

# An Analysis of the South Carolina Forestry Commission's Incident Report System and the Way that Incident Reports are Entered into the NBS LawTrak Program.

|  |  |  |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  |   |   |   |  |                      |   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
|--|--|--|--|-------------------------|---|--------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|----------------------|---|---------------------|--------------|-----|--------------|------|------|
| County _____ <b>INCIDENT REPORT.</b>   |  |  |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  | CASE NUMBER   |   |   |  |                      |   |                     |              |     |              | NCIC |      |
| AGENCY I.D.  |  |  |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  |   |   |   |  |                      |   |                     |              |     |              | INQ  | ENTD |
| SC0  |  |  |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  |   |   |   |  |                      |   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
| EVENT  | INCIDENT TYPE  |  |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  |   | COMPLETED   | FORCED ENTRY  | PREMISE TYPE                               | UNITS ENTERED        | TYPE VICTIM   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
|  | 1.   |  |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  |   | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No                              |  |                      | Individual Business   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
|  | 2.   |  |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  |   | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No                              |  |                      | Financial In. Government Relig. Orgn. Sco./Public Other Unknown Police Off. |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
| 3.   |  |  |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No  |   |  |                      |   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
| INCIDENT LOCATION (SUBDIVISION, APARTMENT & NUMBER, STREET NAME & NUMBER)  |  |  |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  | ZIP CODE  |   |   |  |                      | WEAPON TYPE   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
| INCIDENT DATE  |  | 24 HR. CLOCK TO  |  | DATE                    |   | 24 HR. CLOCK |                                    | DISPATCH DAY / TIME / 24 HR. CLOCK |  |   | DISP. DATE  |   | DISP. TIME                                 |                      | TIME ARRIVED  |                     | DEPART TIME  |     | LOCATION NO. |      |      |
| COMPLAINANT'S NAME (LAST, FIRST, MIDDLE)   |  |  |  | RELATIONSHIP TO SUBJECT |   |              | RESIDENT                           | RACE                               | SEX  | AGE   | ETH   | DAY PHONE   | EVEN. PHONE                                |                      |   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
| #1   |  |  |  | #2                      |   |              | #3                                 | J S O U                            |  |   |   | H B   | H B  |                      |   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
| ADDRESS  |  |  |  | CITY                    |   |              | ST                                 | ZIP CODE                           |  | LOCATION NO.  |   |   |  |                      |   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
| VICTIM'S NAME (LAST, FIRST, MIDDLE)  |  |  |  | RELATIONSHIP TO SUBJECT |   |              | RESIDENT                           | RACE                               | SEX  | AGE   | ETH   | DAY PHONE   | EVEN. PHONE                                |                      |   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
| #1   |  |  |  | #2                      |   |              | #3                                 | J S O U                            |  |   |   | H B   | H B  |                      |   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
| ADDRESS  |  |  |  | CITY                    |   |              | ST                                 | ZIP CODE                           |  | LOCATION NO.  |   |   |  |                      |   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
| VICTIM #1  | HGT  | WGT  | HAIR   | EYES                    | FACIAL HAIR, SCARS, TATOOS, GLASSES, CLOTHING, PHYSICAL PECULIARITIES, ETC. |              |                                    |                                    |  |   |   |   |  |                      |   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
|  | VISIBLE INJURY (VICT. 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No EXPLAIN --   |  |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  |   | COMPLAINT OF ANY NON-VISIBLE INJURIES: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |   |  |                      |   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
| VICTIM (NO. 1) USING: ALCOHOL <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unk                                    |  |  |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  | DRUGS <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unk |   | TYPE:   |  |                      |   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
