

REPORT # 4

Police
INDIVIDUAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REPORT

Marion County, Belleview, Dunnellon, and
in Response to a Request for Technical Assistance by the
Ocala, Florida, Police Department
Consolidation Study

April 21, 1972

34230

Prepared by:

Public Administration Service
1313 East 60th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637

(Per Contract J-LEAA-015-72)

I. PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

A. Consultant Assigned:

**Jerome A. Needle
Senior Associate**

B. Date Assignment Received:

April 3, 1972

C. Date of Contact with LEAA Regional Coordinator:

April 4, 1972

D. Dates of On-Site Consultation:

April 10-14, 1972

E. Individuals Interviewed:

K. C. Alvarez, Chief, Ocala Police Department

Doug Willis, Sheriff, Marion County

Wayne Noland, Chief, Dunnellon Police Department

William Giles, Chief, Belleview Police Department

William Swigert, Mayor, Ocala

Joseph Wilson, President, Ocala City Council

Kenneth McKay, Representative, Florida Legislature

Jim Jackson, Marion County Research and Planning Officer

Jimmy Polk, Planning and Training Officer, Ocala Police Department

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

A. Problem as per Technical Instruction:

The Board of County Commissioners of Marion County, Florida, and the City Councils of the three cities in the County with police departments, Belleview, Dunnellon, and Ocala, each adopted a resolution which expressed an interest in exploring "feasible alternatives and/or methods of improvement" of the present police services within the County. "Feasible alternatives" is the term selected to represent all forms of cooperative service arrangements including full departmental consolidation. Chief K. C. Alvarez of Ocala, as spokesman for the respective governmental units, has requested technical assistance to help develop a "plan for a plan"—a plan to guide officials during an examination of possible cooperative service arrangements. A representative of LEAA, Region IV, stated that the problem was to develop a plan for the interested governments which would permit them to "take an orderly look at consolidation options," and identify the necessary steps to be taken in a study of cooperative arrangements.

B. Problem Actually Observed:

The desirability of establishing some form of cooperative police arrangement in Marion County is an issue which has already evoked official and public concern and discussion. Public concern and discussion, while understandable, are somewhat premature at this time since no systematic study and evaluation of the potential or appropriateness of any cooperative arrangement for Marion County have been undertaken . . . discussions have concentrated on questions which are as yet imperfectly defined.

The major need in Marion County is clear: completion of an objective, professional study of the potentials and prospects for consolidation, or other cooperative arrangements. Consolidation issues will continue to generate attention until some resolution of the issue is achieved. In the interest of the public, it is desirable that resolution of the issue reflect the benefits to be derived from objective study, and that discussions and action on the issue be based to the greatest degree possible on objective analysis.

The Technical Instruction accurately identified the first step as development of a "plan" to guide interested parties in Marion County in their efforts "to systematically evaluate" cooperative service and consolidation arrangements. It properly implied that the study itself should be approached systematically—to first "plan" the study. Development of a "plan" is equivalent to preparation of a preliminary "research design," a step which properly precedes implementation of a professionally structured and administered governmental research study.

III. FACTS BEARING ON THE PROBLEM

- A. Marion County has four organized police agencies: The County Sheriff's Department; the Police Departments of the cities of Ocala, Belleview, and Dunnellon.
- B. Two of these agencies are large: the Sheriff's Department (44 full-time employees) and the Ocala Police Department (70 full-time employees). Two of the agencies are small: the Belleview Police Department (three full-time employees) and the Dunnellon Police Department (five full-time employees). The small departments are not providing a full range of quality police services. They do not appear to have the organizational or economic potential to provide full service nor can investment in certain essential services, required only occasionally, be economically justified for these departments.
- C. There are a number of current instances of cooperation among police agencies in Marion County.
 - 1. The Dunnellon and Belleview Departments receive full communications and detention services and on-request investigations assistance from the County Sheriff.
 - 2. The Dunnellon and Belleview Departments will handle calls for field service in unincorporated areas when requested to do so by the Sheriff.
- D. There is evidence of overlapping in the provision of field services to at least one incorporated jurisdiction.
- E. The County's criminal justice agencies, including the four police agencies, are currently involved in a study to determine the feasibility of a County Criminal Justice Information System.
- F. A Marion County League of Cities has just been formed. One of its objectives is to increase governmental efficiency through cooperation.

