



LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION (LEAA)

POLICE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REPORT

SUBJECT: City-County Police Consolidation Study

REPORT NUMBER: 77-027-136

FOR: City of Baker and Baker County, Oregon

	<u>City</u>	<u>County</u>
Population	9,490	15,950
Police Strength		
(Sworn)	11	7
(Civilian)	<u>7</u>	<u>3</u>
Total	18	10

Square Mile Area 7

CONTRACTOR: Public Administration Service
1776 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

CONSULTANT: Samuel G. Chapman

NCJRS

CONTRACT NUMBER: J-LEAA-002-76

JUL 19 1977

DATE: June 9, 1977

ACQUISITIONS

42433

MICROFICHE

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
FOREWORD	iii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. ANALYSIS OF THE PROBLEM	3
The County and the City	3
City and County Police Forces	3
Other Police in the County	6
The Law Enforcement Consolidation Study Committee	7
Need for Police Services in Baker County	7
Index Crimes Per 100,000 Population	8
Index Crime Clearances	9
Actual Numbers of Incidents	12
Traffic Crashes Investigated	14
Summary	14
III. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	15
IV. RECOMMENDATIONS	16
Understanding the Concept of Amalgamation/Pooling	16
What is Happening Elsewhere	17
Four Options for Improving Law Enforcement	19
Important Concurrent Considerations	19
A Countywide Police Force	21
Two Forces-One Roof, Consolidated Support Services	23
A Joint Judicial Services Building	26
Contract Policing	29
No Further Merger	30
V. AN ACTION PROGRAM	31
Steps to be Taken Locally	31
The State's Role	33
The National Advisory Commission	34
Conclusion	34

Tables

1. Comparison of Index Crimes, 1974-76, for Baker, Oregon, and Baker County with 1975 Crime Rates Per 100,000 Population	10
2. Offenses Reported and Cleared, 1975-76, Baker, Oregon	11
3. Number of Incidents, By Type, Handled by City and County Forces, 1975-76	13

FOREWORD

This report was prepared in response to a request for technical assistance from law enforcement officials in northeast Oregon who are concerned with improving police services in Baker County. Both Baker County and its largest municipality, the City of Baker, are seeking alternatives to the present police structure, primarily through a possible city-county police consolidation, the central topic of this study.

Assigned as consultant was Professor Samuel G. Chapmen; other personnel involved in processing the assistance request were:

Requesting Agencies: Mr. Douglas Humphress
Chief of Police
Baker, Oregon

Sheriff Ross Hunt
Baker County, Oregon

Mr. Richard T. Chaves, Coordinator
Northeast Oregon Law Enforcement Council

Ms. Barbara Lockwood, Chairman
Baker Law Enforcement Consolidation
Study Committee

State Planning Agency: Mr. Keith A. Stubblefield, Administrator
Oregon Law Enforcement Council

Approving Agency: Mr. Galen Willis
Police Specialist
LEAA Region 10 (Seattle)

Mr. Robert O. Heck
Police Specialist
LEAA Central Office of Regional
Operations

I. INTRODUCTION

This project addresses the complicated problem of improving law enforcement services in Baker County through consolidating the two principal local police agencies in the area. The objectives of the assignment were to examine the issues and other factors involved in consolidation as well as to identify alternative means for improving police services.

During the consultant's on-site phase of the assignment, April 12-15, 1977, extensive interviews were conducted with local law enforcement officers, city, county, and state officials, and involved citizens. Among those interviewed were:

Mr. Norman W. Monroe
Oregon Law Enforcement Council
Salem, Oregon

Ms. Barbara Lockwood
KBKR Radio and Baker Law Enforcement
Consolidation Study Committee

Ms. Marilyn Scrivner
Secretary, Law Enforcement
Consolidation Study Committee

Mr. Dennis L. Fuller
County Judge and Baker County
Commission Chairman

Mr. Ross D. Hunt
Sheriff of Baker County

Mr. Delmar Dixon
Former Sheriff of Baker County

Mr. Terry Speelman
Undersheriff of Baker County

Mr. William L. Jackson
Circuit Court Judge, Baker County

Mr. J. R. Himmelsback, Jr.
Prosecuting Attorney, Baker County

Mr. Earl English
Justice of the Peace, Baker County

Mr. Richard T. Chaves
Coordinator, Northeast Oregon Law
Enforcement Council

Lt. Roy Barnes
Regional Supervisor, Oregon State Police

Cpl. Dan Harmon
Oregon State Police, Baker, Oregon

Mayor Ralph McNeil
Baker, Oregon

Mr. George O. Hiatt
City Manager, Baker, Oregon

Mr. Douglas Humphress
Chief of Police, Baker, Oregon

Mr. Kevin Bell
Crime Prevention Officer, Baker, Oregon

II. ANALYSIS OF THE PROBLEM

Commonly accepted techniques of data development were used to obtain background information for this report. Included was review of the pertinent Oregon statutory provisions bearing on local law enforcement and county and local government, local records, where available, and other documents from varying sources.