| TWO-MAN VEH. <input type="checkbox"/> ONE-MAN VEH. <input type="checkbox"/> DETECTIVES-PLASMT. <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/> |  |  |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  | ALONE <input type="checkbox"/> ASSISTED <input type="checkbox"/>                            |   | *In This Jurisdiction S=State O=Out-of-State U=Unknown                                |  |                      |   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
| SUBJECT #1   | <input type="checkbox"/> Suspect   | NAME (LAST, FIRST, MIDDLE)   |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  |   |   | RACE  | SEX  | AGE                  | ETH   | DATE OF BIRTH       | HGT          | WGT | HAIR         | EYES |      |
|  | <input type="checkbox"/> Runaway   | FACIAL HAIR, SCARS, TATOOS, GLASSES, CLOTHING, PHYSICAL PECULIARITIES, ETC.  |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  |   |   |   |  |                      |   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
|  | <input type="checkbox"/> Wanted  | ADDRESS  |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  |   |   | CITY  |  | ST                   | ZIP CODE  |                     | LOCATION NO. |     |              |      |      |
|  | <input type="checkbox"/> Arrest  | SUBJECT (NO. 1) USING: Alcohol <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unk |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  |   |   | ARRESTED NEAR OFFENSE SCENE: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |  | DATE/TIME OF OFFENSE |   | DATE/TIME OF ARREST |              |     |              |      |      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jail  | Drugs <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unk  |  |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  |   | Type:   |   | TOTAL # ARRESTED                           |                      |   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
| NARRATIVE  |  |  |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  |   |   |   |  |                      |   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
|  |  |  |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  |   |   |   |  |                      |   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
|  |  |  |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  |   |   |   |  |                      |   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
|  |  |  |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  |   |   |   |  |                      |   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
| JURISDICTION OF THEFT LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY   |  |  |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  | JURISDICTION OF RECOVERY LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY   |   |   |  |                      |   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
| PROPERTY EST.  | TYPE (GROUP)   |  |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  |   |   |   |  |                      |   |                     | TOTAL VALUE  |     |              |      |      |
|  | STOLEN   |  |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  |   |   |   |  |                      |   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
|  | DAMAGED  |  |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  |   |   |   |  |                      |   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
|  | BURNED   |  |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  |   |   |   |  |                      |   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
|  | RECOVERED  |  |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  |   |   |   |  |                      |   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
| ADMINISTRATIVE   | SUBJECT IDENTIFIED <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No  |  | SUBJECT LOCATED <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |                         | <input type="checkbox"/> ACTIVE <input type="checkbox"/> ADM. CLOSED        |              | <input type="checkbox"/> UNFOUNDED |                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> ARRESTED UNDER 18 |   | <input type="checkbox"/> ARRESTED 18 & OVER   |   | <input type="checkbox"/> EX-CLEAN UNDER 18 |                      | <input type="checkbox"/> EX-CLEAN 18 & OVER                                 |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
|  | REASON FOR EXCEPTIONAL CLEARANCE: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Offender Death <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No Prosecution <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Extradition Denied <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Victim Declines Cooperation <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Juvenile-No Custody |  |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  |   |   |   |  |                      |   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
|  | REPORTING OFFICER(S)   |  |  |                         | DATE  | UNIT NO.     | APPROVING OFFICER                  |                                    |  |   | DATE  | UNIT NO.  |  |                      |   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |
|  | FOLLOW-UP  |  |  |                         |   |              |                                    |                                    |  |   | OFFICER   |   |  |                      |   |                     |              |     |              |      |      |