- G. The voters of the State of Florida recently approved a court reorganization program which more fully centralizes court administration and operations.
- H. LEAA is currently supporting a countywide planning and research program.
- I. State constitutional provisions explicitly provide authority to local governments to modify structures and to contract for services.

These facts suggest that cooperative criminal justice operations are not alien to Marion County and the current environment would not be unsympathetic to a study of further cooperative arrangements.

- J. A local civic group has been promoting consolidation.
- K. There has been much public discussion of both the "potential benefits" and "probable disadvantages" of consolidation of services.
- L. There has been no comprehensive study of cooperative arrangements and no specific proposals to which the public might react or use to develop an informed position.

IV. POSSIBLE COURSES OF ACTION

Three courses of action are possible: (1) allow the present conditions to continue; (2) prepare a plan for a study of cooperative services arrangements; and (3) undertake a study without such a plan.

V. RECOMMENDED COURSE OF ACTION.

For reasons already discussed, it was decided a plan for a study was needed. Such a plan was prepared and presented to a meeting of county and municipal officials. A copy of the plan, a draft version of which was left with the local officials, is attached to this report.

One consideration remains to be discussed, the timing of such a study. It is suggested that it be soon. The suggestion is dictated primarily by the public's need for factual information and a proposal to which it may respond intelligently. The study, and preparation for the study, will take some time. Delay will only prolong uninformed discussion. And if the study revealed that operational benefits could be achieved through cooperative arrangements, it would be prudent to reap those benefits with the least possible delay.

**CONSOLIDATION AND COOPERATIVE ARRANGEMENTS
FOR POLICE SERVICES:
A METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH TO STUDY AND EVALUATION**

Introduction

Presented below is a series of procedural steps which should be included in a study and evaluation of cooperative police services arrangements or consolidation.¹ The approach presented is one which has been used to study cooperative arrangement systems for a number of local governments in the United States and therefore is one which has been "tested" and "tempered." The approach should meet the objective of the current technical assistance assignment—to develop a *plan* which will permit the concerned officials to "take an orderly look" at consolidation and cooperative service arrangements. In developing the plan the primary goal was to at least identify each important consideration involved in completing a cooperative arrangement study.

These considerations are of two kinds: (1) administrative—those things necessary to properly prepare for the study and (2) operational—those things involved in carrying out the study itself. Although time constraints dictate that the presentation take outline form, a number of the more significant considerations are explained at some length. When deemed appropriate, explanations utilize situations and data reflective of actual Marion County police service experience to make the plan somewhat more meaningful to Marion County users. Such examples are not to be interpreted as conclusions or recommendations.

Finally, it should be stated that approaches to consolidation—cooperative arrangement studies developed by other students of the subject might, and probably would, differ from the approach presented below. There is no universally accepted methodological approach to cooperative arrangement studies among students of police science or governmental relations.

¹ "Consolidation" refers to a complete legal and structural merger of police agencies, one result of which is the complete loss of identity and independent existence of the agencies entering into the merger. "Cooperative arrangement" refers to any form of cooperation between two or more police agencies.

Study Management and Administration

I. Assess the Level of Interest in a Study

It is prudent at the outset to determine whether public interest in having a study of cooperative arrangements is sincere. If sincere interest is lacking, it is better to postpone an investment of time and resources, which in that event would probably be wasted. Determining whether interest exists is a delicate exercise. One good technique is to elicit the reaction of community and political leaders. It appears, at the present time, that there is interest in a study for Marion County.

