	0	0	0	0
Motor Units – Troop 6	4	0	0	0	0	0
Motor Units – Troop 7	2	0	0	0	0	0
CIU – Troop 1	2	0	0	0	0	0
CIU – Troop 2	2	0	0	0	0	0
CIU – Troop 3	2	0	0	0	0	0
CIU – Troop 4	2	0	0	0	0	0
CIU – Troop 5	4	0	0	0	0	0
CIU – Troop 6	2	0	0	0	0	0
CIU – Troop 7	2	0	0	0	0	0
Troop 8 Headquarters	0	5*	4**	1	2	1

*Two Corporals will supervise Target Zero personnel in Regions 1 and 2 respectively and two Corporals will supervise Motor Unit personnel in Regions 1 and 2 respectively. One Corporal is a K-9 instructor.

**One Sergeant will supervise statewide SIT operations; one Sergeant will supervise statewide Target Zero and Motor Unit Operations; and two Sergeants will supervise CIU personnel with in Regions 1 and 2.

ALLOCATED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TROOP 9	22	7	2*	0	1	1
MAIT – Troop 1	4	1	0	0	0	0
MAIT – Troop 2	2	1	0	0	0	0
MAIT – Troop 3	4	1	0	0	0	0
MAIT – Troop 4	2	1	0	0	0	0
MAIT – Troop 5	4	1	0	0	0	0
MAIT – Troop 6	4	1	0	0	0	0
MAIT – Troop 7	2	1	0	0	0	0
Troop 9 Headquarters	0	0	2	0	1	1

*The MAIT Sergeants will supervise personnel in Regions 1 and 2.

ALLOCATD	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TROOP 10	28	4*	2	0	2	1
Insurance Enforcement Unit – Troop 1	4	0	0	0	0	0
Insurance Enforcement Unit – Troop 2	2	0	0	0	0	0
Insurance Enforcement Unit – Troop 3	4	0	0	0	0	0
Insurance Enforcement Unit – Troop 4	4	0	0	0	0	0
Insurance Enforcement Unit – Troop 5	4	0	0	0	0	0
Insurance Enforcement Unit – Troop 6	4	0	0	0	0	0
Insurance Enforcement Unit – Troop 7	2	0	0	0	0	0
CEF – Evidence Collection	2	1	0	0	0	0
CEF – Office	2	1	1	0	1	0
Troop 10 – Headquarters	0	2	1**	0	1	1

*The IEU Corporals will supervise personnel in Regions 1 and 2.

**The IEU Sergeant will supervise statewide IEU operations.

ALLOCATED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT	MAJ	LTC	COL
TROOP 11	11	27	12	0	8	6	4	1	1
Training Unit – Advanced	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Training Unit – Basic	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Training Unit – Headquarters	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
CRO/Recruiting – CRO's	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CRO/Recruiting – Recruiters	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CRO/Recruiting – Community	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CRO/Recruiting – Headquarters	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
Special Operations	0	5	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
Employment Unit - Polygraph	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employment Unit - Background	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employment Unit - Headquarters	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Telecommunications	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
Emergency Traffic Management	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0
Resource Management	0	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	0
Liaison	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0
Troop 11 – Headquarters	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	1

Appendix B: Personnel Allocation Model Comparison

TROOPS	Budget Based PAM (850 Total)	Needs Based PAM (1300 Total)	Personnel Difference
Troop 1	106	167	+61
Troop 2	57	98	+41
Troop 3	156	214	+58
Troop 4	92	144	+52
Troop 5	149	177	+28
Troop 6	77	131	+54
Troop 7	71	108	+37
Totals (Troops 1-7)	708	1,039	+331
Troop 8	53	121	+68
Troop 9	28	33	+5
Troop 10*	8	37	+29
Troop 11	53	70	+17
Totals (Troops 8 - 11)	142	261	+119

*Note that the Troop 10 Insurance Enforcement Unit is mostly staffed with retired personnel who presently do not occupy FTE's. It is assumed that, due to changes in the retirement law, Troop 10 will be assigned FTE's in the future and this expected change primarily accounts for the increase in Troop 10 personnel.

Attachment 1: Troop 1 Personnel Allocation Model Summary

The Troop 1 Personnel Allocation Model (PAM) meeting was held on June 21, 2018. Supervisors from both the Troop Headquarters and the respective Posts – Post A (Clarendon and Sumter Counties), Post B (Kershaw and Lee Counties), Post C (Lexington County), and Post D (Richland County) – participated in the meeting. The methodology as outlined in the narrative of this report was used to guide the process. Participants were directed to individually examine the applicable data and respond to each portion of the THIRA/SPR outline. They then took part in a facilitated group discussion of their responses that resulted in a collective determination of the Troop’s staffing requirements. The following provides details of the meeting participants, their Highway Patrol experience, and the critical outcomes of THIRA/SPR process.

Participants/Highway Patrol Experience

- Lieutenant E. Patterson: SCHP 21 years/Supervisor 9 years
- Lieutenant C.M. Shelton: SCHP 26 years/Supervisor 18 years
- First Sergeant J. Ham: SCHP 27 years/Supervisor 16 years
- First Sergeant J.C. McWhorter: SCHP 20 years/Supervisor 10 years
- First Sergeant C.L. Herring: SCHP 26 years/Supervisor 18 years
- First Sergeant T.P. Alford: SCHP 24 years/Supervisor 9 years

Average Experience: SCHP 24 years/Supervisor 13.33 years

THIRA/SPR Outcomes

Identify Threats and Hazards of Concern:

- Manpower shortages
- Officer Safety

Give Threats and Hazards Context:

- Manpower shortages result in:
 - Increased response times
 - Personnel forced into a purely reactive posture and unable to provide proactive law enforcement and address aggressive driving behaviors which result in collisions
 - Public perception affected by increased response times which require longer waits for service
 - Allied agency resources tied up waiting for Troopers to arrive
 - Increased time trying to locate victims and/or violators at hospitals etc
 - Some counties lack hospital or jail facilities requiring Troopers to travel outside of assigned areas
- Personnel concentrated in more populated areas answering call for service leaving rural areas and secondary roads unpatrolled
- Personnel are spread thin responding to calls for service
 - Unable to provide immediate support for each other in emergencies
 - Unable to adequately investigate collisions

Establish Capability Targets:

- An increase of 59 personnel for the Troop will:
 - Decrease response times
 - To calls for service and calls for assistance from other Troopers
 - Improve public perception about the quality of service provided
 - Increase opportunities for proactive enforcement initiatives

Assess Capabilities:

- Current staffing levels in Troop have not kept pace with:
 - Population growth
 - Increases in licensed drivers
 - Increases in registered vehicles
 - Training requirements which pull personnel from the work schedule
 - Special assignments which pull personnel from the work schedule

Identify Capability Gaps and Intended Approaches to Address Them:

Post A Clarendon/Sumter

Shift by Schedule:

- 1 Corporal/3 Troopers

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 1 Corporal/2 Troopers

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 1 Corporal/8 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 First Sergeant

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post A Sumter/Clarendon: **39**

- 1 First Sergeant
- 2 Sergeants
- 4 Corporals
- 32 Troopers

Post B Kershaw/Lee

Shift by Schedule:

- 1 Corporal/3 Troopers

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 1 Corporal/2 Troopers

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 1 Corporal/5 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 First Sergeant

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post B Kershaw/Lee: **27**

- 1 First Sergeant
- 2 Sergeants
- 4 Corporals
- 20 Troopers

Post C Lexington

Shift by Schedule:

- 1 Corporal/4 Troopers

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 1 Corporal/2 Troopers

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 1 Corporal/8 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 First Sergeant/1 Sergeant

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post C Lexington: **39**

- 1 First Sergeant
- 2 Sergeants
- 4 Corporals
- 32 Troopers

Post D Richland

Shift by Schedule:

- 1 Corporal/7 Troopers

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 1 Corporal/4 Troopers

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 2 Corporals/12 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 First Sergeant/1 Sergeant

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post D Richland: **59**

- 1 First Sergeant
- 2 Sergeants
- 8 Corporals
- 48 Troopers

Table 1: Enforcement/Collision Data and Key Statistics

POST A	CLARENDON/SUMTER				
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
TROOPERS	21	18	19	21	18
CASES	11,677	11,722	10,696	12,555	9,712
WARNINGS	10,450	10,165	9,053	11,299	7,545
DUI	456	503	497	469	373
COLLISIONS	1,754	1,749	1,867	1,196	1,777
POST B	KERSHAW/LEE				
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
TROOPERS	17	16	14	15	14
CASES	9,030	10,607	9,684	9,957	12,263
WARNINGS	12,593	11,939	8,962	8,269	8,924
DUI	241	259	227	260	225
COLLISIONS	1,328	1,442	1,465	1,682	1,601
POST C	LEXINGTON				
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
TROOPERS	26	30	27	26	23
CASES	18,104	24,966	24,715	20,012	19,338
WARNINGS	12,712	15,543	15,041	10,161	9,161
DUI	626	634	227	550	464
COLLISIONS	4,877	4,966	5,662	5,824	5,636
POST D	RICHLAND				
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
TROOPERS	41	38	32	37	34
CASES	31,891	31,240	26,225	16,653	19,754
WARNINGS	20,685	19,536	18,990	9,402	11,727
DUI	933	924	744	549	427
COLLISIONS	7,338	7,022	7,720	9,566	9,054

Key Statistics	2014	2015	2016	2017
Population	896,349	902,900	918,900	925,524
Licensed Drivers	662,827	666,428	670,863	756,712
Registered Vehicles	777,187	788,458	798,888	813,236
Roadway Miles	10,336	10,336	10,336	11,995

Table 2: Troop 1 Duty Hours

Assigned Duty Hours	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017
Patrol	75,776	76,529	64,229	62,504	62,262.50
Accident	27,641	29,538	37,031	38,175	38,609.50
Court	5197	5,524	4,922	4,793	5,446.50
Administrative	35,982	40,005	35,567	34,030.25	33,203.75
Supervisory	4582	3,724	4,856.50	5,235	5,612
Special Duty	19,730	20,117	26,979.25	24,164.75	22,378.50
Training	0	14	64	99	72
Other	2,109	2,075	2,688.50	2,518.50	2,608.50

Table 3: Troop 1 PAM

CURRENTLY FIELDED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TROOP 1 TOTALS	69	14	3	4	3	1
A -Sumter/Clarendon	12	4	0	1	0	0
B -Kershaw/Lee	10	4	0	1	0	0
C -Lexington	16	3	1	1	0	0
D -Richland	31	3	1	1	0	0
Troop 1 Headquarters	0	0	1	0	3	1

ESTIMATED NEED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TROOP 1 TOTALS	132	20	9	4	3	1
A -Sumter/Clarendon	32	4	2	1	0	0
B -Kershaw/Lee	20	4	2	1	0	0
C -Lexington	32	4	2	1	0	0
D -Richland	48	8	2	1	0	0
Troop 1 Headquarters	0	0	1	0	3	1

Attachment 2: Troop 2 Personnel Allocation Model Summary

The Troop 2 Personnel Allocation Model (PAM) meeting was held on June 22, 2018. Supervisors from both the Troop Headquarters and the respective Posts – Post A (Laurens and Newberry Counties), Post B (Abbeville and Greenwood Counties), and Post C (Edgefield, McCormick, and Saluda Counties) – participated in the meeting. The methodology as outlined in the narrative of this report was used to guide the process. Participants were directed to individually examine the applicable data (Table 1 and Table 2) and respond to each portion of the THIRA/SPR outline. They then took part in a facilitated group discussion of their responses that resulted in a collective determination of the Troop’s staffing requirements (Table 3). The following provides details of the meeting participants, their Highway Patrol experience, and the critical outcomes of THIRA/SPR process.