Jonathan Calore  
 Assistant Law Enforcement Chief  
 South Carolina Forestry Commission  
 January 22, 2010

S. C. STATE LIBRARY

An Analysis of the South Carolina Forestry Commission's Incident Report System and the Way that Incident Reports are Entered into the NBS LawTrak Program.

By Jonathan Calore

The South Carolina Forestry Commission (SCFC) was established through legislative action in 1927. At its inception, the agency had three charges - to protect the forest, to promote the benefits of forest management, and to monitor the forests' condition. At that time, much of our forestland had been heavily cut over and was eroding badly due to poor farming practices. Today South Carolina's forests provide the raw material for the state's forest products industry - the largest manufacturing industry in South Carolina. (SCFC website, History and Mission page)

The South Carolina Forestry Commission is responsible for protecting 13.6 million acres from wildland fire. This includes 12.2 million acres of commercial forestland. The Forestry Commission has a statewide wildland fire prevention, detection and control network in place. Personnel are assigned throughout the state to one of our unit or regional offices, or the state headquarters. The largest single group of employees -wildland firefighters – effectively “work from home,” responding to wildland fires. Dispatch is based on closest available resource, regardless of political or administrative boundaries.

Forestry Commission firefighters respond to more than 4,000 wildland fires that burn about 24,000 acres per year. Human activity accounts for 98% of the causes for these fires. Interest in the reforestation and protection of forest land in South Carolina began as early as 1787 when a law was passed providing for the punishment of any person who willfully, maliciously, or negligently caused fire which damaged another

person's property. Between 1787 and 1912, lawmakers passed eleven bills concerned with forestry. Most dealt with the protection of the forest from fire. Increasing activities in lumber and naval stores (stands of trees dedicated to ship building) directed the attention of thoughtful individuals to the quickly disappearing timber supply. The future of South Carolina's forest resource was headed toward crisis when the General Assembly created the State Commission of Forestry on April 26, 1927. (SCFC website, History and Mission page)

The first organized forest fire control efforts were initiated in 1928 when groups of landowners, in cooperation with the S.C. State Commission of Forestry, formed five forest fire protection organizations for the control of woods fires on some 195,000 acres of woodland. These Forest Protective Associations, as they were known, grew in number and size until 1944 when 24 counties had organized fire protection organizations. In 1945 the General Assembly passed the South Carolina Forest Fire Protection Act which extended organized forest fire protection to every county in South Carolina - the first of any of the southeastern states to take such a step. (SCFC website, History and Mission page)

At present, the Forestry Commission has about 380-employees and is still charged with protecting and enhancing South Carolina's forest resource. Forest firefighters are based in every county for quick response to wildfires, and project foresters are available to assist landowners throughout the state. Three regional dispatch centers coordinate statewide forest protection.

The Forestry Commission has always been involved in forest law enforcement. The degree of involvement was not always consistent, being dictated by both public attitude and the attitude of agency administration. The Forestry Commission's first

attempt to prosecute someone for illegal woodburning was in 1929. In this case, a Charleston County Grand Jury refused to return an indictment. This was indicative of a prevailing public attitude toward woodburning. Fire was credited with getting rid of snakes, chiggers, ticks, and other vermin. It made the woods "green up" in the spring. It didn't hurt anything except maybe a few trees and they'd probably grow back. Many people simply didn't see fire as a problem, or fire-setting as a crime for which someone should be punished.

During 1930-31, however, Forestry Commission authorities successfully prosecuted cases in Fairfield and Williamsburg Counties. Both cases were for careless burning: and in each case the accused was found guilty and sentenced to 30 days on the county chain gang. The Williamsburg case's sentence was suspended, but apparently the Fairfield culprit served his time.

In 1936, a Georgetown County man was charged and found guilty of careless burning. A creative judge sentenced him to help fight all wildfires in his community for the rest of his natural life.

The first Forestry Commission officers were commissioned as state constables. There was little training, so officers put their own distinctive touches to their law enforcement effort. One early County Ranger was also a magistrate, and would try his cases right at the fire scene. His bench was the hood of his truck and his statement to the accused was, "Don't you lie to me . . . did you start this fire?"

Law enforcement is an important part of forest fire prevention. The Forestry Commission assumes the primary responsibility for statewide forest fire law enforcement.

All Forestry Commission officers are trained and certified by the SC Criminal Justice Academy. After graduation, officers receive additional training on forestry law, wildland fire behavior, forest fire investigation, and incident management. Forestry Commission officers have statewide jurisdiction and full power of arrest. Forestry Commission officers may issue citations (tickets) for misdemeanor offenses. For more serious crimes, officers obtain warrants and make physical arrests. In the early 1990's, the agency began investigating timber transaction crime, primarily in response to public demand. Specially trained Forestry Commission agents now investigate hundreds of timber thefts and fraudulent timber deals every year.