Law enforcement facilities in the city and county were inspected. General observations were made, too, from viewing other governmental facilities.

An especially salient aspect of the analysis relevant to law enforcement improvement in Baker County stemmed from understanding the nature of the city and the county, their police forces, and the extent of the local need for police services. It was also important to learn that Baker residents have been engaged in a local evaluation of the consolidation issue since late 1975.

The County and the City

Baker County was established on September 22, 1862, three years after Oregon was admitted to statehood. It encompasses 3,085 square miles and had a population of 15,950 in 1975. Baker, a city of about seven square miles and 9,490 population, is the county seat. This city, the largest populated place in the county, rests at 3,471 feet above sea level.

Years ago, Baker County was one of the richest gold-producing localities in the Pacific Northwest. Today, however, the county's principal industries including lumbering, livestock, various aspects of agriculture, and some mining. Tourism and recreation also rank high, with attractive hunting and fishing and the fabled ghost towns in the Hell's Canyon, Old Oregon Trail, Anthony Lakes, and Sumpter Valley areas helping to make Baker County appealing to outsiders.

The City of Baker, when incorporated in 1874, was an important stop along the historic Oregon Trail. Today, Interstate Highway 80 passes along its eastern extremity, the Union Pacific Railroad skirts the western reaches, and the city operates a small airport north of the city. The community has operated under a council-city manager form of government since 1950.

The city's general fund budget for the current fiscal year (July 1, 1976--June 30, 1977) is about \$998,000; of these funds, about \$250,000 are committed to police services. The county has allocated approximately \$117,000 to cover the costs of the Sheriff's Department during the same period from its general funds of about \$1 million, the city's population seems to have stabilized over the past 40 years, while the county's population has fluctuated, though not sharply. The Oregon Blue Book, 1977-78 set out the following longitudinal picture for both:

	<u>1940</u>	<u>1950</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1976</u>
City	9,342	9,471	9,986	9,354	9,490
County	18,297	16,175	17,295	14,919	15,950

City and County Police Forces

The Baker Police Department includes 11 sworn and 7 nonsworn personnel, divided as follows:

	1 Chief
	2 Lieutenants
	3 Corporals
	<u>5</u> Police officers
11	Sworn members
	4 Communications clerks
	1 Parking enforcement officer
	1 Crime prevention officer
	<u>1</u> Code enforcement officer
7	Nonsworn members

The force is comprised of two divisions, each headed by a lieutenant--uniformed and criminal investigation. In addition to patrolling the city, the uniformed division includes the records and communications elements. Three police cars provide for patrol duties. The criminal investigation division includes four personnel and handles parking code enforcement, crime prevention, and follow-up investigations.

There is a supervisor and one (sometimes two) officers on patrol on each shift in Baker. There is also a communications clerk at headquarters on each shift handling the incoming phone calls and the city's radio traffic. The communications clerk on each shift maintains the city's police records system, prepares periodic reports for the chief and monthly returns to the Oregon uniform crime reporting program in Salem, and handles other clerical duties.

City police headquarters is in the city hall, about six blocks from the sheriff's headquarters and jail, which are located in the basement of the courthouse at Fourth and Washington Streets. On April 1, 1976, the Baker city jail was closed after a contract was reached with the county. Suspects in city cases have since been booked into the county jail, and the city pays the county \$10 per day per prisoner according to terms of the original agreement. That agreement has been renegotiated effective April 1, 1977, and includes terms essentially similar to the initial agreement.

The Baker County Sheriff's Office includes seven full-time sworn members and three non-sworn corrections officers. In addition to the sheriff, who is an official elected to a four-year term, there is an undersheriff; a female deputy-matron who works days at headquarters; three deputies who work out of headquarters, usually during days or evenings; and a deputy who resides at Halfway and polices the panhandle area, about 50 miles east of Baker on the road to Oxbow Dam and the Snake River Canyon. The deputy at Halfway polices that town (population, 370) in accord with an agreement between Halfway and the Board of County Commissioners (called the County Court) wherein \$1,000 is paid the county for the deputy to enforce the town's ordinances.

The three non-sworn corrections officers work one each on the two night shifts handling the jail, telephone calls, and radio traffic on the sheriff's radio frequency. Two female matrons are summoned to work at night and on weekends whenever female suspects are in custody. The day deputy-matron handles the rudimentary police records kept by the sheriff, handles clerical chores, meets the public at the counter, and executes a host of other roles in the office in addition to her jail role.

The sheriff's personnel have four motor vehicles at their disposal, three of which are conspicuously marked. In addition, the sheriff has boats and four-wheel-drive vehicles for use during search and rescue missions.