II. Appoint a Study Committee

A successful study depends upon the quality of its direction, control, and management, and these in turn are strongly influenced by the character of the study committee chosen for its oversight. Three essential considerations with respect to a study committee are (1) its composition, (2) its functions, and (3) its operating procedures.

A. Composition. Most successful committees for cooperative arrangement studies are those composed of persons who (1) reflect, as fully as possible, public constituencies affected by cooperative services arrangements, and (2) have technical expertise in law enforcement and intergovernmental relations studies. Technical expertise can, of course, be acquired by hiring or appointing professional staff to serve the committee.

When appointing members to its study committee, Marion County should include representatives of the four police agencies, community interest group members (Chamber of Commerce, taxpayers, and civic groups), political representatives (county commissioners and city council members), and such persons as university and college faculty members with interest in law enforcement and public administration. It is usually prudent to try to limit committee size to about a dozen persons.

B. Functions. The committee would have ultimate responsibility for the direction and quality of the study. Among its duties would be to: (1) define the nature of the study; (2) define the expected products; (3) determine who would conduct the study; (4) monitor study progress; and (5) review and approve or disapprove the study products.

The committee should have continuing involvement in the study. It must be remembered, however, that its objectives are to facilitate completion of a study and to assure that the purposes of the study are achieved objectively, rationally, and thoroughly. Decisions concerning desirability or feasibility of consolidation or cooperative services are the prerogatives of the public—the committee serves as manager and catalyst, not as a legislative body.

C. Operating Procedures. The committee should determine its own procedures and rules for operation. Any of the widely used systems of parliamentary procedure normally would suffice.

III. Financing the Study

Prior to taking any definitive action, sources of funding should be identified and definite commitments of financial support obtained. Promises of financial support are not sufficient. Sources to consider are the participating local governments, federal agencies (in this case LEAA), and foundations. Studies performed by local personnel² can usually be supported by the local governments which would stand to benefit from the study, without other financial assistance. Studies performed by consultants or research organizations often require expenditures which exceed the financial abilities of local governments. In these cases it has become common to seek federal assistance.

It is wise to determine whether local governments really cannot afford a study or simply do not wish a study. Experience has shown that the willingness of local governments to contribute to the costs of studies is often a very revealing measure of sincere interest. Too often federal funds are viewed as "gifts," with local participants feeling that there is every reason to utilize the funds since they can take or leave alone the study products. Federal assistance should not be sought if local interest in the study is merely casual.

IV. Select a Study Team

The inevitable question with respect to study teams is whether the study should be made by local personnel or outside consultants. "Mixed" local personnel—consultant teams are a third option, but one not recommended for cooperative services studies. Local personnel, who are normally less expensive in terms of dollar outlay,³ should be used for studies when:

² Local personnel refers to employees or citizens of involved governments as opposed to professional and/or commercial research and consulting organizations.

³ When local personnel cannot provide the quality of expertise that consultants can, they are *not* less expensive.

1. They have full competence and expertise in the subjects of study.
2. They can be made available for concentrated periods of time.
3. The study is of a kind which will be repeated periodically, and there is an advantage in having local staff learn the methodology.
4. The subject of the study is not sensitive.

Independent assistance is normally used when one of these conditions does not prevail locally. In the present Marion County situation, the political sensitivity of the consolidation-cooperative arrangements issue suggests that outside consultant assistance be sought. This would help assure that those who would ultimately evaluate a study—the public and governmental representatives—need not question the objectivity of the findings and recommendations.