Participants/Highway Patrol Experience

- Captain D.W. Yongue: SCHP 31 years/Supervisor 16 years
- Lieutenant M. F. Mars, Sr.: SCHP 30 years/Supervisor 18 years
- Lieutenant C.R. May: SCHP 22 years/Supervisor 9 years
- Lt. J.T. Morf: SCHP 18 years/Supervisor 7 years
- First Sergeant M.V. Harris: SCHP 19 years/Supervisor 9 years
- First Sergeant J.C. Gambrell: SCHP 19 years/Supervisor 10 years
- First Sergeant T.E. Stone, Jr.: SCHP 29 years/Supervisor 10 years

Average Experience: SCHP 24 years/Supervisor 11.28 years

THIRA/SPR Outcomes

Identify Threats and Hazards of Concern:

- Manpower shortages
- Increases in Licensed Drivers and Registered Vehicles
 - Population Growth
- Officer Safety

Give Threats and Hazards Context:

- Manpower shortages result in:
 - Insufficient Interstate coverage
 - Increased response times
 - Personnel forced into a purely reactive posture and unable to provide proactive law enforcement and address aggressive driving behaviors which result in collisions
 - Strained relationships with allied agencies by tying up local resources waiting for Troop response
 - Public perception affected by increased response times which require longer waits for service
- Personnel concentrated in more populated areas answering call for service leaving rural areas and secondary roads unpatrolled
- Personnel are spread thin responding to calls for service

- Unable to provide immediate support for each other in emergencies
- Unable to adequately investigate collisions

Establish Capability Targets:

- An increase of 48 personnel for the Troop will:
 - Decrease response times
 - To calls for service and calls for assistance from other Troopers
 - Improve public perception about the quality of service provided
 - Increase opportunities for proactive enforcement initiatives
 - Reduce demands on local agency resources

Assess Capabilities:

- Current staffing levels in Troop have not kept pace with:
 - Population growth
 - Increases in licensed drivers
 - Increases in registered vehicles
 - Training requirements which pull personnel from the work schedule
 - Special assignments which pull personnel from the work schedule

Identify Capability Gaps and Intended Approaches to Address Them:

Post A Laurens/Newberry

Shift by Schedule:

- 1 Corporal/4 Troopers

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 1 Corporal/2 Troopers

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 1 Corporal/9 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 First Sergeant/1 Sergeant

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post A Laurens/Newberry: **43**

- 1 First Sergeant
- 2 Sergeants
- 4 Corporals
- 36 Troopers

Post B Abbeville/Greenwood

Shift by Schedule:

- 1 Corporal/3 Troopers

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 1 Corporal/1 Troopers

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 1 Corporal/7 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 First Sergeant

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post B Abbeville/Greenwood: **35**

- 1 First Sergeant
- 2 Sergeants
- 4 Corporals
- 28 Troopers

Post C Edgefield/McCormick/Saluda

Shift by Schedule:

- 1 Corporal/3 Troopers

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 1 Corporal/1 Troopers

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 1 Corporal/5 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 First Sergeant/1 Sergeant

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post C Edgefield/McCormick/Saluda: **27**

- 1 First Sergeant
- 2 Sergeants
- 4 Corporals
- 20 Troopers

Table 1: Troop 2 Enforcement/Collision Data and Key Statistics

POST A	LAURENS/NEWBERRY				
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
TROOPERS	21	21	23	23	20
CASES	16,538	17,573	14,814	14,610	14,774
WARNINGS	13,667	12,808	9,560	10,922	10,475
DUI	319	320	319	343	332
COLLISIONS	1,963	1,971	2,247	2,257	2,226
POST B	ABBEVILLE/GREENWOOD				
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
TROOPERS	17	17	16	17	18
CASES	13,850	12,166	10,432	10,961	10,666
WARNINGS	9,437	8,787	7,019	8,502	8,817
DUI	400	421	384	367	364
COLLISIONS	1,278	1,335	1,445	1,467	1,444
POST C	EDEGEFIELD/MCCORMICK/SALUDA				
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
TROOPERS	13	15	14	16	15
CASES	8,812	9,051	7,247	6,794	6,643
WARNINGS	606	655	5,341	6,219	6,509
DUI	195	226	217	168	150
COLLISIONS	606	655	704	665	688

Key Statistics	2014	2015	2016	2017
Population	254,954	255,226	255,948	257,103
Licensed Drivers	188,304	187,938	188,333	206,152
Registered Vehicles	235,449	239,012	242,111	245,116
Roadway Miles	7,921	7,921	7,921	7,895

Table 2: Troop 2 Duty Hours

Assigned Duty Hours	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017
Patrol	39,069	40,490	32,082	33,158.50	32,340
Accident	11,395	11,759	12,476.50	12,265.50	11,715.50
Court	3072	2,999	2,397.50	2,534	2,450
Administrative	24,576	24,357	22,695.50	24,814.75	26,321.75
Supervisory	4641	5,384	5,596	6,207	6,365
Special Duty	11,666	10,209	13,986.50	16,472.25	13,162.75
Training	20	30	0	0	0
Other	660	675	711.5	852.5	761.5

Table 3: Troop 2 PAM

CURRENTLY FIELDED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TROOP 2 TOTALS	44	12	3	3	3	1
A -Laurens/Newberry	19	4	1	1	0	0
B -Abbeville/Greenwood	14	4	0	1	0	0
C -Edgefield/McCormick/Saluda	11	4	1	1	0	0
Troop 2 Headquarters	0	0	1	0	3	1

ESTIMATED NEED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TROOP 2 TOTALS	84	12	7	3	3	1
A -Laurens/Newberry	36	4	2	1	0	0
B -Abbeville/Greenwood	28	4	2	1	0	0
C -Edgefield/McCormick/Saluda	20	4	2	1	0	0
Troop 2 Headquarters	0	0	1	0	3	1

Attachment 3: Troop 3 Personnel Allocation Model Summary

The Troop 3 Personnel Allocation Model (PAM) meeting was held on June 25, 2018. Supervisors from both the Troop Headquarters and the respective Posts – Post A (Anderson County), Post B (Oconee and Pickens Counties), Post C (Greenville County), and Post D (Spartanburg County) – participated in the meeting. The methodology as outlined in the narrative of this report was used to guide the process. Participants were directed to individually examine the applicable data (Table 1 and Table 2) and respond to each portion of the THIRA/SPR outline. They then took part in a facilitated group discussion of their responses that resulted in a collective determination of the Troop’s staffing requirements (Table 3). The following provides details of the meeting participants, their Highway Patrol experience, and the critical outcomes of THIRA/SPR process.

Participants/Highway Patrol Experience

- Captain S.A. Craven: SCHP 29 years/Supervisor 15 years
- Lieutenant M.C. Carson: SCHP 29 years/Supervisor 18 years
- Lieutenant M.L. Pelfry: SCHP 27 years/Supervisor 15 years
- First Sergeant D. Johnson: SCHP 15 years/Supervisor 6 years
- First Sergeant W.M. Hiott: SCHP 27 years/Supervisor 14 years
- First Sergeant B.J. Shaw: SCHP 20 years/Supervisor 7 years
- Sergeant D.C. May: SCHP 15 years/Supervisor 6 years
- Sergeant K.N. Brown: SCHP 15 years/Supervisor 3 years

Average Experience: SCHP 22.12 years/Supervisor 10.50 years

THIRA/SPR Outcomes

Identify Threats and Hazards of Concern:

- Manpower shortages
- Population Growth
- Officer Safety
- Infrastructure (Area Dams, Nuclear Power Station)
- Administrative Demands

Give Threats and Hazards Context:

- Manpower shortages due to attrition as well as Specials and Training result in:
 - Increased response times
 - Personnel forced into a purely reactive posture and unable to provide proactive law enforcement and address aggressive driving behaviors which result in collisions
 - Public perception affected by increased response times which require longer waits for service
- Personnel concentrated in more populated areas answering call for service leaving rural areas and secondary roads unpatrolled
 - Increases in Licensed Drivers and Registered Vehicles

- Increased calls for service
- Personnel are spread thin responding to calls for service
 - Large geographical areas covered by fewer personnel
 - Unable to provide immediate support for each other in emergencies
 - Unable to adequately investigate collisions
 - Overworked trying to maintain existing schedules
- Inadequate staffing to address emergencies arising of natural or man-made disasters
- Inadequate staffing to address internal administrative demands such as Blue Team, FOIA, Wrecker Administration as well the demands of the court systems and provide quality service

Establish Capability Targets:

- An increase of 79 personnel for the Troop will:
 - Decrease response times
 - To calls for service and calls for assistance from other Troopers
 - Improve public perception about the quality of service provided
 - Increase opportunities for proactive enforcement initiatives
 - Increase probability for quality investigations
 - Improve the ability to absorb the demands of Training and Special Events

Assess Capabilities:

- Current staffing levels in Troop have not kept pace with:
 - Population growth
 - Increases in licensed drivers
 - Increases in registered vehicles
 - Training requirements which pull personnel from the work schedule
 - Special assignments which pull personnel from the work schedule
 - Administrative demands of a Troop this large

Identify Capability Gaps and Intended Approaches to Address Them:

Post A Anderson

Shift by Schedule:

- 1 Corporal/6 Troopers

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 1 Corporal/4 Troopers

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 1 Corporal/10 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 First Sergeant/1 Sergeant

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post A Anderson: **47**

- 1 First Sergeant

- 2 Sergeants
- 4 Corporals
- 40 Troopers

Post B Oconee/Pickens

Shift by Schedule:

- 1 Corporal/6 Troopers

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 1 Corporal/4 Troopers

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 1 Corporal/8 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 First Sergeant/1 Sergeant

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post B Oconee/Pickens: **39**

- 1 First Sergeant
- 2 Sergeants
- 4 Corporals
- 32 Troopers

Post C Greenville

Shift by Schedule:

- 1 Corporal/11 Troopers

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 1 Corporal/7 Troopers

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 2 Corporals/20 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 First Sergeant/1 Sergeant

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post C Greenville: **93**

- 1 First Sergeant
- 4 Sergeants
- 8 Corporals
- 80 Troopers

Post D Spartanburg

Shift by Schedule:

- 1 Corporal/8 Troopers

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 1 Corporal/5 Troopers

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 1 Corporal/12 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 First Sergeant/1 Sergeant

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post D Spartanburg: **56**

- 1 First Sergeant
- 2 Sergeants
- 5 Corporals (1 Floating)
- 48 Troopers

Table 1: Troop 3 Enforcement/Collision Data and Key Statistics

POST A	ANDERSON				
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
TROOPERS	26	27	24	29	25
CASES	17,054	17,102	15,138	12,683	12,710
WARNINGS	15,313	17,263	17,410	12,952	13,108
DUI	777	658	608	504	472
COLLISIONS	4,544	4,312	5,082	5,256	5,386
POST B	OCONEE/PICKENS				
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
TROOPERS	25	31	22	25	27
CASES	16,274	13,043	9,048	9,256	10,159
WARNINGS	19,329	14,420	9,303	9,196	10,628
DUI	597	579	438	391	359
COLLISIONS	2,643	2,453	2,885	2,935	2,763
POST C	GREENVILLE				
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
TROOPERS	50	51	49	57	52
CASES	33,147	30,405	27,334	31,225	22,449
WARNINGS	27,546	22,286	17,204	19,874	15,249
DUI	1,220	1,259	1,075	1,174	882
COLLISIONS	11,467	11,557	12,275	13,357	13,524
POST D	SPARTANBURG				
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
TROOPERS	40	40	37	35	35
CASES	29,720	25,639	21,941	18,094	15,105
WARNINGS	24,188	18,464	14,497	11,492	8,490
DUI	696	684	687	618	551
COLLISIONS	6,767	6,771	7,848	8,567	8,674