The general duties of the sheriff in each of Oregon's 36 counties are spelled out in section 206.010 of the Oregon Revised Statutes. Essentially, the sheriff is supposed to make arrests, preserve the peace, run the county jail, execute orders of the courts, serve warrants, transport adult and juvenile prisoners, and attend the terms of the county court. Section 206.210 of the ORS sets out guidelines within which the sheriff may organize the work of his office.

In Baker County, all seven field employees are involved in a full range of civil responsibilities in addition to criminal investigations. Deputies handle the service of such intricate and time-consuming papers as orders to apprehend and confine persons, executions, tax warrants and citations, sales, judgments and garnishments. The personnel also serve a high volume of less complicated classes of papers such as summons and complaints, subpoenas, notices, and orders to show cause. There are some instances when danger may be involved in effecting services, as in orders to apprehend and confine persons. Under such conditions, the deputy might seek back-up assistance from another deputy or from an Oregon State Police trooper.

Based on a review of criminal activity summaries reported by the Sheriff's Office to the OUCR in Salem, it appears that deputies spend far more time on civil process service than they do on criminal work. Baker police officers, on the other hand, serve very few civil papers but are heavily involved in criminal and traffic investigative work.

The Baker County Jail is in the courthouse basement. The original structure, modified in the 1950's, now has a capacity of 44 adult male and 7 female suspects in segregated holding facilities. The normal population is about 20 persons. The facilities are regularly inspected by state personnel from the Office of Jail Inspections and Misdemeanant Services in Salem.

Facilities are in accord with ORS 169.075 which sets out the state's minimum standards for local correctional facilities. However, after recent inspections, state officials have noted that: 1) lighting should be improved; 2) there should be more toilets and sinks and an additional shower; 3) visiting and attorney consultation facilities are inadequate; and 4) control and supervision of jail cells is nearly impossible. The expected construction of new juvenile holding facilities and visiting/counseling rooms, slated for completion by December, 1977, will ease the visiting and consultation problems noted by the inspectors. Also, the juvenile cells will free the sheriff of the expensive, time-consuming need to transport youthful suspects to facilities 100 miles away in Pendleton.

Chapter 169 of the Oregon Revised Statutes requires that all corrections officers statewide, including those in each sheriff's department, be certified. Certification is earned after a person successfully completes a five-week training course given by the State Board of Police Standards and Training at Monmouth, Oregon. This law imposes a heavy initial cost on county officials, one which is repeated each time a trained employee separates and a new one is appointed. It is also a consideration should city and county employees ever be merged into a joint communications-records-jail center.

Other Police in the County

There are four police units in the county in addition to the city and county forces; three are local town marshals, while the fourth is a major component -- the Oregon State Police.

The marshal in each of the little towns of Haines (population: 325), Huntington (population: 520), and Sumpter (population: 130) handles a full range of public duties of a highly local nature, including a few police roles.

The Oregon State Police District 4 Headquarters is at Baker in a barracks almost two miles from the city hall and county courthouse. There are about 20 troopers who work Baker County, three of whom are full-time in game and fish enforcement roles. The OSP works the unincorporated Baker County region, duplicating the modest police patrol that sheriff's personnel are able to provide. The OSP barracks also has its own headquarters and records staff which is on duty around the clock, takes calls made to the state police and dispatches OSP units over a radio frequency separate from the city's and county's.

The Law Enforcement Consolidation Study Committee

In the fall of 1975, several influential figures in both Baker city and county government, as well as some prominent lay citizens, became convinced that law enforcement services in the county might be improved if some form of consolidation between city and county police forces could be achieved. A means of realizing dollar savings without reducing police effectiveness was a principal objective of this group.

As a result, a study committee was appointed, comprised of equal numbers of persons from the city and county. Its initial makeup included the sheriff, police chief, a member of the Baker County bar, the district planner of the law enforcement council in Baker, and eight lay citizens, four appointed by the city council and four by the county court. The committee was asked to study the possible alternatives for city-county resources pooling and consolidation and to advise the city council and county court on promising courses of action. The advisory committee first met on January 13, 1976; its eighth meeting was on January 12, 1977.

In early 1977, the committee felt it had reached a point where outside assistance were needed in assessing the Baker city-county options. Technical assistance, at no cost to the county or city, was requested from the Oregon Law Enforcement Council in Salem, and the committee decided to suspend its formal activities pending receipt of this assistance.

While the committee's one year of deliberations were in some ways inconclusive, they were productive in that: 1) useful discussions about various forms of city-county police resource pooling took place, and 2) the city and county reached an accord whereby the city closed its decades-old jail, the sheriff assuming this role. Several additional ideas were discussed without tangible results. Nevertheless, the committee's membership can take pride in breaking important ground which has led to further action.