Study Methodology

The fundamental purpose of consolidation/cooperative arrangement studies is to determine whether the *public* would be better served by a police services delivery system which differs from a given current system. Stated alternatively, would a cooperative arrangement or consolidation delivery system upgrade and be superior to the present system? Conversion to a consolidated or cooperative arrangement system is usually desirable when most of the following major benefits can be achieved:

1. Quality of service throughout the area can be upgraded more effectively under a consolidation/cooperative system than through the current systems.
2. Service levels of police functions throughout the area can be raised at costs which are equal to or lower than costs which would be experienced if service levels were raised in the present systems.
3. Duplicated services may be combined with some resultant cost savings.
4. Areawide administration of police services is simplified through reduction of number of units delivering police services.
5. Responsibility for police services is concentrated, facilitating the public's evaluation and control of these services.

To determine whether retention of the present systems or conversion to a cooperative arrangement system is the more desirable option, the following study tasks must be completed:

- Task 1: Review the present systems.
- Task 2: Evaluate the present systems and define needs.
- Task 3: Identify cooperative arrangements alternatives.
- Task 4: Compare and evaluate the present systems and cooperative arrangements alternatives and select the police services system which meets the defined needs.

Task 1: Review the Present System

The purpose of Task 1 is to assemble all information which describes and explains the current police services system. The following kinds of information should be assembled:

1. **Area Geographic and Demographic Data.** Size of service area (in square miles), population, jurisdictional geographic configuration, location of units of government, miles between incorporated municipalities, etc.
2. **Governmental Patterns.** The number of governmental units, their powers, the general environment for, and characteristics of, intergovernmental relations (current intergovernmental activities, history of intergovernmental attempts), etc.
3. **Legal Prescriptions and Prohibitions.** Constitutional and statutory provisions concerning joint exercise of powers, home rule, consolidation, mandatory constitutional offices, legal methods for modernizing local government structure, etc. (Florida law appears to contain few if any constraints to structural modification of local government.)
4. **Law Enforcement Agency Resources and Operations.** For each law enforcement agency within the service area, collect data pertaining to:
 - a. Expenditures (by program or function if possible).
 - b. Crime, traffic, service levels, and demands.
 - c. Manpower: strength, composition, rank, full-time, part-time, sworn and nonsworn, age, education, training attainments, etc.
 - d. Employment conditions: salary, fringe and retirement benefits, recruitment practices, selection standards, recruit training, etc.
 - e. Equipment and facilities: buildings, automobiles, communications, officers' equipment, etc.
 - f. Organization: structure, activities performed.

- g. Management: management role in policy formulation, control of operations, management information collection and utilization, budgeting procedures, in-service training, etc.
 - h. Operations: scope, organization, policies, practices in patrol, traffic, investigations, juvenile services, legal paper service, bailiff service, community relations and public information; other field services (e.g., parking meter collection and animal control), communications, detention, evidence collection and preservation, records, training, planning, inspections, personnel management.
5. Other considerations which appear pertinent to analysis of the specific local situation. These may become apparent during initial data collection or be revealed during subsequent analysis and evaluation.

Note that each function and activity normally performed by police agencies must be individually reviewed (4g). This is done to facilitate the analysis, construction, design, and selection among alternative types of consolidated or cooperative police services. The individual functions serve as "building blocks" or "components" of police services systems, and each must be treated as an entity. Thus one type of cooperative arrangement might be considered which seeks to treat only staff functions cooperatively. Another may seek to treat auxiliary and staff services. Intelligent consideration of alternative arrangements requires that each function be capable of individual "analytical handling."

Task 2: Evaluate Present System and Define Needs

The purpose of Task 2 is to determine the following with relation to the functions and activities of *each* law enforcement agency:

1. Whether all necessary functions and activities are carried out by the agency or otherwise provided to citizens within the jurisdiction.
2. Whether the functions and activities are carried out at levels demanded.
3. Whether the quality of the services provided meet modern police and management standards.

Task 2 also seeks to determine with respect to *all* agencies:

4. Whether services are being duplicated.
5. The degree of compatibility of the quality, scope, and nature of their police operations, and whether their manpower, salaries, fringe benefits, selection, promotional, and retirement systems are compatible or susceptible of accommodation.