Timber transaction crime includes outright theft of forest products, as well as fraud. Timber transaction crime is characterized as "white collar crime committed by criminals in work clothes." Forestry Commission agents say losses to SC landowners could be as high as \$10 million each year. Many cases are never reported.

The Forestry Commission is the primary law enforcement agency investigating timber transaction crime in SC. Four agents handle several hundred timber transaction crime investigations per year. Investigations usually begin with a complaint from a landowner.

### **Description of Problem**

The SCFC currently has 38 officers statewide who submit Incident Reports year-round. Each officer currently hand writes or types an Incident Report for every call for service (fire, litter, timber case, etc.). Some reports have a citation that goes with them and some have an arrest warrant. Under ideal conditions, all of the information on the incident report is entered into a central database located at the state headquarters. Currently, there is only one person who enters each of these reports by hand on a part

time (dual-employment) basis. This person works an average of 9.6 hours per month. The incident reports which are being entered have only the minimum amount of information entered required by SLED (State Law Enforcement Division) and the FBI (Federal Bureau of Investigation). We would like to have all of the data entered that the database will allow. Also, we would like to have all of the reports from the last two years updated to this level.

### **History of Problem**

Approximately two years ago, SLED contacted us about the length of time that it was taking for us to get incident reports entered into the database and submitted to SLED. In most instances Incident Reports were seven-to-eight-months-old before they were entered into the database. I and Law Enforcement Chief David West met with SLED about what we needed to do for a short-term remedy to get the eight-month back log entered within two months to be able to meet an annual data deadline of February 1<sup>st</sup> for reporting to the FBI. At that time we learned what the bare minimum of information to be entered is and implemented a procedure of entering this reduced amount of information to be able to stay current, until a better solution could be developed. We currently still only enter this bare minimum.

The other issue that has arisen out of entering this reduced amount of information is that when the public sends in a "Freedom of Information Act" request for a copy of an incident report, it takes much longer to be able to provide a copy. The process for finding the Incident Report goes much faster if all of the information is entered. I am able to query the database, pull up the Incident Report, and print the entire report for the requestor. If the report falls from within the last two years, I am able to find what month

it was entered and then I have to go the files and find the hard copy version. This can be a very time consuming process.

During the last eighteen months the SCFC has suffered a 33% reduction in state funding and the near future predictions for the budget do not look any better. The SCFC along with most other state agencies, is dealing with these budgetary issues several different ways. The SCFC has implemented two separate five-day furloughs and a retirement incentive program, leaving positions vacant when an employee leaves the agency. Due to reductions in funding, employees of the SCFC are taking on more responsibilities and are trying to improve processes to become more efficient during these tough economic times.

### **Data Collection and Analysis**

Data was collected by conducting verbal surveys of several other law enforcement agencies that are similar in size of the SCFC's Law Enforcement Section. I surveyed Camden Police Department (27 Officers), Newberry Police Department (31 Officers), and Irmo Police Department (24 Officers). Each agency was asked which database system they currently use to warehouse and submit their Incident Reports. They were asked about the process that is used to enter and validate these reports. They were asked how many reports are entered during an average month. Lastly they were asked what the average amount of time for someone in their agency to enter a complete Incident Report.

I also spoke with the database provider, Nicholson Business Systems, which the SCFC uses, regarding the number of licensed users that we can put on the system and the system requirements for entering the data. I then spoke to my agency's Information Technology Section, regarding the system requirements for our users to be able to access the incident report database.

Lastly, I did a phone pole of all of our Law Enforcement officers to find out who has a computer or access to one with a DSL or faster connection.