Key Statistics	2014	2015	2016	2017
Population	1,150,750	1,164,664	1,195,414	1,213,199
Licensed Drivers	895,285	903,325	916,249	1,024,607
Registered Vehicles	1,024,194	1,049,109	1,074,233	1,093,314
Roadway Miles	7,921	7,921	7,921	14,431

Table 2: Troop 3 Duty Hours

Assigned Duty Hours	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017
Patrol	98,014	93,256	67,847.75	68,300.25	66,369.50
Accident	50,022	51,726	60,903.25	63,085.50	64,617.75
Court	6,317	5,826	4,657.50	4,776	4,345.50
Administrative	46,596	46,063	40,786.75	42,876.50	42,991
Supervisory	16,552	15,452	15,009	14,223.50	14,295.50
Special Duty	31,572	29,825	35,412	48,460	42,687.25
Training	0	0	40	0	0
Other	3,179	3,398.5	3,162.50	3,444.50	4,078.50

Table 3: Troop 3 PAM

CURRENTLY FIELDED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TROOP 3 TOTALS	129	13	5	2	2	1
A -Anderson	25	3	1	1	0	0
B -Oconee/Pickens	22	3	1	1	0	0
C -Greenville	49	3	1	1	0	0
D -Spartanburg	33	4	1	1	0	0
Troop 3 Headquarters	0	0	1	0	2	1

ESTIMATED NEED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TROOP 3 TOTALS	200	17	9	4	3	1
A -Anderson	40	4	2	1	0	0
B -Oconee/Pickens	32	4	2	1	0	0
C -Greenville	80	4	2	1	0	0
D -Spartanburg	48	5	2	1	0	0
Troop 3 Headquarters	0	0	1	0	2	1

Attachment 4: Troop 4 Personnel Allocation Model Summary

The Troop 4 Personnel Allocation Model (PAM) meeting was held on June 29, 2018. Supervisors from both the Troop Headquarters and the respective Posts – Post A (Cherokee and Union Counties), Post B (York County), Post C (Chester and Fairfield Counties), and Post D (Chesterfield and Lancaster Counties) – participated in the meeting. The methodology as outlined in the narrative of this report was used to guide the process. Participants were directed to individually examine the applicable data (Table 1 and Table 2) and respond to each portion of the THIRA/SPR outline. They then took part in a facilitated group discussion of their responses that resulted in a collective determination of the Troop’s staffing requirements (Table 3). The following provides details of the meeting participants, their Highway Patrol experience, and the critical outcomes of THIRA/SPR process.

Participants/Highway Patrol Experience

- Captain B.J. Albert: SCHP 28 years/Supervisor 17 years
- Lieutenant L.K. Guempel: SCHP 30 years/Supervisor 23 years
- Lieutenant A.R. Walters: SCHP 29 years/Supervisor 9 years
- First Sergeant J.A. Staehr: SCHP 19 years/Supervisor 8 years
- Sergeant B.S. Benfield: SCHP 22 years/Supervisor 11 years
- Sergeant J.L. Godfrey: SCHP 24 years/Supervisor 4 years
- Sergeant K.B. Winburn: SCHP 24 years/Supervisor 6 years

Average Experience: SCHP 25.14 years/Supervisor 11.14 years

THIRA/SPR Outcomes

Identify Threats and Hazards of Concern:

- Manpower shortages
- Population Growth
- Officer Safety
- Infrastructure (Interstate Coverage)
- Special Events

Give Threats and Hazards Context:

- Manpower shortages due to attrition as well as Specials and Training result in:
 - Increased response times
 - Personnel forced into a purely reactive posture and unable to provide proactive law enforcement and address aggressive driving behaviors which result in collisions
 - Public perception affected by increased response times which require longer waits for service
- Personnel concentrated in more populated areas answering call for service leaving rural areas and secondary roads unpatrolled
 - Increases in population growth
 - 25% in York County over the last 5 years

- 32% increase in the Indian land area
 - Increases in Licensed Drivers and Registered Vehicles
 - Increased calls for service
- Personnel are spread thin responding to calls for service
 - Large geographical areas covered by fewer personnel
 - Insufficient personnel to cover Interstates
 - 23 miles of I-85
 - Construction on I-85 expected to last to 2021
 - I-77 has only one diversion route (US-21)
 - Unable to provide immediate support for each other in emergencies
 - Unable to adequately investigate collisions
 - Overworked trying to maintain existing schedules
- Inadequate staffing to address emergencies arising of natural or man-made disasters
- Inadequate staffing to address internal administrative demands such as Blue Team, FOIA, Wrecker Administration as well the demands of the court systems and provide quality service
 - Supervisors tied up assisting with collisions on the road

Establish Capability Targets:

- An increase of 57 personnel for the Troop will:
 - Decrease response times
 - To calls for service and calls for assistance from other Troopers
 - Improve public perception about the quality of service provided
 - Increase opportunities for proactive enforcement initiatives
 - Increase the ability to provide adequate Interstate coverage
 - Improve the ability to absorb the demands of Training and Special Events
 - Improve the ability to adequately supervise personnel

Assess Capabilities:

- Current staffing levels in Troop have not kept pace with:
 - Population growth
 - Increases in licensed drivers
 - Increases in registered vehicles
 - Training requirements which pull personnel from the work schedule
 - Special assignments which pull personnel from the work schedule
 - Traffic volumes on existing Interstate routes
 - Administrative demands of a Troop this large

Identify Capability Gaps and Intended Approaches to Address Them:

Post A Cherokee/Union

Shift by Schedule:

- 1 Corporal/4 Troopers

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 1 Corporal/4 Troopers

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 1 Corporal/6 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 Sergeant

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post A Cherokee/Union: **31**

- 1 First Sergeant
- 2 Sergeants
- 4 Corporals
- 24 Troopers

Post B York

Shift by Schedule:

- 1 Corporal/4 Troopers

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 1 Corporal/3 Troopers

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 1 Corporal/10 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 Sergeant

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post B York: **47**

- 1 First Sergeant
- 2 Sergeants
- 4 Corporals
- 40 Troopers

Post C Chester/Fairfield

Shift by Schedule:

- 1 Corporal/2-3 Troopers

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 1 Corporal/2-3 Troopers

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 1 Corporal/6 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 First Sergeant/1 Sergeant

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post C Chester/Fairfield: **31**

- 1 First Sergeant
- 2 Sergeants
- 4 Corporals
- 24 Troopers

Post D Chesterfield/Lancaster

Shift by Schedule:

- 1 Corporal/2-3 Troopers

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 1 Corporal/2-3 Troopers

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 1 Corporal/6 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 First Sergeant

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post D Chesterfield/Lancaster: **31**

- 1 First Sergeant
- 2 Sergeants
- 4 Corporals
- 24 Troopers

Table 1: Troop 4 Enforcement/Collision Data and Key Statistics

POST A	CHEROKEE/UNION				
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
TROOPERS	18	17	18	18	22
CASES	14,116	13,735	14,589	12,915	14,250
WARNINGS	11,987	11,509	10,535	10,042	11,236
DUI	438	383	421	287	297
COLLISIONS	1,642	1,757	1,852	1,776	1,772
POST B	YORK				
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
TROOPERS	25	27	25	27	21
CASES	23,412	25,181	21,569	19,821	16,736
WARNINGS	20,686	19,402	14,104	13,473	9,677
DUI	681	741	536	511	505
COLLISIONS	3,021	3,464	3,898	4,116	4,151
POST C	CHESTER/FAIRFIELD				
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
TROOPERS	15	18	20	18	16
CASES	14,165	11,565	8,947	12,582	11,793
WARNINGS	12,218	10,234	9,289	10,776	9,442
DUI	312	222	256	281	263
COLLISIONS	1,215	1,150	1,486	1,581	1,428
POST D	CHESTERFIELD/LANCASTER				
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
TROOPERS	18	15	20	18	15
CASES	10,345	7,851	8,947	12,859	11,866
WARNINGS	14,051	1,719	13,000	16,984	13,518
DUI	368	340	256	330	260
COLLISIONS	1,588	1,719	2,201	2,298	2,270

Key Statistics	2014	2015	2016	2017
Population	505,620	516,844	533,343	544,487
Licensed Drivers	402,762	407,206	414,700	468,403
Registered Vehicles	469,953	486,264	500,007	512,905
Roadway Miles	8,864	8,864	8,864	9,931

Table 2: Troop 4 Duty Hours

Assigned Duty Hours	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017
Patrol	82,139	78,813	70,632.50	68,556.25	67,007.50
Accident	12,640	13,509	15,020.50	15,236.75	15,122.50
Court	2,839	2,711	2,540	2,502.50	2,550.50
Administrative	31,205	19,147	28,398	28,466.50	29,539.50
Supervisory	6,156	5,282	6,585	6,445	7,128
Special Duty	14,989	11,988	17,280	20,834	17,175.25
Training	24	0	96	58	47
Other	1,331	1,149	1,300	1,658.50	1,791.50

Table 3: Troop 4 PAM

CURRENTLY FIELDDED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TROOP 4 TOTALS	58	16	4	2	3	1
A -Cherokee/Union	16	4	1	0	0	0
B -York	19	4	1	0	0	0
C -Chester/Fairfield	12	4	1	1	0	0
D -Chesterfield/Lancaster	11	4	0	1	0	0
Troop 4 Headquarters	0	0	1	0	3	1

ESTIMATED NEED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TROOP 4 TOTALS	112	12	9	4	3	1
A -Cherokee/Union	24	4	2	1	0	0
B -York	40	4	2	1	0	0
C -Chester/Fairfield	24	4	2	1	0	0
D -Chesterfield/Lancaster	24	4	2	1	0	0
Troop 4 Headquarters	0	0	1	0	3	1

Attachment 5: Troop 5 Personnel Allocation Model Summary

The Troop 5 Personnel Allocation Model (PAM) meeting was held on July 2, 2018. Supervisors from both the Troop Headquarters and the respective Posts – Post A (Darlington and Marlboro Counties), Post B (Dillon, Florence, and Marion Counties), Post C (Georgetown and Williamsburg Counties), and Post D (Horry County) – participated in the meeting. The methodology as outlined in the narrative of this report was used to guide the process. Participants were directed to individually examine the applicable data (Table 1 and Table 2) and respond to each portion of the THIRA/SPR outline. They then took part in a facilitated group discussion of their responses that resulted in a collective determination of the Troop’s staffing requirements (Table 3). The following provides details of the meeting participants, their Highway Patrol experience, and the critical outcomes of THIRA/SPR process.