After Tasks 1 and 2 have been completed and combined, the product would be a countywide PROFILE OF POLICE RESOURCES, SERVICES, AND NEEDS. Among the contents of the PROFILE will be: resources; identification of services which are adequately performed, quantitatively and qualitatively; identification of services which are *not* performed adequately, quantitatively and qualitatively (these service areas represent police services needs); duplication; and assessment of the potential compatibility of the police systems under study.

The needs, along with the maintenance of present quality services, the elimination of duplication, and the maximization of dollar-investment represent the *objectives* to be sought in the police services system recommended in the final step of the study. Note that what has been taking place thus far in the study (among other things) is a definition of *needs and objectives* of the police services systems. As is required in any competent systems analysis, the key task of formulating objectives precedes systems design. In this case systems design is represented by the selection of a system for delivery of police services—a structural arrangement, either the present one or a newly created cooperative system.

"Evaluation" or analysis of the present system is primarily a function of knowledge of police services and intergovernmental relations and experience in doing studies in these areas. There are no stock approaches to evaluation of either police systems or intergovernmental relations studies; methods cannot be applied uniformly.

Task 3: Identify Cooperative Arrangements Alternatives

The purpose of Task 3 is to identify and define the various cooperative arrangement options which may serve as structures through which defined police systems objectives may be achieved. The alternative arrangements are well known, and some of the more prominent options are noted below.

1. **A Consolidated County Police Agency.** The county police concept refers to one police agency within the county having jurisdiction in all incorporated and unincorporated areas. Creation of such an agency involves complete legal and structural merger of all existing departments and the assumption of their responsibilities by the county department. For Marion County this option would require merger of the Sheriff's Department and the Ocala, Dunnellon, and

Belleview Departments. Merger could also be partial and take the form of the Sheriff's absorbing some of the other three departments, any one of the other three departments absorbing the remaining two or, perhaps, dissolution of all four departments and creation of a "new" county department.

2. **Contract Services.** This kind of arrangement involves provision of services by one police agency to another jurisdiction for a fee. Contract services may be:
 - a. Full—all police functions are provided by a police department to the citizens of another jurisdiction.
 - b. Selective—selected functions are provided by a police department for the citizens of another jurisdiction.

A number of contract plans, differing in the combination of the functions to be provided by contract, and the agency providing the service, could be considered in Marion County. In the area of "full contract services," the Sheriff might provide all services to Belleview and/or Dunnellon. Ocala might provide full services to Belleview while the Sheriff provided full service to Dunnellon. Other options which might be considered are: provision of all services except patrol by the Sheriff to Dunnellon and Belleview; provision of countywide communications, records, and detention services by Ocala (or the Sheriff) to all other departments. Many other combinations might be developed for contract services in Marion County.

3. **Shared Services.** Under this kind of arrangement (often referred to as "pooling"), departments agree to combine resources to perform a function at a "higher level of service." Unlike the county police or a contract arrangement, all parties in the "pool" engage directly in provision of services. Shared or pooled services are selective in nature. Among functions amenable to effective pooling are communications, personnel recruitment and testing, training, records and identification services, and detention operations. Under pooling arrangements the departments involved contribute manpower, facilities, and funds in accordance with predetermined commitments. Marion County is currently considering a county records and information system. Presumably each user could contribute money, space, or other resources to create a "pooling" arrangement.