Need for Police Services in Baker County

Effective January 1, 1974, all municipal and county police forces in Oregon were required by ORS 181.550 to report certain criminal activity information to the Oregon Uniform Crime Reporting program office in Salem each month. In turn, the OUCR office, a unit of the law enforcement data system, is obliged to publish certain reports. One of these is an annual report of criminal offenses which sets out the numbers of incidents, by type, for the most immediate calendar year and data from earlier years. This discussion of the nature and scope of police problems across the county is based on that report, where data are available, contrasts are made with the problems faced by other rural and small city forces nationwide.

In a conceptual sense, the quality of police services should be measured, ideally, by the crimes, disturbances, and motor vehicle crashes that are prevented by police vigilance. Unfortunately, the number of incidents that do not happen is unknown and the level of services can be measured only negatively by those that do occur and by the success of the police in bringing violators to justice. The number of index crimes per 100,000 population^{1/}, the index crime clearance rate, and traffic crash statistics are commonly used "bench marks" across the nation which permit some degree of insight into staffing adequacy and police efficiency.

Index Crimes Per 100,000 Population

Crime rates vary widely by geographical locations, the size of jurisdictions, the varying nature of cities and counties, and the reliability with which jurisdictions report local occurrences. In an attempt to measure police accomplishments, a comparison between the reported experience in terms of index crime rates of a particular city and those of other cities and counties, the region and state is sometimes made.

Table 1 presents the number of index crimes in 1974-76 for Baker and the county compared with the 1975 crime rate per 100,000 population in Baker city and county and in U.S. cities of less than 10,000 population, rural locales nationally, and for the State of Oregon. The 1975 Baker County index crime rate has been calculated by dividing the sum of 1975 offenses reported by both the sheriff and the state police detachment in Baker and dividing by the county's population, excluding the 9,490 residents of the City of Baker. These tallies were combined so that as complete a picture as possible of non-urban action could be presented.

Data in Table 1 reveal that there is little index crime in the non-urban portion of the county. There is practically no robbery, very little aggravated assault, and an extraordinarily modest burglary and

^{1/}Index crimes are those seven classes of offenses shown by experience to be most generally and completely reported to the police. The annual crime reporting program was initiated by the International Association of Chiefs of Police in January, 1930. In September, 1930 the FBI was designated by an Act of Congress as the central clearing-house for police statistics nationally. Baker and the county have been submitting monthly returns of offenses to the Oregon uniform crime reporting program office in Salem ever since Oregon law mandated that monthly accounts be sent.

larceny-theft rate. These data fail to confirm the verbal accounts given the survey staff of frequent brutal fights, murders, and burglaries occurring in the smaller settlements and camps beyond the Baker city area. If the data are inaccurate, it discloses the urgent need for dramatic upgrading of the sheriff's police records system. However, if the data are accurate (and there is no reason to doubt them, since they were prepared and submitted by the sheriff's staff) they present still another salient reason why Baker County residents are pleased with conditions in their area.

The City of Baker's police force records system appeared to be well conceived and essentially adequate for the needs of a small force. Assuming their accuracy, the rate of violent crime in Baker compares very favorably with that of other small and rural places as well as the State of Oregon. The property crime rate, on the other hand, far outstrips that of other small and rural places and approaches the statewide rate. The larceny-theft rate (and burglary to a lesser extent) is the prime problem. The principal targets which inflate this rate are CB radio and bicycle thefts as well as shoplifting. The department's crime prevention program is aimed at countering these classes of offenses. Interestingly, the number of these offenses has gone down nominally during each year 1974-76, which may reflect that the program has had some success.

It was not possible to audit the accuracy of recording and reporting procedures in either the city or county forces, so it is not possible to firmly observe why the countywide reported offenses were far fewer than the city's. Perhaps the difference is due to the county's vast area and sparse population, the presence of few police, the absence of regular patrol all 24 hours, a greater number of targets more widely dispersed, more limited means of reaching the police, or a host of other factors. It may well be a combination of all of these. But the data in Table 1 clearly indicate that there is misbehavior, especially in the city, which must be addressed by improving police services across all 3,085 square miles of Baker County.

Index Crime Clearances

Of at least equal importance to the crime rate in a city or county is the index crime clearance percentage which the police department or sheriff's office achieves. The annual percentage clearance rate for index offenses by the Baker city police for 1975 was 27.3. In 1976, the city force cleared 33.1 percent of the 477 serious offenses reported to it. Table 2 sets out the city clearance picture, by offense for 1975 and 1976 combined.

The city police clearance rates compare very favorably with the 1975 annual clearance percentages in 1,504 rural agencies nationwide (23.6 percent); 3,584 suburban forces nationwide (19.7 percent); and in 4,256 cities under 10,000 population nationwide (21.0 percent).