Here is what the data collected revealed:

| LE Agency       | Incident Report Database | Method of Entry | Avg. Reports per Month | Avg. Time per Entry |
|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Camden Police   | NBS LawTrak              | Each Officer    | 190                    | 2 - 5 minutes       |
| Newberry Police | NBS LawTrak              | Each Officer    | 300 - 500              | 2 - 3 minutes       |
| Irmo Police     | RMS                      | Each Officer    | 140                    | 5 - 7 minutes       |

Every agency that I spoke with, have each of their officers enter their own

incident reports. It appears that the average report takes about three to four minutes type into the database that is used by each agency. Using these numbers, it appears that the average report that the SCFC enters takes 8-10 minutes to enter by the time it is typed twice.

| Month               | Calendar Year |            |             |
|---------------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
|                     | 2007          | 2008       | 2009        |
| January             | 73            | 76         | 65          |
| February            | 206           | 139        | 171         |
| March               | 306           | 158        | 136         |
| April               | 163           | 53         | 80          |
| May                 | 101           | 48         | 19          |
| June                | 28            | 69         | 23          |
| July                | 32            | 39         | 19          |
| August              | 74            | 40         | 20          |
| September           | 60            | 23         | 20          |
| October             | 59            | 45         | 4           |
| November            | 113           | 47         | 0           |
| December            | 115           | 43         | 0           |
| <b>TOTAL</b>        | <b>1330</b>   | <b>780</b> | <b>557</b>  |
| <b>MONTHLY AVG.</b> | <b>110.8</b>  | <b>65</b>  | <b>46.4</b> |

The SCFC officers currently type or some even still hand write their Incident

Reports, these reports then go to the regional investigator for approval, and then finally to the agency headquarters to be entered into LawTrak. The process that we currently use is a duplication of effort. The reports are written twice by the time that they are entered into the database.



| Month  | Hours | Dual-Employment Personnel |            |          |
|--------|-------|---------------------------|------------|----------|
|        |       | Rate                      | Salary     | Fringe   |
| Dec-09 | 9     | \$ 15.39                  | \$ 138.51  | \$ 34.63 |
| Nov-09 | 6     | \$ 15.39                  | \$ 92.34   | \$ 23.09 |
| Oct-09 | 8     | \$ 15.39                  | \$ 123.12  | \$ 30.78 |
| Sep-09 | 8     | \$ 15.39                  | \$ 123.12  | \$ 30.78 |
| Aug-09 | 8     | \$ 15.39                  | \$ 123.12  | \$ 30.78 |
| Jul-09 | 14    | \$ 15.39                  | \$ 215.46  | \$ 53.87 |
| May-09 | 8     | \$ 15.39                  | \$ 123.12  | \$ 30.78 |
| Apr-09 | 10    | \$ 15.39                  | \$ 153.90  | \$ 38.48 |
| Mar-09 | 8     | \$ 15.39                  | \$ 123.12  | \$ 30.78 |
| Feb-09 | 7.5   | \$ 15.39                  | \$ 115.42  | \$ 28.86 |
| Jan-09 | 5.25  | \$ 15.39                  | \$ 80.79   | \$ 20.20 |
| Dec-08 | 3.75  | \$ 15.39                  | \$ 57.71   | \$ 14.43 |
| Nov-08 | 4.5   | \$ 15.39                  | \$ 69.25   | \$ 17.31 |
| Oct-08 | 8     | \$ 15.39                  | \$ 123.12  | \$ 30.78 |
| Sep-08 | 9     | \$ 15.39                  | \$ 138.51  | \$ 34.63 |
| Aug-08 | 6     | \$ 15.39                  | \$ 92.34   | \$ 23.09 |
| Jul-08 | 12    | \$ 15.39                  | \$ 184.68  | \$ 46.17 |
| May-08 | 17    | \$ 15.23                  | \$ 258.91  | \$ 64.73 |
| Apr-08 | 11.5  | \$ 15.23                  | \$ 175.14  | \$ 43.79 |
| Mar-08 | 11.5  | \$ 15.23                  | \$ 175.14  | \$ 43.79 |
| Feb-08 | 28    | \$ 15.23                  | \$ 426.44  | \$106.61 |
| Jan-08 | 8.5   | \$ 15.23                  | \$ 129.45  | \$ 32.36 |
|        | 211.5 |                           | \$3,242.71 | \$810.68 |