Participants/Highway Patrol Experience

- Captain J.N. Nell: SCHK 32 years/Supervisor 25 years
- Lieutenant B.W. Tyler: SCHK 20 years/Supervisor 10 years
- Lieutenant J.A. Segars: SCHK 24 years/Supervisor 14 years
- First Sergeant D.A. Miller: SCHK 24 years/Supervisor 15 years
- First Sergeant S.S. McKenzie: SCHK 21 years/Supervisor 12 years
- First Sergeant W.S. Owens: SCHK 19 years/Supervisor 7 years
- First Sergeant W.M. Clemmons: SCHK 26 years/Supervisor 11 years

Average Experience: SCHK 23.71 years/Supervisor 13.42 years

THIRA/SPR Outcomes

Identify Threats and Hazards of Concern:

- Manpower shortages
- Population Growth
- Interstate Coverage
- Large Geographical Areas
- Officer Safety
- Administrative Demands

Give Threats and Hazards Context:

- Manpower shortages have resulted in :
 - Increased response times
 - Personnel forced into a purely reactive posture and unable to provide proactive law enforcement and address aggressive driving behaviors which result in collisions
 - Public perception affected by increased response times which require longer waits for service
- Personnel concentrated in more populated areas answering call for service leaving rural areas underserved in quality of service, visibility, and enforcement
 - Increases in Licensed Drivers and Registered Vehicles

- Increased calls for service
- Personnel are spread thin responding to calls for service
 - Large geographical areas covered by fewer personnel
 - Inadequate personnel to maintain a strong presence on Interstates
 - Unable to provide immediate support for each other in emergencies
 - Unable to adequately investigate collisions
- Inadequate staffing to address emergencies arising of natural or man-made disasters
- Inadequate staffing to address internal administrative demands such as Blue Team, FOIA, Wrecker Administration as well the demands of the court systems which increasingly require more time

Establish Capability Targets:

- An increase of 49 personnel for the Troop will:
 - Decrease response times
 - To calls for service over large geographical areas
 - To calls for assistance from other Troopers/Allied Agencies
 - Improve public perception about the quality of service provided
 - Increase opportunities for proactive enforcement initiatives
 - Increase Interstate coverage
 - Improve the ability to absorb the demands of Training and Special Events
 - Improve the ability to address administrative duties such as the courts

Assess Capabilities:

- Current staffing levels in Troop have not kept pace with:
 - Population growth
 - Increases in licensed drivers
 - Increases in registered vehicles
 - Increased volumes of traffic on Interstates
 - Training requirements which pull personnel from the work schedule
 - Special assignments which pull personnel from the work schedule
 - Administrative demands of a Troop this large

Identify Capability Gaps and Intended Approaches to Address Them:

Post A Darlington/Marlboro

Shift by Schedule:

- 1 Corporal/6 Troopers

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 1 Corporal/4-5 Troopers

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 1 Corporal/7 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 First Sergeant/1 Sergeant

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post A Darlington/Marlboro: **34**

- 1 First Sergeant
- 2 Sergeants
- 4 Corporals
- 28 Troopers

Post B Florence/Marion/Dillon

Shift by Schedule:

- 1 Corporal/10 Troopers

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 1 Corporal/9 Troopers

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 1 Corporal/12 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 First Sergeant/1 Sergeant

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post B Florence/Marion/Dillon: **59**

- 1 First Sergeant
- 2 Sergeants
- 8 Corporals
- 48 Troopers

Post C Williamsburg/Georgetown

Shift by Schedule:

- 1 Corporal/5 Troopers

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 1 Corporal/4 Troopers

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 1 Corporal/7 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 First Sergeant/1 Sergeant

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post C Williamsburg/Georgetown: **34**

- 1 First Sergeant
- 1 Sergeants
- 4 Corporals
- 34 Troopers

Post D Horry

Shift by Schedule:

- 1 Corporal/9 Troopers

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 1 Corporal/7 Troopers

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 2 Corporals/14 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 First Sergeant/1 Sergeant

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post D Horry: **71**

- 1 First Sergeant
- 2 Sergeants
- 8 Corporals
- 60 Troopers

Table 1: Troop 5 Enforcement/Collision Data and Key Statistics

POST A	DARLINGTON/MARLBORO				
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
TROOPERS	20	19	18	21	27
CASES	12,810	12,702	10,317	7,106	9,256
WARNINGS	4,761	5,830	5,699	4,999	8,309
DUI	648	670	511	406	394
COLLISIONS	1,435	1,487	1,627	1,861	1,805
POST B	DILLON/FLORENCE/MARION				
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
TROOPERS	37	37	40	43	43
CASES	23,812	22,949	26,111	24,925	23,243
WARNINGS	14,489	8,246	9,808	8,427	9,295
DUI	1,082	1,003	955	853	775
COLLISIONS	3,234	3,362	3,929	4,128	3,924
POST C	GEORGETOWN/WILLIAMSBURG				
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
TROOPERS	25	25	25	27	28
CASES	13,648	12,065	11,395	11,916	13,583
WARNINGS	6,748	4,566	4,454	5,682	6,993
DUI	593	540	541	521	632
COLLISIONS	1,473	1,524	1,782	1,853	1,961
POST D	HORRY				
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
TROOPERS	46	44	36	40	43
CASES	40,410	29,928	29,904	21,389	27,126
WARNINGS	13,199	8,074	7,758	6,092	9,075
DUI	1,169	1,191	929	906	973
COLLISIONS	5,770	6,374	7,391	8,013	8,091

Key Statistics	2014	2015	2016	2017
Population	680,722	590,314	710,085	693,798
Licensed Drivers	546,329	551,476	559,190	634,266
Registered Vehicles	601,226	617,861	632,248	647,809
Roadway Miles	10,648	10,648	10,648	13,462

Table 2: Troop 5 Duty Hours

Assigned Duty Hours	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017
Patrol	110,889	104,839	88,522	88,007.50	92,131
Accident	27,268	28,559	33,773.50	35,081	35,542.50
Court	4,294	3,645	3,546.50	3,621.25	3,959.50
Administrative	52,966	55,176	56,270.50	55,630.50	59,882
Supervisory	13,230	14,097	9,473	8,235	8,002
Special Duty	22,590	19,302	25,028	35,870.25	29,312.75
Training	0	40	32	94	52
Other	2,150	1,875	2,791.50	3,179	3,211

Table 3: Troop 5 PAM

CURRENTLY	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TROOP 5 TOTALS	116	14	3	4	3	1
A -Darlington/Marlboro	22	3	1	1	0	0
B -Dillion/Florence/Marion	38	3	1	1	0	0
C -Georgetown/Williamsburg	19	4	0	1	0	0
D -Horry	37	4	0	1	0	0
Troop 5 Headquarters	0	0	1	0	3	1

ESTIMATED NEED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TROOP 5 TOTALS	170	24	7	4	3	1
A -Darlington/Marlboro	28	4	1	1	0	0
B -Dillion/Florence/Marion	48	8	2	1	0	0
C -Georgetown/Williamsburg	34	4	1	1	0	0
D -Horry	60	8	2	1	0	0
Troop 5 Headquarters	0	0	1	0	3	1

Attachment 6: Troop 6 Personnel Allocation Model Summary

The Troop 6 Personnel Allocation Model (PAM) meeting was held on July 6, 2018. Supervisors from both the Troop Headquarters and the respective Posts – Post A (Berkeley and Charleston Counties), Post B (Colleton and Dorchester Counties), and Post C (Beaufort and Jasper Counties) – participated in the meeting. The methodology as outlined in the narrative of this report was used to guide the process. Participants were directed to individually examine the applicable data (Table 1 and Table 2) and respond to each portion of the THIRA/SPR outline. They then took part in a facilitated group discussion of their responses that resulted in a collective determination of the Troop’s staffing requirements (Table 3). The following provides details of the meeting participants, their Highway Patrol experience, and the critical outcomes of THIRA/SPR process.

Participants/Highway Patrol Experience

- Captain J.T Manley: SCHP 27 years/Supervisor 13 years
- Lieutenant Dennis Boniecki: SCHP 20.5 years/Supervisor 11 years
- Lieutenant K.V. Welch: SCHP 31 years/Supervisor 19 years
- First Sergeant Q.M. Brown: SCHP 18.50 years/Supervisor 10 years
- First Sergeant C.A. Pearson: SCHP 20 years/Supervisor 9 years
- First Sergeant W.A. Rouse: SCHP 19 years/Supervisor 7 years

Average Experience: SCHP 22.66 years/Supervisor 11.50 years

THIRA/SPR Outcomes

Identify Threats and Hazards of Concern:

- Manpower shortages
- Population Growth
- Officer Safety
- Infrastructure (Interstates)
- Administrative Demands

Give Threats and Hazards Context:

- Manpower shortages due to attrition as well as Specials and Training result in:
 - Increased response times
 - Tie up allied agency resources waiting for Troop response
 - Personnel forced into a purely reactive posture and unable to provide proactive law enforcement and address aggressive driving behaviors which result in collisions
 - Public perception affected by increased response times which require longer waits for service
- Personnel concentrated in more populated areas answering call for service leaving rural areas and secondary roads unpatrolled and underserved
 - Increases in Licensed Drivers and Registered Vehicles
 - Increased calls for service

- Personnel are spread thin responding to calls for service
 - Large geographical areas covered by fewer personnel
 - Inadequate staffing for Interstates (I-26 and I-95)
 - Difficulty covering interstates and alternate routes during peak times of Holiday Travel
 - Unable to provide immediate support for each other in emergencies
 - Unable to adequately investigate collisions
 - Overworked trying to maintain existing schedules
- Inadequate staffing to address emergencies arising of natural or man-made disasters
- Inadequate staffing to address internal administrative demands such as Blue Team, FOIA, Wrecker Administration as well the demands of the court systems and provide quality service

Establish Capability Targets:

- An increase of 49 personnel for the Troop will:
 - Decrease response times
 - To calls for service and calls for assistance from other Troopers
 - Improve public perception about the quality of service provided
 - Improve the ability to cover Interstate and alternate routes during peak travel periods during the year
 - Increase opportunities for proactive enforcement initiatives
 - Increase probability for quality investigations
 - Improve the ability to absorb the demands of Training and Special Events

Assess Capabilities:

- Current staffing levels in Troop have not kept pace with:
 - The need for service over large Geographical areas
 - Population growth
 - Increases in licensed drivers
 - Increases in registered vehicles
 - Training requirements which pull personnel from the work schedule
 - Special assignments which pull personnel from the work schedule
 - Administrative demands of a Troop this large

Identify Capability Gaps and Intended Approaches to Address Them:

Post A Charleston/Berkeley

Shift by Schedule:

- 1 Corporal/4 Troopers

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 1 Corporal/2 Troopers

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 1 Corporal/10 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 First Sergeant/1 Sergeant

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post A Charleston/Berkeley: **47**

- 1 First Sergeant
- 2 Sergeants
- 4 Corporals
- 40 Troopers

Post B Dorchester/Colleton

Shift by Schedule:

- 1 Corporal/4 Troopers

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 1 Corporal/2 Troopers

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 1 Corporal/9 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 First Sergeant/1 Sergeant

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post B Dorchester/Colleton: **43**

- 1 First Sergeant
- 2 Sergeants
- 4 Corporals
- 36 Troopers

Post C Beaufort/Jasper

Shift by Schedule:

- 1 Corporal/4 Troopers

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 1 Corporal/2 Troopers

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 1 Corporal/7 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 First Sergeant/1 Sergeant

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post C Beaufort/Jasper: **34**

- 1 First Sergeant
- 1 Sergeants
- 4 Corporals
- 28 Troopers

Table 1: Troop 6 Enforcement/Collision Data and Key Statistics

POST A	BERKELEY/CHARLESTON				
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
TROOPERS	26	27	29	29	27
CASES	22,585	22,664	17,047	20,837	16,481
WARNINGS	10,280	7,967	6,417	7,290	7,489
DUI	582	546	549	473	504
COLLISIONS	3,975	4,063	4,223	4,316	4,731
POST B	COLLETON/DORCHESTER				
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
TROOPERS	20	20	19	23	21
CASES	13,558	14,342	13,883	13,140	13,993
WARNINGS	7,824	7,334	7,630	6,325	6,294
DUI	379	380	273	250	299
COLLISIONS	2,548	2,690	2,840	3,112	3,401
POST C	BEAUFORT/JASPER				
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
TROOPERS	23	19	19	22	22
CASES	15,974	14,753	16,234	16,398	15,053
WARNINGS	10,241	8,083	8,278	6,936	7,302
DUI	495	537	505	396	462
COLLISIONS	1,601	1,787	1,924	1,849	1,896