TABLE 1

The Number of Index Crimes in 1974-1976 for Baker and Baker County Oregon,
 And the Oregon State Police Baker Detachment, Compared with the 1975 Rates per 100,000 Population
 In Baker City and County and in U.S. Cities of Less Than 10,000;
 Rural Locales Nationally; and for the State of Oregon a/

Index Crime	Baker City			Baker County			OSP	City of Baker	OSP and Baker County <u>b/</u>	Index Crime Rates per 100,000 Population- 1975		
	1974	1975	1976	1974	1975	1976	1975			4,056 Cities Under 10,000	USA: 1,640 Rural Forces	State of Oregon
Murder and non-negligent manslaughter	-	1	1	-	-	2	1	10.5	15.5	3.9	7.9	6.2
Forcible rape	1	1	2	1	1	1	-	10.5	15.5	10.9	12.6	32.6
Robbery	5	2	3	2	-	-	-	21.1	--	48.5	24.0	130.3
Aggravated assault	13	14	10	1	4	2	2	147.5	92.9	159.2	124.9	269.4
Burglary - breaking and entering	106	102	93	10	1	5	18	1074.8	294.1	995.0	828.3	1911.6
Larceny - theft	394	380	345	18	9	16	37	4004.2	712.1	2548.7	1020.0	3935.9
Auto theft	15	20	23	-	1	2	5	210.7	92.9	205.2	106.7	466.2
Violent crime total	19	18	16	4	5	5	3	189.7	123.8	222.5	169.4	438.5
Property crime total	515	502	461	28	11	23	60	5289.8	1099.1	3748.8	1955.0	6313.7
Crime index total	534	520	477	32	16	28	63	5479.5	1222.9	3971.3	2124.4	6752.2

a/ The data in the three right-hand columns are from Tables 3 and 10 of Crime in the United States, Uniform Crime Reports, 1975 released by the Federal Bureau of Investigation on August 25, 1976. The Baker city and county and OSP data were provided by the Oregon Uniform Crime Reporting program in Salem. These reflect data sent to the OUCR office monthly by each force. The 1975 national data are the most current available.

b/ This rate is calculated on the sum of the 1975 county and OSP offenses divided by the county's population, excluding Baker's. There are 15,950 persons in the county, of whom 9,490 reside in Baker.

TABLE 2

Crimes and Clearances in the City of Baker
for 1975 and 1976

<u>Offense</u>	<u>Total Offenses 1975-1976</u>		<u>Percent Cleared</u>
	<u>Reported</u>	<u>Cleared</u>	
Murder and non-negligent manslaughter	2	2	100.0
Forcible rape	3	1	33.3
Robbery	5	1	20.0
Aggravated assault	24	20	83.3
Burglary - breaking and entering	195	31	15.9
Larceny - theft	725	224	30.9
Auto theft	43	21	48.8
Violent crime: total	34	24	75.0
Property crime: total	963	276	28.7
Crime index total	997	300	30.1

In fact, the city clearance rates are impressive and are indicative either of investigative persistence and imagination or of imperfect recording procedures. There was no opportunity, it should be noted, to audit clearance procedures against those set out by the Oregon UCR program which are exactly the same as those of the FBI. If the city's clearances prove to have been made in accord with FBI guidelines, the force deserves praise for an outstanding performance over the years.^{2/} The 1975 national data are the most current available.

Clearance experience for the entire county cannot be presented owing to the absence of OSP data for 1975. Data depicting the rate compiled exclusively by the sheriff's personnel for 1975 and 1976, however, is available. It reveals that in 1976 the force cleared 9 of the 28 index offenses (a 32.1 percent rate) and 5 of the 16 reported offenses during 1975 (a 31.3 percent clearance rate). For the two years, the county force has compiled a clearance rate essentially equivalent to that of the city. As in the city, there was no audit of county clearances or their accord (or lack of it) with the FBI standards set out in note 2.

Actual Numbers of Incidents

Another yardstick of the need for police services in an area is the number of various classes of incidents which are reported to the police that require officer time and other departmental resources to resolve. Some types of calls oblige a force to commit dozens, and perhaps even hundreds, of hours to an investigation. Others don't take much time, on an average. Taken together, however, the numbers and classes of incidents which both the city and county forces were asked to handle during 1975 and 1976 provide another indication of their relative "busy-ness" and how each force must be ready for practically any eventuality. There are set out in Table 3.

Data in Table 3 clearly disclose that the city police handle a far greater workload than the county's police. These data also suggest, strongly, that of all the persons booked into the county jail, most are there owing to action by city police officers.

^{2/} Irrespective of the audit question, Baker records personnel should be clearing cases only if investigative results are in full compliance with standards set out on pages 44-45 of: Federal Bureau of Investigation, Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, January, 1974).