4. *Transfer of Functions.* When evaluating arrangements, consideration should be given to transferring functions to other levels or departments of government. For example, there is evidence which commends the transfer of responsibilities for detention to a state's correctional services organization. Responsibility for purchasing, vehicle maintenance, and planning can be placed with the appropriate departments of local or county government if competent units are already in existence. In these instances, what is being considered are cooperative arrangements with governmental units other than the police agencies involved.
5. *Special Police Districts or Authorities.* Special districts are units of government created to provide service to all or part of a geographical service area. Thus, in Marion County a special police district encompassing some combination of Ocala, Belleview, Dunnellon, and the unincorporated area could be created.
6. *Combinations of the Above.* Consideration should be given to utilizing combinations of the arrangements already discussed as well as *designing* alternative packages. Several combinations are quite compatible, such as contracting and pooling. Under this kind of arrangement, for example, Dunnellon and Belleview might contract with the Sheriff for services, while the Sheriff and the Ocala Police Department shared or pooled certain services, such as records and communications. Many, if not most, cooperative intergovernmental arrangements are "combinations." When designing a combination form the task is to evaluate each police function and determine how it might be best administered in the area. The design begins with consideration of the function, not with the existing structural arrangements. (The requirement that Task 1 include analysis of each function in each department may now seem more meaningful.) During the consideration of how each function might be administered, a basic pattern will often emerge suggesting which cooperative arrangement or combination of arrangements is most appropriate and realistic. As identification of arrangements proceeds evaluation is already taking place.

Additional description and explanation of alternative arrangements (as well as discussion of advantages and disadvantages of options) are treated at length in the *Police Task Force Report* of the President's Commission on Crime and the Administration of Justice (Chapter 4). The Report should be studied by those who are involved in the study.

Experience has demonstrated that at least two of the presumed advantages of cooperative service arrangements do obtain. First, service to citizens served by small departments which are organizationally and financially incapable of providing high quality services is usually upgraded under cooperative arrangements. Second, duplication of services is often eliminated. These are tangible evidences of the desirability of establishing cooperative service arrangements. Many other presumed advantages (or presumed disadvantages) have not as yet been confirmed by experience to the extent the two discussed above have.

Task 4: Compare and Evaluate the Present System and the Cooperative Alternatives and Select the Best Police Services System

Task 2 identified police services system objectives. Task 3 identified alternative structural arrangements to be considered which might accommodate system objectives. The purpose of Task 4 is to select the system which best does so. Task 4 culminates with a recommendation either to retain the present system of police services or to convert to an alternative system—a consolidated or cooperative arrangement system, because that system would provide a total pattern⁴ of police services superior to those provided under the present system. Two considerations are of major significance to this task: philosophy and methodology.

Philosophy

In approaching evaluation and system selection it must be recognized that there is no automatic answer to cooperative arrangement questions. No *a priori* position should be taken. Task 4 should be approached practically and pragmatically. The objective is to select a police services system which will *work*. Any arrangement which promises improved quality and responsiveness of police services, elimination of current problems and of duplication is, cost being reasonable, worth pursuing.

Methodology

Comparison and selection of alternatives is largely an analytical exercise relying on knowledge and judgment. The quality of analysis and the appropriateness of the decision are, as was the case in Task 2, a function of the competence and experience of the individuals carrying out the task. To date no objective-quantitative approaches to this task have been successfully formulated. The task, however, can be carried out systematically.

The most productive approach to comparison and selection requires that the following steps be carried out.

1. Each cooperative arrangement alternative should be evaluated through application of a set of criteria which normally reveal the positive and negative potentials of each alternative in terms of its ability to: (a) achieve the defined systems objectives and (b) to satisfy additional requirements of sound and responsible governmental systems. The following criteria and requirements are among those to which each alternative should be submitted:

⁴ Total pattern refers to services throughout the entire geographical area being considered for service under cooperative arrangements.

- a. Can the system accommodate the quantitative and qualitative service needs previously identified? That is, will the system be large enough to assure that it has sufficient resources, personnel, and organizational effectiveness to provide high quality service in every necessary functional area throughout the geographical service area?
- b. Will the system eliminate or minimize duplication and fragmentation?
- c. Can the system maintain or absorb, with little or no disruption of the better police service, areas which currently exist? That is, can the system being considered assure that where high quality service is presently being provided the level of quality will be maintained? Consolidated or cooperative systems have, as a major purpose, upgrading the total law enforcement system. This is to be done, however without reducing service in other parts of the system.
- d. Will the system be reasonably cost-effective? That is, will the costs of the system be justifiable in terms of service provided?