Key Statistics	2014	2015	2016	2017
Population	948,475	968,482	1,011,071	1,0128,744
Licensed Drivers	729,320	757,927	772,931	889,256
Registered Vehicles	806,387	833,724	857,119	877,251
Roadway Miles	7,796	7,796	7,796	10,182

Table 2: Troop 6 – Duty Hours

Assigned Duty Hours	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017
Patrol	51,488	51,117	46,289.50	49,147	52,760
Accident	16,945	19,178	19,326	18,909.50	19,913
Court	4,521	4,260	3,878.50	4,211	4,304
Administrative	28,397	26,275	23,276	24,836	28,299
Supervisory	8,373	8,744	7,121	7,593	7,670
Special Duty	17,163	14,514	18,429	22,411	19,511
Training	0	0	8	0	0
Other	1,579	1,189	1,013	1,348	1,666

Table 3: Troop 6 PAM

CURRENTY FIELDDED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TROOP 6 TOTALS	61	11	4	3	2	1
A -Berkeley/Charleston	25	4	1	1	0	0
B -Colleton/Dorchester	17	3	1	1	0	0
C -Beaufort/Jasper	19	4	1	1	0	0
Troop 6 Headquarters	0	0	1	0	2	1

ESTIMATED NEED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TROOP 6 TOTALS	104	12	6	3	3	1
A -Berkeley/Charleston	40	4	2	1	0	0
B -Colleton/Dorchester	36	4	2	1	0	0
C -Beaufort/Jasper	28	4	1	1	0	0
Troop 6 Headquarters	0	0	1	0	3	1

Attachment 7: Troop 7 Personnel Allocation Model Summary

The Troop 7 Personnel Allocation Model (PAM) meeting was held on July 5, 2018. Supervisors from both the Troop Headquarters and the respective Posts – Post A (Allendale, Bamberg, Barnwell, and Hampton Counties), Post B (Calhoun and Orangeburg Counties), and Post C (Aiken County) – participated in the meeting. The methodology as outlined in the narrative of this report was used to guide the process. Participants were directed to individually examine the applicable data (Table 1 and Table 2) and respond to each portion of the THIRA/SPR outline. They then took part in a facilitated group discussion of their responses that resulted in a collective determination of the Troop’s staffing requirements (Table 3). The following provides details of the meeting participants, their Highway Patrol experience, and the critical outcomes of THIRA/SPR process.

Participants/Highway Patrol Experience

- Captain S.N. Gadsden: SCHP 25 years/Supervisor 16 years
- Lieutenant T.E. Moore: SCHP 21 years/Supervisor 14 years
- Lieutenant N.W. King: SCHP 24 years/Supervisor 14 years
- Lieutenant J.R. LaChance: SCHP 25 years/Supervisor 11 years
- First Sergeant C.A. Burns: SCHP 20 years/Supervisor 9 years
- Sergeant David Smith: SCHP 19 years/Supervisor 6 years
- Sergeant J.R. Francis: SCHP 12 years/Supervisor 6 years
- Sergeant D.A. Deering: SCHP 21 years/Supervisor 9 years
- Sergeant M.D. Thompson: SCHP 29 years/Supervisor 9 years

Average Experience: SCHP 21.77 years/Supervisor 10.44 years

THIRA/SPR Outcomes

Identify Threats and Hazards of Concern:

- Geographical Area (4 Counties in Post A alone)
- Manpower
- Population Growth
- Officer Safety
- Infrastructure
 - Interstates (I-26 and I-95)
 - Two Federal Prisons
 - Proximity of Vogtle Nuclear Facility
 - Natural and Man-Made disaster evacuation routes pass through Troop 7
 - Lack of Trauma Centers/Units in area hospitals
- Administrative Demands
 - 4 different Court Systems

Give Threats and Hazards Context:

- Personnel are spread thin over large geographical areas responding to calls for service

- Large geographical areas covered by fewer personnel where support from other Troopers may be 2-3 counties away
 - Unable to provide immediate support for each other in emergencies
 - Unable to adequately investigate collisions
 - Overworked trying to maintain existing schedules
- Manpower shortages due to attrition as well as Specials and Training result in:
 - Increased response times
 - Increases in response times due to personnel shortages are further aggravated by large geographical areas of responsibility
 - Lack of Trauma Centers/Units require personnel to leave areas of responsibility to investigate collisions
 - In many instances this requires leaving the state and crossing into Georgia
 - Personnel forced into a purely reactive posture and unable to provide proactive law enforcement and address aggressive driving behaviors which result in collisions
 - Public perception affected by increased response times which require longer waits for service
- Personnel concentrated in more populated areas answering call for service leaving rural areas and secondary roads unpatrolled
 - Increases in Licensed Drivers and Registered Vehicles
 - Increased calls for service
- Inadequate staffing to address emergencies arising of natural or man-made disasters
- Inadequate staffing to address internal administrative demands such as Blue Team, FOIA, Wrecker Administration as well the demands of the court systems and provide quality service

Establish Capability Targets:

- An increase of 79 personnel for the Troop will:
 - Decrease response times
 - To calls for service and calls for assistance from other Troopers
 - Improve public perception about the quality of service provided
 - Increase opportunities for proactive enforcement initiatives
 - Increase probability for quality investigations
 - Improve the ability to absorb the demands of Training and Special Events

Assess Capabilities:

- Current staffing levels in Troop have not kept pace with:
 - Population growth
 - Increases in licensed drivers
 - Increases in registered vehicles
 - Training requirements which pull personnel from the work schedule
 - Special assignments which pull personnel from the work schedule
 - Administrative demands of a Troop this large

Identify Capability Gaps and Intended Approaches to Address Them:

Post A Allendale/Bamberg/Barnwell/Hampton

Shift by Schedule:

- 1 Corporal/2 Troopers

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 1 Corporal/1 Troopers

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 1 Corporal/5 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 First Sergeant/1 Sergeant

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post A Allen/Bamb/Barnw/Hampton: **26**

- 1 First Sergeant
- 1 Sergeants
- 4 Corporals
- 20 Troopers

Post B Orangeburg/Calhoun

Shift by Schedule:

- 1 Corporal/3 Troopers

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 1 Corporal/2 Troopers

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 1 Corporal/10 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 2 Sergeants

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post B Orangeburg/Calhoun: **47**

- 1 First Sergeant
- 2 Sergeants
- 4 Corporals
- 40 Troopers

Post C Aiken

Shift by Schedule:

- 1 Corporal/3 Troopers

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 1 Corporal/2 Troopers

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 1 Corporal/9 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 Sergeant

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post C Aiken: **43**

- 1 First Sergeant
- 2 Sergeants
- 4 Corporals
- 36 Troopers

Table 1: Troop 7 Enforcement/Collision Data and Key Statistics

POST A	ALLENDALE/BAMBERG/BARNWELL/HAMPTON				
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
TROOPERS	15	14	13	12	11
CASES	10,302	11,012	11,568	8,361	6,952
WARNINGS	10,180	9,423	11,104	7,984	5,995
DUI	254	201	227	139	177
COLLISIONS	510	497	578	542	558
POST B	CALHOUN/ORANGEBURG				
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
TROOPERS	21	22	23	23	18
CASES	19,991	14,004	16,230	13,009	8,957
WARNINGS	9,863	7,172	9,208	7,396	4,216
DUI	444	347	444	421	319
COLLISIONS	2,740	2,679	3,004	3,314	3,129
POST C	AIKEN				
	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
TROOPERS	16	21	18	18	18
CASES	16,302	14,983	17,690	17,252	14,895
WARNINGS	10,445	6,451	6,452	5,811	5,160
DUI	431	356	349	358	348
COLLISIONS	2,017	2,121	2,324	2,299	2,441

Key Statistics	2014	2015	2016	2017
Population	317,561	336,962	335,061	334,689
Licensed Drivers	251,162	250,310	249,359	279,389
Registered Vehicles	295,851	300,018	303,567	306,858
Roadway Miles	8,621	8,621	8,621	9,444

Table 2: Troop 7 Duty Hours

Assigned Duty Hours	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017
Patrol	42,278	40,480	40,975	35,762	31,186
Accident	12,898	13,942	15,652	15,347	15,190
Court	3,074	2,977	3,231	2,963	2,733
Administrative	24,754	25,869	26,814	24,549	24,270.50
Supervisory	5,274	6,817	6,606	6,581	7,015
Special Duty	10,625	8,390	10,441	11,581	9,404
Training	23	36	0	0	0
Other	1,012	1,157	1,115	1,234	1,114

Table 3: Troop 7 PAM

CURRENTLY FIELDDED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TROOP 7 TOTALS	40	11	4	1	3	1
A -Allendale/Barnwell/Bamberg/Hampton	10	4	1	1	0	0
B -Calhoun/Orangeburg	17	3	1	0	0	0
C -Aiken	13	4	1	0	0	0
Troop 7 Headquarters	0	0	0	0	3	1

ESTIMATED NEED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TROOP 7 TOTALS	96	12	6	3	3	1
A -Allendale/Barnwell/Bamberg/Hampton	20	4	1	1	0	0
B -Calhoun/Orangeburg	40	4	2	1	0	0
C -Aiken	36	4	2	1	0	0
Troop 7 Headquarters	0	0	1	0	3	1

Attachment 8: Troop 8 Personnel Allocation Model Summary

Troop 8 is comprised of four sections to provide specialized law enforcement support to the Highway Patrol. The Motorcycle Unit conducts statewide traffic enforcement and motorcycle safety. The Safety Improvement Team conducts statewide traffic enforcement and safety in highway construction work zones. The Target Zero Team conducts statewide enforcement with the emphasis on speeding, seatbelt violations, DUI detection and criminal enforcement. In addition to these support functions, Troop 8 includes the Criminal Interdiction Unit which emphasizes drug interdiction with specially trained Troopers and K-9's. Members of each section are specifically trained in their area of responsibility.

Participants/Highway Patrol Experience

- Captain G.S. Owens: SCHP 24 years/Supervisor 12 years
- Lieutenant B.D. Dowis: SCHP 21 years/Supervisor 9 years

Average Experience: SCHP 22.50 years/Supervisor 10.50 years

THIRA/SPR Outcomes

Identify Threats and Hazards of Concern:

- Work Zone and Construction Projects
- Population Growth
- Officer Safety
- Special Events
- Challenges of Criminal Interdiction

Give Threats and Hazards Context:

- Gas Tax revenue and Federal grants have the potential to triple work zone areas and construction projects placing additional demands on Safety Improvement Team personnel resources.
- Population growth and increases in traffic volumes are placing greater demands on the Target Zero Team and Motor Units for selective enforcement on targeted roads.
- Special events requiring escorts are placing increasing demands on the Motor Units personnel resources
- The newly formed Criminal Interdiction Unit is creating a demand for personnel to accomplish its mission of deterrence and apprehension
 - This strains already diminished manpower resources
- All activities which spread personnel thin create Officer Safety issues

Establish Capability Targets:

- An increase of 85 personnel for the Troop will:
 - Provide for adequate staffing of all Troop 8 units

- Increase quality of service in respective areas
- Improve the ability to absorb the demands of Training and Special Events

Assess Capabilities:

- Current staffing levels in Troop have not kept pace with:
 - Population growth
 - Increases in licensed drivers
 - Increases in registered vehicles
 - Training requirements which pull personnel from the work schedule
 - Special assignments which pull personnel from the work schedule
 - Administrative demands of a Troop this large

Identify Capability Gaps and Intended Approaches to Address Them:

Safety Improvement Team (SIT)

Slotted Manpower:

- 24 Troopers

Fielded Manpower:

- 19 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 Motor Sergeant

Total personnel required to adequately staff the Safety Improvement Team (SIT): **48**