TABLE 3

The Actual Number of Incidents, by Type,
Handled by the Baker City and County Forces

<u>Type of Incident</u>	<u>County</u>		<u>City</u>	
	<u>1975</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1976</u>
Arson	2	-	1	3
Forgery/counterfeiting	2	-	7	33
Fraud	5	2	142	163
Vandalism	1	4	166	195
Weapons	1	-	22	25
Sex offenses	1	1	5	4
Drug abuse	8	6	32	26
Gambling	-	1	-	1
Liquor laws	2	-	73	78
Driving under the influence	7	15	75	78
Disorderly conduct	1	2	22	21
Curfew-loitering (juvenile)	-	-	34	54
Runaway (juvenile)	-	-	83	85
Missing person	-	-	7	18
Sudden death/body found	-	20	10	12
Suicide/attempts	-	1	5	2
Lost/found property	-	-	189	188
Domestic problems	1	1	54	50
Insecure premises	-	-	149	169
Suspicious person/circumstances	-	-	180	224
Disturbance/noise complaints	-	2	108	180
Sick cared for	-	-	2	27

Source: These data were extracted from printouts provided by the Law Enforcement Data System, Executive Department of the State of Oregon, Salem.

Traffic Crashes Investigated

The Oregon law enforcement data system presents information which shows the number of traffic crashes each force reported it investigated for 1975 and 1976. These data, like crime data, were reported by each force to Salem. They were derived by each force from its own records and hence would be the most reliable indicator of volume, load, scope of activity and so forth.

The City of Baker police investigated a far greater number of traffic crashes than the sheriff's personnel during both 1975 and 1976. Information about the number of OSP investigations was not available. Data set out below shows the sharp volume difference between the city and county forces.

<u>Classification</u>	<u>County</u>		<u>City</u>	
	<u>1975</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1976</u>
Traffic crash--injury	-0-	1	21	24
Traffic crash--property	-0-	5	174	168

Summary

Police in Baker County face a preponderance of crimes against property -- burglary and larceny-theft, principally, and a disturbing amount of vandalism. There are very few recorded crimes against persons. The police in Baker are very busy in a crime-investigation and control sense; authorities elsewhere have far fewer criminal cases to handle.

By no means is the county overrun with crime, though the city has sufficient reported "action" to underscore that police are important to order in the urban setting. While the citizens of both the city and county support their police in terms of annual appropriations, there do not appear to be too many police. Physical facilities can at best be described as barely adequate. When crimes are reported to the police, both the city and county personnel report they clear almost one of every three, a success rate approximately 10 percent greater than forces of similar circumstances nationwide. All this is achieved with relatively few police employees per 1,000 population, when numbers are contrasted with the FBI-published national averages for small cities and rural areas.

Observations in this analysis are based on data prepared by local forces and officials. The data are only as accurate as their sources, and there was no way to readily audit them. For want of other information, then, the data must be accepted as indicative of the picture across Baker County.

III. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The following findings and conclusions can be drawn from the foregoing analysis:

1. There is local interest in merger of some form and to some degree between Baker city and county forces.
2. The citizens' study group has performed very useful service but awaits outside advice.
3. There is a mood, with some reserve, apparent in both the city and county forces and their leaders that some sort of accord may be reached if the politics can be worked out.
4. The state police are not likely prospects to be included in any merger plans owing to a long tradition of working in cooperation with but not merged with county and local forces.
5. There appears to be much more crime and traffic-criminal work to be handled in the city than in the rest of the county.
6. The sheriff's principal roles are jailing and civil work, although data to confirm this were sketchy.
7. The sheriff's criminal records system appears to be in need of major revision; the city's system could readily be expanded to embrace the county's.
8. There is strong probability that police efficiency could be enhanced if the city and county records and communications facilities were merged at one point and handled by one dispatch-clerical team.
9. Jail services, too, should be handled by these personnel.
10. Efficiency would probably be enhanced if the two forces were either merged into one or if they were moved under one roof without losing their own identities, but with records-communications-jailing merged.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

There are some important alternatives which Baker County citizens should study as they devise a proposed police improvement program for the region. However, citizens should evaluate alternatives only after they become familiar with the concepts of resource pooling and consolidation in a larger sense and what has been done elsewhere. This educational process is the first recommended step.

Overall, recommendations include the following:

1. Local citizens must fully understand the concepts of partial and total consolidation of police services.
2. A Baker County Law Enforcement Improvement Advisory Council (LEIAC) should be established.
3. The LEIAC should review every apparent practical means of improving local police services.
4. The various means will probably fall into four action courses:
 - a. Total consolidation plans
 - b. Partial merger
 - c. Contract policing
 - d. Remain essentially as is
5. The LEIAC should select the option it sees as most practical and draw up an implementation proposal.
6. Legal considerations should be evaluated.
7. Over the longer range, the LEIAC should evaluate the need for a joint Baker-Baker County judicial services building.