The four criteria above "test" how well the system under consideration will meet system objectives. Other criteria include:

- e. Is the proposed system organizationally and administratively efficient? It is best to avoid the adoption of complex combinations of organizational structures and powers.
- f. Can continuity of existence and leadership be expected under the proposed system? It is best to adopt a system in which continuing participation of law enforcement agencies may be assured, as well as reasonably predictable continuity of leadership.
- g. Will responsibility for the system be clear to the public?
- h. Will the organization be of manageable size and responsive to the public?
- i. Will the system have a funding base adequate for present and foreseeable future needs?

Additional criteria should emerge during the identification of alternative arrangements (Task 3), particularly if effort is put into designing combination systems.

A Hypothetical Example

A hypothetical example may make the application of these criteria more clear. When evaluating, for example, the "consolidated county police" alternative for Marion County application of the criteria might yield these answers. The county force promises to be large enough and endowed with sufficient resources to provide quality services throughout the area. The county force would, more than other alternatives, eliminate duplication and fragmentation. Properly designed, the force could maintain present quality where it now exists in the County and should be as cost-effective as any other system. Properly designed the system would be administratively and organizationally simple. Continuity of leadership, if the Sheriff is to head the agency, cannot be counted upon. Placement of responsibility for the system would be clear. Responsiveness to the public might be less than under other systems.

Application of these and other criteria to each system's option considered will, rather automatically, eliminate the less desirable options and usually reduce the choices to one or two appropriate alternatives. The evaluation process usually will also permit evaluators to modify the alternatives and continue to combine aspects of several systems until the one most appropriate for their own needs has been designed. In this sense the study involves constant modification and evaluation of alternatives.

After criteria have been applied and the best alternative selected, the present system should be subjected to the criteria. It is possible that the present system offers advantages and benefits equal to those of the best option. This is not common, however.

Select the system to be recommended. Based on the previous exercises the best choice or choices should be apparent. If no choice or several choices are not apparent, which is possible, this would be the major finding of the study and it is likely that no future action would be taken. At this point the primary objective of the cooperative arrangement study has been completed and all that remains is to record the findings and results of the analyses which led to findings.

Additional Study Considerations

There are a number of additional issues which properly may be considered only after Task 4 has been completed. These include preliminary consideration of:

1. Financing the proposed system.
2. Organization for the proposed system.

Choice of financing is predicated mainly upon the nature of the local tax structure and its capacity. Principles of equitable taxation are well known and of course should be incorporated in choice of financing methods. Organization should be treated in the broadest terms, concentrating mainly on identifying positions and functions in the new organization. Precise allocation of personnel operating within present police systems, along with other aspects related to carrying out the cooperative arrangements, should be left to a second study and an Implementation and Design Study.

Committee Action

The final steps in the study include:

1. Review of the study by the Committee.
2. A resolution by the Committee to accept or reject the study. What is to be considered is whether a professional and thorough study has been completed. The task is not to respond to, approve, or reject the *findings* of the study. This is the public's task.
3. Transmission of the Committee's resolution to governing bodies within the service area, in this case the County Commissioners and the City Councils in Marion County.

A Final Note

The approach to cooperative arrangements just presented permits their systematic evaluation and a determination of whether cooperative arrangements would provide police services superior to those provided by a present system. The recommended approach intentionally does not carry analysis through planning, design, and implementation of a new cooperative arrangement system if one has been selected. Once a system has been selected, the selection should be presented, in the form of a recommendation, to governing bodies for action. It would be unwise to develop detailed design and implementation plans until an affirmative response to the recommendation is received from the governing bodies. To proceed directly from the evaluation of possible arrangements to a systems design study is to risk wasting the effort contributed to the latter should governing bodies not react favorably to the former.