- 6 Corporals
- 42 Troopers

Personnel divided into six 8-man teams

Target Zero Team

Total personnel required to adequately staff the Target Zero Team: **24**

Motor Units

Slotted Manpower:

- 25 Troopers
- 5 Corporals

Fielded Manpower:

- 9 Troopers
- 2 corporals

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 Motor Sergeant

Total personnel required to adequately staff the Motor Units: **30**

- 25 Troopers
- 5 Corporals

Personnel divided into five 6-man teams

Criminal Interdiction Unit (CIU)

Slotted Manpower:

- 8 Interdiction Troopers
- 8 K-9 Troopers

Fielded Manpower:

- 8 Interdiction Troopers
- 8 K-9 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 2 Sergeants

Total personnel required to adequately staff the Criminal Interdiction Unit: **27**

- 2 Sergeants
- 1 Corporal
- 16 Interdiction Troopers
- 8 K-9 Troopers

Personnel divided into eight 3-man teams

Table 1: Troop 8 Enforcement Data

Troop 8 Activity	2015	2016	2017
Cases	22,833	29,834	30,932
Warnings	33,228	37,344	42,937
DUI	104	346	258
Stolen vehicles	4	2	6
Weapons violations	6	12	17
Fugitive arrests	28	23	26
Felony arrests	23	27	25
Vehicles seized	1	3	0
Drug cases	118	169	260

Table 2: Troop 8 PAM

CURRENTLY FIELDED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TROOP 8 TOTALS	63	5	4	0	1	1
Safety Improvement Team	24	0	*	0	0	0
Target Zero Team	14	3	*	0	0	0
Motor Units	9	2	1	0	0	0
Criminal Interdiction Team	16	0	2	0	0	0
Troop 8 Headquarters	0	0	1	0	1	1

*TZT and SIT supervised by the Motor Sergeant

ESTIMATED NEED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TROOP 8 TOTALS	116	11	5	1	2	1
Safety Improvement Team	43	5	1	0	*	0
Target Zero Team	24	0	0	0	0	0
Motor Units	25	5	1	0	1	0
Criminal Interdiction Team	24	1	2	0	1	0
Troop 8 Headquarters	0	0	1	1	0	1

*SIT, TZT and Motor Units under one Lieutenant

Attachment 9: Troop 9 Personnel Allocation Model Summary

Troop 9 is the Multidisciplinary Accident Investigation Team (MAIT) which is responsible for conducting in-depth investigations of complex collisions. MAIT Troopers are trained in collision reconstruction for the purpose of determining collision causation. Troop 9 assists other law enforcement agencies with accident reconstruction and trains other Troopers in accident investigation techniques.

Participants/Highway Patrol Experience

- Captain Johnny Rosado: SChP 28 years/Supervisor 15 years
- Sergeant J.C. Rikard: SChP 19 years/Supervisor 12 years
- Sergeant J.L. Booker: SChP 13 years/Supervisor 5 years
- Corporal J.T. Brooks: SChP 22 years/Supervisor 9 years

Average Experience: SChP 20.50 years/Supervisor 10.25 years

THIRA/SPR Outcomes

Identify Threats and Hazards of Concern:

- Manpower shortages
- Large Geographical Areas of Responsibility
- Quality of Investigations

Give Threats and Hazards Context:

- Manpower shortages due to attrition have resulted in:
 - Increased response times
 - A lack of properly trained and qualified personnel
 - Issues in providing support for Specials and other events
- Large Geographical Areas of Responsibility also contribute to longer response times
 - Personnel shortages prevent meaningful distribution throughout the MAIT Posts
 - Personnel concentrated in more populated areas
- Quality of investigations have been affected by manpower shortages and lack of experience
 - Due dates extended to facilitate completion of investigations beyond the norm
 - Investigative reports have been modified to a bullet format to allow for a quicker turn around
 - Case reviews take more time which in turn creates a backlog in case completion

Establish Capability Targets:

- An increase of 13 personnel for the Troop will:
 - Decrease response times

- To calls for service and calls for assistance from allied agencies
- Increase the ability to respond over large geographical areas of responsibility in shorter periods of time
- Increase quality of investigations
 - Providing adequate time for investigations
 - Improve the quality of reporting
 - Improve the quality of case review
- Improve the ability to absorb the demands of Training and Special Events

Assess Capabilities:

- Current staffing levels in the Troop have not kept pace with:
 - Attrition through separation
 - Lack of field personnel trained in collision reconstruction beyond minimal requirements
 - Special assignments which pull personnel from the work schedule
 - Administrative demands of an investigative Troop

Identify Capability Gaps and Intended Approaches to Address Them:

Post A Piedmont

Shift by Schedule:

- 1 Corporal/3 Troopers

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 2 Troopers

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 1 Corporal/3 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 Corporal

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post A Piedmont: **9**

- 1 Sergeant
- 2 Corporals
- 6 Troopers

Post B Midlands

Shift by Schedule:

- 2 Troopers or 1 Corporal/1 Trooper

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 2 Troopers or 1 Corporal/1 Trooper

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 1 Corporal/3 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 Sergeant

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post B Midlands: **9**

- 1 Sergeant
- 2 Corporals
- 6 Troopers

Post C Coastal

Shift by Schedule:

- 1 Corporal/2 Troopers

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 1 Corporal/2 Trooper or 1 Sergeant/1Trooper

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 1 Corporals/2 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: Sergeant works shifts and provides Post supervision

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post C Coastal: **7**

- 1 Sergeant
- 2 Corporals
- 4 Troopers

Post D Pee Dee

Shift by Schedule:

- 1 Corporal/2 Troopers

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 1 Corporal/2 Troopers or 1 Corporal/1 Trooper

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 1 Corporal/2 Troopers

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 Sergeant

Total personnel required to adequately staff Post D Pee Dee: **7**

- 1 Sergeant
- 2 Corporals
- 4 Troopers

Table 1: Troop 9 Activity/Hit and Run Collisions

MAIT ACTIVITY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Total Investigations	751	776	754	642	426
Fatality - DUI	35	56	55	47	36
GBI - DUI	62	66	69	55	46
Limited Investigations	178	172	176	153	173
At-Scene Investigations	188	199	251	224	136
Supplemental	79	104	77	39	25
Patrol Backgrounds	209	179	126	124	10
HIT AND RUN INVESTIGATIONS	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Total Hit and Runs	53	37	52	51	53
Total Hit and Runs with Fatalities	30	20	33	43	36
Total Hit and Run Non-Fatal	29	16	18	15	23
Hit and Run vehicle type identified	38	25	36	38	38

Table 2: Troop 9 PAM

CURRENTLY FIELDDED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TROOP 9 TOTALS	15	5	4	0	0	1
A –Piedmont (Troops 2/3)	4	1	0	0	0	0
B – Midlands (Troops 1/4)	5	1	1	0	0	0
C – Coastal (Troops 6/7)	3	1	1	0	0	0
D – Pee Dee (Troop 5)	3	2	1	0	0	0
Troop 9 Headquarters	0	0	1	0	0	1

ESTIMATED NEED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TROOP 9 TOTALS	20	8	5	0	2	1
A –Piedmont (Troops 2/3)	6	2	1	0	0	0
B – Midlands (Troops 1/4)	6	2	1	0	0	0
C – Coastal (Troops 6/7)	4	2	1	0	0	0
D – Pee Dee (Troop 5)	4	2	1	0	0	0
Troop 9 Headquarters	0	0	1	0	2	1

Attachment 10: Troop 10 Personnel Allocation Model Summary

Troop 10 is the Administrative and Regulatory Compliance Unit and oversees administrative and regulatory compliance in the Highway Patrol, which includes Wrecker Regulation, Records Maintenance, Insurance Enforcement, CALEA, Grants, and the Centralized Evidence Facility. The Insurance Enforcement Unit (IEU) is responsible for enforcing motor vehicle insurance laws covering the suspension of drivers and/or vehicle licenses. The Central Evidence Facility (CEF) is tasked with the storage, maintenance, and retention of seized evidence within the Department of Public Safety.

Participants/Highway Patrol Experience

- Captain C.B. Hughes: SCHP 30.50 years/Supervisor 21 years
- Lieutenant Carl Payne: SCHP 41 years/Supervisor 32 years
- Lieutenant M.C. Rivers: SCHP 27 years/Supervisor 14 years

Average Experience: SCHP 32.83 years/Supervisor 22.33 years

THIRA/SPR Outcomes

Identify Threats and Hazards of Concern:

- Manpower
- Population Growth
- Large Geographical Areas of Responsibility
- Storage Facilities
- Ability to provide services

Give Threats and Hazards Context:

- The Insurance Unit is primarily made of retired personnel
 - When these personnel leave the unit, replacements are not readily available
- Central Evidence Facility responsibilities require that personnel are available for the pick-up and transport of evidence from the field and to and from SLED
 - Current staffing is inadequate
- Increases in Population Growth have resulted in:
 - Increases in the number of collections required (Insurance Unit)
 - Increases in Field Pick-ups due to increased activity in the Field (CEF)
- Large Geographical Areas of Responsibility stretch personnel resources
 - Affects locating vehicles during normal working hours
 - Affects meeting target due dates for collections
- Personnel requests for Special Assignments, Holiday Enforcement strain resources

Establish Capability Targets:

- An increase of 22 personnel for the Troop will:
 - Increase the ability to meet collection due dates

- Improve the coverages over large geographical areas
- Improve the ability to meet evidence pick-up and transport requirements
- Improve the ability to absorb the demands of Special Assignments

Assess Capabilities:

- Current staffing levels in the Troop have not kept pace with:
 - Attrition through separation
 - Lack of personnel required to meet responsibilities in the field
 - Special assignments which pull personnel from the work schedule
 - Administrative demands of an Administrative Troop

Identify Capability Gaps and Intended Approaches to Address Them:

Insurance Unit

Shift by Schedule:

- 3 Troopers in the Upstate
- 5 Troopers in the Lower state

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 3 Troopers in the Upstate
- 2 Troopers in the Lower state

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 20 Troopers in the Upstate
- 20 Troopers in the Lower state

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 Corporal/ 2 Lieutenants

Total personnel required to adequately staff the Insurance Unit: **46**

- 1 Lieutenant
- 1 Sergeant
- 4 Corporals
- 40 Troopers

Central Evidence Facility

Shift by Schedule:

- 4 Troopers
- 1 State Transport Police Officer

Typical Shift Fielded:

- 3 Troopers
- 1 personnel (SCHP or STP)

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 1 Corporal/2 (SCHP and STP)
- 2 CEF Supervisors (1 Sergeant/1 Corporal)

Available supervision outside of shift personnel: 1 Lieutenant

Total personnel required to adequately staff the Central Evidence Facility: **8**

- 1 Lieutenant
- 1 Sergeants
- 2 Corporals
- 4 Troopers

Table 1: Troop 10 - IEU Activity and CEF Stats

INSURANCE ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITY			
	2015	2016	2017
Contacts	81,115	81,483	74,991
Suspensions	54,503	63,651	66,108
Suspensions Cleared	51,421	52,754	54,761
Confiscated License Plates	20,563	20,624	21,817
Cases Made	533	429	616

CENTRALIZED EVIDENCE STATISTICS			
	2015	2016	2017
Evidence collected-state wide	10,861	10,270	16,539
Evidence disposed	5,725	4,207	4,344
Seized weapons	209	367	267
Inventory during year-end audit	10,236	14,133	15,606
Evidence custodians trained	38	28	22

Table 2: Troop 10 - IEU and CEF PAM

CURRENTLY FIELDED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
IEU TOTALS	9	1	0	0	2	1
Upstate	7	0	0	0	0	0
Lower state	2	1	0	0	0	0
IEU Headquarters	0	0	0	0	2	1*

*Troop 10 Captain

ESTIMATED NEED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
IEU TOTALS	40	4	1	0	1	1
Upstate	20	2	0	0	0	0
Lower state	20	2	0	0	0	0
IEU Headquarters	0	0	1	0	1	1*

*Troop 10 Captain

CURRENTLY FIELDED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
CEF TOTALS	2	2	1	0	1	1
Evidence Collection	2	1	0	0	0	0
CEF Headquarters	0	1	1	0	1	1*

*Troop 10 Captain

ESTIMATED NEED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
CEF TOTALS	4	2	1	0	1	1
Evidence Collection	2	1	0	0	0	0
CEF Headquarters	2	1	1	0	1	1*

*Troop 10 Captain

Attachment 11 A: Training Personnel Allocation Model Summary

The Training Unit is a part of Troop 11 and is responsible for training and certifying all incoming trainees as well as assuring that all department law enforcement officers are certified in their respective fields of responsibility. Instructors consistently evaluate changing trends within law enforcement and tailor training courses to meet specific instructional needs.