Understanding the Concept of Amalgamation/Pooling

Police protection is one of the traditional and most nearly universal of American local government services. How well this service is rendered affects the safety and security of all citizens since the problems that occur in the field of law enforcement do not belong to a single jurisdiction; there are ramifications for persons in the unincorporated areas, too. It is a concomitant of effective police work that there must be close cooperation between the law enforcement agencies of a county and its cities, for boundaries have little meaning to the burglar, vandal, speeder, or narcotics dealer.

The American system of government and, to some extent, our concept of individual freedom, demand that the regulation of personal conduct shall be as close to the people and as responsive to the public will as possible. The local control concept is made doubly important by the wide range of opinions that exist between jurisdictions with respect to definition of socially acceptable conduct. Such definitions are often reflected in laws and ordinances, but more so in public attitudes as they develop from local customs and needs.

The case for control of police services by that level of government closest to the electorate is a persuasive one, but the administrative difficulties imposed by such an arrangement are sometimes complicated. However, the political constraints may be the most constraining of all. Contemporary living and life styles may exaggerate city-county rivalry, while at the same time greatly increasing the pitfalls implicit in inconsistent approaches to police administration. If it be true that no city will willingly tolerate being policed by its neighbor (if there is one), or even by its county (or by the state police under a negotiated contract), it is equally true that each city owes its neighbors certain obligations which deny the concept that "any place has a right to be as badly policed as it chooses." Analogous cases can be developed in the fields of fire prevention, pollution control, building inspection, and water treatment. To reconcile these conflicts is the chief problem of organizing to provide better police services for the citizens of Baker and Baker County.

What Is Happening Elsewhere

Other than in four regions -- Multnomah County and Portland and the greater Salem, Corvallis, and Eugene/Springfield areas -- Oregon's nominal population density is placing a great burden on county and municipal governments throughout the state. This happens because the ever-rising cost of government, levied against a static or nominally declining population base, places a severe economic strain on residents. The situation in Baker County is an excellent example. In addition, the small size of the population groups served by local government frequently precludes the likelihood of implementing the most efficient levels of service. To improve government service without being confronted with a monumental increase in taxes, rural areas across the nation are commencing to explore various aspects of regional cooperation. Among these considerations is partial and full consolidation of police functions. A few of the locales that have had studies made include Caddo and Dewey Counties, Oklahoma; Goodhue County, Minnesota; Benton County, Oregon; Durham County, North Carolina; Summit County, Colorado; Park and Livingston Counties, Montana; and Snohomish County, Washington.^{3/}

^{3/} A text, which in several respects will help Bakerites better understand the concept of resource pooling/consolidation, stemmed from the Snohomish County project. See: S.G. Chapman and George D. Eastman, Short of Merger (Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books, 1977), 160 pp.

The Law Enforcement Improvement Advisory Council

The second step which Baker County officials should take in a program to improve police services countywide is to reconstitute and revitalize the now-latent Baker County Law Enforcement Consolidation Study Committee. In doing so, the initial move would be to make an important name change.

It is recommended that the group be renamed the Baker County Law Enforcement Improvement Advisory Council (LEIAC). By so doing, two benefits accrue:

1. The trigger word "consolidation" is dropped from the title. Its presence suggests the ultimate -- merger -- as a goal and that may not necessarily be the case.
2. The council is identified as advisory in nature. Any suggestion that it is an administrative group is clarified. Also, while not in its title, the reconstituted council should be ad hoc in nature, mission oriented, to work itself out of existence after whatever course of action has been taken reaches fruition.

While a recommendation is not made as to the precise makeup of the LEIAC, it seems logical to include two police representatives each from the sheriff's department and the Baker city police; one person in government (other than in law enforcement) each from Baker and the county; a judge; the prosecuting attorney; one or two persons from the chamber of commerce; and about five lay citizen members. The working members of the earlier committee should surely be named among these. It seems proper for the judge to chair the organizational meeting and perhaps to serve as the chairman throughout the duration of deliberations. Or there may be sentiment to select a chairman from the membership -- to serve for a one-year term but not eligible to succeed him or herself. Local feeling should resolve the chair issue. Finally, the Northeast Oregon Law Enforcement Council (NOLEC) coordinator should be requested to work closely with the LEIAC as the group's staff assistant, a very important role. Secretarial help should be provided through the NOLEC, too.

It is suggested that the purpose of the LEIAC be to review every apparent available and practical means of improving local law enforcement services in Baker County. It should then select the most likely option and prepare a plan for its implementation. Then the LEIAC should serve in an advisory relationship to the chief and the sheriff while the chosen option is implemented. Open and full use of the advisory council should tend to dispel any undercurrents of tension which may arise among the agencies and lead to full cooperation in the business at hand -- improvement of local law enforcement services.