211.5 hours / 22 months = 9.6 hours per month

Total Salary & Fringe for 22 months = \$4,053.39

The SCFC pays a yearly service and maintenance fee to Nicholson Business Systems for the use of LawTrak. This fee allows us to have access to software updates, an unlimited number of users, technical support, and training. Users do not have to be located in the same place as the database. It can be accessed by remote computer through a VPN (virtual private network) connection or terminal service. The user has to be able to access the internet either through DSL or broadband connection.

The SCFC IT Section was consulted to see if the agency computer infrastructure could handle the number of remote access users that this would create. Each of these

users will be able to access the LawTrak database through a VPN connection to the SCFC mainframe. All of the users will need to have a VPN account. All of the users will not be able to be on the system at the same time, but this should not be a major issue. Each user will need to have access to a computer as a minimum, but ideally will need to have their own designated computer. All but three of the SCFC Law Enforcement Officers have an agency owned computer and access to the internet through DSL or broadband.

There are several possible options to solving our current problem. The first is obviously to do nothing at all and let the problem continue the way that it has for the past two years. The second option is to hire a part-time employee to enter all of the complete incident reports and also to bring the database up to date during slow times of reporting activity. The third option would be to have each officer enter their own reports and continue to use our dual-employment employee to check the reports for quality control. Also as part of the third option we could hire a temporary employee to bring the database up to date.

## **Findings and Conclusions**

Based on information gathered from the other agencies I spoke with about how their incident reports get entered and current budget restrictions, I would recommend the SCFC implement a new procedure for entering our reports. The SCFC should start having each individual officer enter his or her own complete incident reports and then have our dual-employment employee switch from being the point of entry for all of the reports to being more of a records custodian. She would be the one who checks behind these officers to verify that they are entering the correct codes for each incident. She

could check these reports daily or even weekly, depending on the number of reports being entered.

The number of incident reports written by SCFC Law Enforcement Officers depends heavily on the number of escaped debris fires, wildland arson fires, and timber complaints that we have. The fire numbers depend heavily on the weather conditions that we are experiencing (dry and windy more fires versus wet and calm no fires). The timber complaints usually follow the economy. We are currently seeing an increase in the number of timber complaints since the economic downturn.

The SCFC has roughly 2,500 reports that need to be updated with the narrative portion. It is my recommendation that we contract the State Office of Human Resources TempO program to hire one individual to update the database. It should cost the SCFC roughly \$2,100 to implement this, figuring three weeks at 37.5 hours per week, \$15 per hour plus 23% administrative fee assessed by OHR for the TempO service. The SCFC should implement the use of this service immediately. It will take roughly ½ day to orient the TempO employee with the LawTrak database. Our dual-employment employee works an average of 9.6 hours per month entering incident reports. Based on the amount of reports to be updated it would take just under twelve months for her to get all of the reports updated without doing any of the quality control on the new reports that are being entered. The pay rate that was chosen for the TempO employee is based off of the pay rate for our dual-employment employee. We currently pay our employee \$15.39 per hour.

## References

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Camden Police Department                   | Captain Morgan 803-425-6025                                     |
| Newberry Police Department                 | Nielle Andrews 803-321-1010                                     |
| Irmo Police Department                     | Captain Nates 803-781-8088                                      |
| Nicholson Business Systems                 | Brian Lovenshimer 843-393-7800                                  |
| SCFC Accounting Department                 | Cathy Nordeen 803-896-8865                                      |
| SCFC IT Section                            | Scott Drafts 803-896-8877                                       |
| B&CB Office of Human Resources             | Jane Page 803-734-9082  |
| SCFC Website Agency Background and History | <a href="http://www.trees.sc.gov/">http://www.trees.sc.gov/</a> |