Participants/Highway Patrol Experience

- Captain T.K. Craig: SCHP 24.5 years/Supervisor 13 years
- Lieutenant J.M. Spencer: SCHP 18.50 years/Supervisor 7 years

Average Experience: SCHP 21.50 years/Supervisor 10.00 years

THIRA/SPR Outcomes

Identify Threats and Hazards of Concern:

- Training Schedules
- Internal Training of Personnel
- Certification of New Training Officers

Give Threats and Hazards Context:

- Training Schedules are affected by:
 - Manpower shortages
 - No time to develop training
 - Patrol classes tie up resources
 - A lack of properly trained and qualified personnel
 - Requires placing a demand for personnel from the field for In-Service etc
- Minimal ability to address new societal trends in training of personnel
 - Active shooter
 - Mobile field force
 - Officer survival
 - Update in mobile data/console changes
 - Certification of new Training Officers hampered by existing Patrol Class, In-Service, and other training related demands

Establish Capability Targets:

- An increase of 8 personnel for the Troop will:
 - Improve the availability of personnel resources when scheduling
 - Ensure adequate resources for Patrol Training classes
 - Improve the ability to train and qualify personnel to meet existing training demands
 - Reduce demands for personnel from the field
 - Improve the ability to provide for new Training Officers

- Equipped to provide training on societal trends

Assess Capabilities:

- Current staffing levels in the Troop have not kept pace with:
 - Attrition through separation
 - New hiring and training practices
 - Increased need for recurring training on a shorter rotation
 - Administrative demands of a Training Unit

Identify Capability Gaps and Intended Approaches to Address Them:

Total personnel required to adequately staff the Troop 11 Training Unit: **17**

- 1 Captain
- 2 Lieutenants
- 1 First Sergeant (Office/Administration of Advanced Training)
- 2 Sergeants (1 for Advanced Training/1 for Basic Training)
- 11 Corporals (7 for Advanced Training/4 for Basic Training)

Table 1: Troop 11 Training Unit PAM

CURRENTLY FIELDED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TRAINING UNIT TOTALS	0	5	2	0	1	1
Advanced Training	0	3	1	0	0	0
Basic Training	0	2	1	0	0	0
Training Unit Headquarters	0	0	0	0	1	1

ESTIMATED NEED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
TRAINING UNIT TOTALS	0	11	2	1	2	1
Advanced Training	0	7	1	0	0	0
Basic Training	0	4	1	0	0	0
Training Unit Headquarters	0	0	0	1	2	1

Attachment 11 B: CRO Personnel Allocation Model Summary

Community Relations Officers (CRO's) are a part of Troop 11 and are responsible for supporting the enforcement arm of the Highway Patrol through safety education. CRO's conduct safety presentations to schools, civic organizations, and private industry; in addition, they serve as public information officers and liaison between the Highway Patrol and both the news media and other governmental organizations. As a part of the community relations function, Highway Patrol recruiters canvas the state to identify and hire qualified law enforcement applicants.

Participants/Highway Patrol Experience

- Captain R.K. Hughes: SCHP 28 years/Supervisor 15 years

Average Experience: SCHP 28 years/Supervisor 15 years

THIRA/SPR Outcomes

Identify Threats and Hazards of Concern:

- Population Growth
- Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests
- Ability to provide services

Give Threats and Hazards Context:

- Increases in Population Growth require:
 - Greater outreach for educational programs
 - Requests have been turned away due to a lack of personnel
 - Greater availability of CRO personnel to handle Media inquiries
 - Requests for interviews/appearances have been turned away due to a lack of personnel
- FOIA requests have increased approximately 138% from 2013
 - Current practices require CRO Corporals to come to Blythewood to review materials prior to dissemination
 - This pulls personnel away from educational efforts
- Personnel requests for Special Assignments, Holiday Enforcement, etc. strain resources

Establish Capability Targets:

- An increase of 7 personnel for the Troop will:
 - Increase the ability to conduct educational programs
 - Increase the ability to process FOIA requests
 - Improve the ability to handle media requests for interviews/appearances
 - Improve the ability to absorb the demands of Special Assignments

Assess Capabilities:

- Current staffing levels in the Troop have not kept pace with:
 - Population Growth trends
 - Increased need for CRO services in the field
 - Increases in FOIA requests
 - Special assignments which pull personnel from the work schedule

Identify Capability Gaps and Intended Approaches to Address Them:

Community Relations Officers/Recruiting

Slotted Manpower:

- 7 CROs (One for each Troop)
- 2 Recruiters
- 4 Corporals
 - 2 CRO Region Supervisors
 - 1 CRO Outreach Supervisor
 - 1 Recruiting Supervisor
- 1 Sergeant (CRO/Recruiting Manager)
- 1 Lieutenant
- 1 Captain

Fielded Manpower:

- 6 CROs
- 2 Recruiters
- 3 Corporals
 - 2 CRO Region Supervisors
 - 1 Recruiting Supervisor
- 1 Lieutenant
- 1 Captain

Shift Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 11 CROs (One for Troop 2,4,and 7/ Two for Troop 1,3,5,and 6)
- 2 Recruiters
- 4 Corporals
 - 2 CRO Region Supervisors
 - 1 CRO Outreach Supervisor
 - 1 Recruiting Supervisor
- 1 Sergeant (CRO/Recruiting Manager)
- 1 Lieutenant
- 1 Captain

Total personnel required to adequately staff the CRO Unit: **20**

- 1 Captain
- 1 Lieutenant
- 1 Sergeant
- 4 Corporals
- 13 Troopers

Table 1: Troop 11 – CRO and Recruiting Activity

CRO ACTIVITY			
YEAR	2015	2016	2017
Safety Presentations	722	815	764
Safety Fairs	513	115	65
Media Contacts	6,962	4,923	4,309

RECRUITING ACTIVITY			
YEAR	2015	2016	2017
Universities/Colleges	36	55	79
Military Installations	12	20	25
High Schools	2	6	12
Career Fairs	20	40	22
Community Events	35	57	39

Table 2: Troop 11 – CRO and Recruiting PAM

CURRENTLYY FIELDDED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
CRO/RECRUITING TOTALS	8	3	0	0	1	1
CRO	6	2	0	0	0	0
Recruiting	2	1	0	0	0	0
CRO/Recruiting Headquarters	0	0	0	0	1	1

ESTIMATED NEED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
CRO/RECRUITING TOTALS	13	4	1	0	1	1
CRO	11	3	0	0	0	0
Recruiting	2	1	0	0	0	0
CRO/Recruiting Headquarters	0	0	1	0	1	1

Attachment 11 C: Special Operations Personnel Allocation Model **Summary**

The Special Operations Unit is a part of Troop 11 and is responsible for the Civil Emergency Response Team (CERT), Advanced Civil Emergency Response Team (A-CERT), Honor Guard Unit, and Fitness Testing Program. In addition, the Special Operations Unit has responsibility for active shooter training, civil disturbance training (mobile field force), select and patrol rifle training. The Unit's primary mission is to coordinate the Department's civil disorder responsibilities during emergencies and preplanned events throughout the State. This includes planning and response to State House and Bike rallies; providing the Department of Public Safety officers with high-risk incident assistance as it relates to the performance of their duties; and assisting law enforcement agencies through the State with critical incidents upon request on a twenty four hour basis.

Participants/Highway Patrol Experience

- Lieutenant D.J. Gamble: SCHP 24.5 years/Supervisor 11 years

Average Experience: SCHP 24.5 years/Supervisor 11 years

THIRA/SPR Outcomes

Identify Threats and Hazards of Concern:

- Protests/Demonstrations
- Training Events
- Increases in request for services

Give Threats and Hazards Context:

- Increases in Protests and Demonstrations which attract large crowds have resulted in an increased demand for Special Operations Personnel
 - A-CERT
- Increases in Training Events have increased demands on Special Operations Personnel
 - Mobile Force Training
 - Active Shooter Training
 - A-CERT Training
 - Physical Fitness Training
- Increase in requests for Honor Guard services

Establish Capability Targets:

- An increase of 3 personnel for the Troop will:
 - Improve the ability to provide supervision during Protests/Demonstrations
 - Improve the ability to handle multiple Training Events
 - Increase the ability to process request for services

Assess Capabilities:

- Current staffing levels in the Special Operations Unit have not kept pace with:
 - Population Growth trends
 - Greater number of people now attracted to Protest/Demonstrations whether they are participating or not
 - Creates an increased possibility for escalation
 - Increases in Training requirements that required skill sets developed/located in the Special Operations Unit
 - Special assignments which require an increased demand for personnel from the field

Identify Capability Gaps and Intended Approaches to Address Them:

Special Operations Unit

Slotted Manpower:

- 2 Corporals
- 1 Sergeant
- 1 Lieutenant
- 1 Captain

Fielded Manpower:

- 2 Corporals
- 1 Sergeant
- 1 Lieutenant
- 1 Captain

Manpower Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 5 Corporals
- 1 Sergeant
- 1 Lieutenant
- 1 Captain

Total personnel required to adequately staff the Special Operations Unit: **8**

- 1 Captain
- 1 Lieutenant
- 1 Sergeant
- 5 Corporals

Table 1: Troop 11 – Special Operations Activity

SPECIAL OPERATIONS UNIT	
Honor Guard	A-CERT / CERT
19 Funeral Details	15 Events at Statehouse
19 Memorial / CCC Functions	19 Statewide Assignments
38 Total Assignments	34 Total Assignments

Table 2: Troop 11 – Special Operations PAM

CURRENTLY FIELDDED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
Special Operations Totals	0	2	1	0	1	1
Special Operations Headquarters	0	2	1	0	1	1

ESTIMATED NEED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
Special Operations Totals	0	5	1	0	1	1
Special Operations Headquarters	0	5	1	0	1	1

Attachment 11 D: Employment Personnel Allocation Model Summary

The Employment Unit is a part of Troop 11 and is responsible for effectively processing and hiring the most qualified applicants into law enforcement positions within the Highway Patrol. The Employment Unit's mission is to ensure that each applicant's qualifications are suitable for employment as a law enforcement officer. Every applicant's qualifications are carefully examined and meet the standards to become a member of the South Carolina Highway Patrol.

Participants/Highway Patrol Experience

- Lieutenant Jamie Cardona: SCHP 15/Supervisor 8

Average Experience: SCHP 15 years/Supervisor 8 years

THIRA/SPR Outcomes

Identify Threats and Hazards of Concern:

- Manpower
- Employment Applications
- Background Investigations
- Polygraph Tests

Give Threats and Hazards Context:

- Restructuring of the Patrol Class Training Schedule has resulted in an increased demand for faster applicant processing
 - Requires personnel at Blythewood for administrative handling
- A greater number of applicants translates into a greater number of required Background Investigations
 - This is a time consuming task that currently requires assigning Background Investigations to the Troops
 - The volume of Polygraph tests has increased
 - SCHP Polygraphers handle testing for all of SCDPS
 - Personnel are approaching retirement with no succession plan in place
 - Training involves a lengthy certification process
- Personnel requests for Special Assignments, Holiday Enforcement, etc. strain resources

Establish Capability Targets:

- An increase of 4 personnel for the Employment Unit:
 - Increase the ability to process employment applications
 - Increase the ability to process Background Investigations
 - Improve the ability to handle the volume of polygraph tests required
 - Improve the ability to absorb the demands of Special Assignments

Assess Capabilities:

- Current staffing levels in the Troop have not kept pace with:
 - Changes in hiring practices
 - Changes in Patrol Training Schedules
 - The volume of polygraph tests conducted
 - Special assignments which pull personnel from the work schedule

Identify Capability Gaps and Intended Approaches to Address Them:

Employment Unit

Slotted Manpower:

- 2 Polygraph Operators
- 1 Sergeant (Background Investigator)
- 1 Lieutenant

Fielded Manpower:

- 2 Polygraph Operators
- 1 Sergeant (Background Investigator)
- 1 Lieutenant

Manpower Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 3 Polygraph Operators
- 3 Background Investigators
- 2 Sergeants
- 1 Lieutenant

Total personnel required to adequately staff the Employment Unit: **9**

- 1 Lieutenant
- 2 Sergeants
- 6 Corporals

Table 1: Troop 11 – Employment Unit Activity

2017 EMPLOYMENT UNIT ACTIVITY	
State Applications Received	2,087
Automatic Disqualifiers	207
Background Questionnaires Received	806
Applicants PAT	510
Polygraph Exams	371
New Troopers Graduates	78
Re-Hire Applications Received	12
Re-Hire Applicants Hired	4

2017 EMPLOYMENT UNIT STATISTICS	
State Applications Processed	2087
Total New Troopers Hired	101

2017 POLYGRAPH TESTS ADMINISTERED	
Highway Patrol	222
State Transport Police	40
Bureau of Protective Services	15
Telecommunications	94
Total	371

Table 2: Troop 11 – Employment Unit PAM

CURRENTLY FIELDDED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
EMPLOYMENT UNIT TOTALS	0	2	1	0	1	0
Background Investigators	0	0	1	0	0	0
Polygraph Examiners	0	2	0	0	0	0
Employment Headquarters	0	0	0	0	1	0

ESTIMATED NEED	TPR - LCPL	CPL	SGT	FSGT	LT	CAPT
EMPLOYMENT UNIT TOTALS	0	6	2	0	1	0
Background Investigators	0	3	1	0	0	0
Polygraph Examiners	0	3	0	0	0	0
Employment Headquarters	0	0	1	0	1	0

Attachment 11 E: Telecommunications Personnel Allocation Model **Summary**

The Telecommunications Unit is a part of Troop 11 and consists of four operations centers around the state where calls for service from the public are received and dispatched to Troopers to respond. Telecommunications Operators keep track of all calls for service through the Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) System.

Participants/Highway Patrol Experience

- Sergeant D.A. McMurry: SCHP 22 years/Supervisor 12 years

Average Experience: SCHP 22 years/Supervisor 12 years

THIRA/SPR Outcomes

Identify Threats and Hazards of Concern:

- Manpower
- Population Growth
- Training

Give Threats and Hazards Context:

- Manpower shortages make it difficult to maintain a schedule that keeps all TCCs covered
- Population growth has resulted in:
 - Increased number of licensed drivers
 - Increased number of registered vehicles
 - Increased call for service coming into the TCCs
- Training and recertification requirements remain a challenge in light of personnel shortages

Establish Capability Targets:

- An increase of 112 personnel for the Telecommunications Centers:
 - Increase the ability to process calls for service
 - Increase the ability to maintain proper radio communication with field personnel
 - Improve the ability to schedule training and recertification

Assess Capabilities:

- Current staffing levels in the TCC's have not kept pace with:
 - Changes in the volume of calls for service
 - Training and recertification requirements

Identify Capability Gaps and Intended Approaches to Address Them:

Telecommunications Centers

Slotted Manpower:

- 32 personnel in Blythewood
- 27 personnel in Charleston
- 31 personnel in Greenville
- 20 personnel in Florence

Fielded Manpower:

- 22 personnel in Blythewood
- 22 personnel in Charleston
- 21 personnel in Greenville
- 21 personnel in Florence

Manpower Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 54 personnel in Blythewood
- 46 personnel in Charleston
- 54 personnel in Greenville
- 46 personnel in Florence

Total personnel required to adequately staff the Telecommunications Centers: **207**

- 1 Captain
- 1 Lieutenant
- 1 Sergeant
- 2 Training Coordinators
- 2 Employment Coordinators
- 200 TCOs

Table 1: Troop 11 – Telecommunications Unit Activity

TELECOMMUNICATIONS UNIT ACTIVITY			
CALL CENTER	CALLS FOR SERVICE		
	2015	2016	2017
BLYTHEWOOD (TROOPS 1 & 4)	279,965	276,405	279,367
CHARLESTON (TROOPS 6 & 7)	207,085	199,971	186,273
FLORENCE (TROOP 5)	149,611	145,941	163,698
GREENVILLE (TROOPS 2 & 3)	256,825	257,967	244,095
TOTAL	893,486	880,284	873,433

Table 2: Troop 11 – Telecommunications PAM

CURRENTLY FIELDED	TCO	ATCS	TCS	TCM	LT	CAPT
TCC TOTALS	64	0	0	0	1	1
Blythewood	16	4	1	1	0	0
Charleston	16	4	1	1	0	0
Greenville	16	3	1	1	0	0
Florence	16	4	0	1	0	0
Coordinators	0	0	0	0	0	0
TCC Headquarters	0	0	0	0	1	1

ESTIMATED NEED	TCO	ATCS	TCS	TCM	SGT	LT	CAPT
TCC TOTALS	200	16	4	4	1	1	1
Blythewood	54	4	1	1	0	0	0
Charleston	46	4	1	1	0	0	0
Greenville	54	4	1	1	0	0	0
Florence	46	4	1	1	0	0	0
Coordinators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TCC HQ	0	0	0	0	1	1	1

Attachment 11 F: Emergency Traffic Management Personnel Allocation **Model Summary**

The Emergency Traffic Management Unit (ETMU) is a part of Troop 11 and is responsible for coordinating and implementing the department's response to natural and man-made disasters in the state. These responsibilities mainly include the evacuation of citizens and response to all hazard contingencies. ETMU coordinates with local, state, and federal agencies to develop plans to respond to emergency situations.

Participants/Highway Patrol Experience

- Lieutenant C.P. Logdon: SCHP 22 years/Supervisor 11 years

Average Experience: SCHP 22 years/Supervisor 11 years

THIRA/SPR Outcomes

Identify Threats and Hazards of Concern:

- Manpower
- Population Growth
- Hazardous Weather Events
- Training

Give Threats and Hazards Context:

- ETMU is involved in numerous emergency management meeting with allied agencies throughout the year which strain already limited manpower resources
 - Table Top Exercises
 - Drills
 - Staffing for rotating shifts during events
 - Lack of experienced personnel affects longevity of the unit
- Continued population growth in South Carolina requires an ongoing evaluation of existing evacuation routes to be used in the event of a natural or man-made disaster
 - Routes have to be driven to assess infrastructure condition as well as residential and commercial developments which could affect evacuation routes
- ETMU continues to assess the response capabilities of the department in the event of a hazardous weather event
 - Continuous and purposeful review of existing plans requires experienced personnel
- Training required Emergency Management often requires travel out of state further highlighting the need for the presence of experienced personnel

Establish Capability Targets:

- An increase of 3 personnel for the Emergency Traffic Management Unit:
 - Increase the ability to develop experience in personnel for the longevity of the unit

- Address personnel needs in terms of planning for future events
 - Evacuation Routes
 - Infrastructure concerns
 - Staffing
- Improve the ability to schedule training and maintain an adequate presence in case of a Natural or Man-Made disaster
 - Implementation of existing plans
 - Coordination of resources

Assess Capabilities:

- Current staffing levels in the ETMU have not kept pace with:
 - The continuing changes in population and infrastructure which affect evacuating the population in the event of a Natural or Man-Made disaster
 - The necessity to maintain experienced and capable personnel in sufficient numbers to provide for adequate planning and response
 - Staffing to accommodate training needs other demands which require the use of personnel
 - Holiday Enforcement
 - Specials

Identify Capability Gaps and Intended Approaches to Address Them:

Emergency Traffic Management Unit

Slotted Manpower:

- 1 Captain
- 1 Lieutenant
- 2 Sergeants

Fielded Uniformed Personnel:

- 1 Lieutenant

Uniformed Personnel Required for Adequate Function:

- 1 Captain
- 1 Lieutenant
- 2 Sergeants

Total personnel required to adequately staff the Emergency Traffic Management Unit: **4**

- 1 Captain
- 1 Lieutenant
- 2 Sergeants

Attachment 11 G: Resource Management Personnel Allocation Model **Summary**

Resource Management is responsible for the purchase and supply of law enforcement equipment for all law enforcement officers of the Department of Public Safety. Patrol Supply stocks, tracks and issues all equipment. Fleet Services Shop equips and maintains all law enforcement vehicles. Budget/Procurement ensures that proper procurement procedures are followed for the purchase of all equipment.

Participants/Highway Patrol Experience

- Sergeant T.J. Riddle: SCHP 19 years/Supervisor 8 years

Average Experience: SCHP 19 years/Supervisor 8 years

THIRA/SPR Outcomes

Identify Threats and Hazards of Concern:

- Keeping pace with new hiring processes to adequately equip personnel
- Maintaining equipment stores for an increased number of personnel
- Additional Responsibilities:
 - Body Camera Deployment
 - Facilities management
 - Fleet Services
 - Communications

Give Threats and Hazards Context:

- New processes for equipping personnel require oversight/management
- Maintaining equipment stores for an increased number of personnel requires oversight/management
- Additional Responsibilities require adequate supervision:
 - Body Camera Deployment
 - Facilities management
 - Fleet Services
 - In-Car Communications Equipment/Handheld Radios

Establish Capability Targets:

- An increase of 3 personnel for the Patrol Supply:
 - Improve processes used to equip personnel
 - Improve the maintaining of equipment stores for an increased number of personnel
 - Address additional responsibilities with adequate supervision

Assess Capabilities:

- Current staffing levels in Patrol Supply have not kept pace with:
 - Maintaining services
 - Supply
 - Fleet
 - Armory

Identify Capability Gaps and Intended Approaches to Address Them:

Resource Management

Slotted Manpower:

- 1 Captain
- 1 Lieutenant
- 2 Sergeants
- 1 Corporal
- 1 Lance Corporal (Armorer)
- 1 DPS Communications Officer

Fielded Manpower:

- 1 Captain
- 2 Sergeants
- 1 Lance Corporal (Armorer)
- 1 DPS Communications Officer

Manpower Required for Adequate Coverage:

- 1 Captain
- 2 Lieutenant (1 Communication Lieutenant)
- 3 Sergeants (1 Communications Sergeant)
- 2 Corporals
 - 1 Corporal (Armorer)

Total uniformed personnel required to adequately staff Resource Management: **9**

- 1 Captain
- 2 Lieutenant (1 Communication Lieutenant)
- 3 Sergeants (1 Communications Sergeant)
- 2 Corporals
 - 1 Corporal (Armorer)