Four Options for Improving Law Enforcement

Baker County residents are fortunate that several of the political, civic, and law enforcement figures countywide have shown a commendable willingness to study alternatives which may be implemented to resolve the nagging city and county police issues. These persons have demonstrated maturity and progressiveness by making concerted efforts to maximize the service return of public funds and minimize instances where overlapping functions, facilities, and equipment would result in costly duplications. For example, one jail facility for adults now serves the needs of the city and county forces. The year-long deliberations of the Law Enforcement Consolidation Study Committee are also evidence that more than just a few persons want to see law enforcement services improved.

Even though the jail has been merged, much more can be done to improve law enforcement in Baker County. Four options, possibly with unique variations, which promise still greater police utility and efficiency, coupled with eventual dollar savings, include:

1. Creating a single countywide police force.
2. Merging the support service elements of the two major local forces, though not the forces themselves, so that there is but one city-county records and communications center in the county. Jailing would remain consolidated.
3. Contract policing for the City of Baker by the county.
4. Strengthening the two forces but without any contracting or mergers other than for jailing.

Important Concurrent Considerations

Seven important concurrent observations must be clearly set out when discussing alternatives for police improvement in an area like Baker County which is not densely populated. First is that resolving the vexing law enforcement problem facing a major central city (Baker) and the remainder of a sparsely populated county is often less susceptible to solution than those of more populous and urban areas. The basic impediments are: 1) a simple lack of financial and human resources, and 2) considerations of who will be boss. Ironically, commonly acceptable solutions applicable to large jurisdictions may have little relevance to smaller ones! Second is that some suggestions which may, and indeed would, appear ludicrous where applied to larger jurisdictions may have merit in smaller ones.

The third observation is that present senses of local autonomy, pride, and identity may be harmful in the extreme unless extended to the greater community -- countywide -- in which neighbors and small communities are looked upon as partners rather than competitors.

The fourth observation is that solutions which only deal with the present, or short-range, may not long remain viable and, indeed, if too formalized may hinder future success. A fifth and crucial consideration is that if a consultant is to serve well, the person must recognize and understand existing community and county political stances and prejudices but not condition the recommendations by them. Resolution of problems ultimately lies in the hands of those affected by them -- the people of both city and county -- and they must have the facts and alternatives on which to base judgments.

A further concurrent consideration which must be recognized as the LEIAC and others studying alternative options is that there are probably few legal and administrative considerations to be resolved in determining what form of cooperative police services are practical. There is an apparent physical space problem -- only modest space is available in the courthouse basement if option two is pursued. It should not prove insurmountable, however; it will merely make things somewhat crowded and inconvenient for two forces under one roof. The political aspects, perhaps complicated by personal egos, may be the greatest barriers to further pooling. The LEIAC will have to mediate with principals as programs are evaluated and, later, an action course is set.

A seventh consideration, of high principle as well as very practical, should pervade the LEIAC's deliberations. This is whether or not contemplated cooperative services will enhance police services. Generally, governmental units can achieve an advantage through cooperative police services if only one or more of the following conditions will accrue:

1. The quality of service throughout Baker County can be upgraded more effectively than through the existing system.
2. Service levels of police functions throughout the area can be raised at costs which are essentially equivalent with costs which would be experienced if service levels were raised under the existing system.
3. Duplicated services may be combined with some cost savings after initial outlay.
4. Responsibility for police services is not unduly complicated, facilitating the public's evaluation and control of these services.

It is now time for Baker and Baker County officials and the LEIAC to study the four options above and decide on short- and long-range programs leading to improved law enforcement service. Each of the four options is discussed below.

A Countywide Police Force

If the Baker County Law Enforcement Improvement Advisory Council recommends the option calling for a countywide police force, it would be telling the city and county they should implement the most dramatic and potentially most effective program over the long range. But this is also the option having the greatest complications, some of which may for practical purposes be so compelling as to prompt backing another alternative.

The concept of a countywide police force is neither new to Oregon nor the nation. For example, it was proposed for Multnomah County and the City of Portland but was defeated at the polls in 1974. Elsewhere, the City of Jacksonville and Duval County, Florida, merged their forces in 1968. Moreover, the forces of Nashville and Davidson County, Tennessee, merged in 1962, while the forces in Fayette County and Lexington, Kentucky, did so in 1973. Also, forces in Hardeman County, Texas, just south of the Oklahoma line merged in 1971 and established an impressive, utilitarian headquarters facility in Quanah.

Consolidating the present city and county forces into a single countywide police department could have several significant products, including:

1. An end to duplication of supportive and auxiliary services.
2. Centralization of police authority resulting in the ability to speedily muster a number of police officers and supervisors at trouble spots anywhere in the county.
3. Better trained officers who would be working under a unified command and in accord with one set of policies and procedures.
4. The immediate availability for use countywide of experienced investigators who could be trained as specialists in particular types of crimes and drug offense investigations. Given Baker's inordinately high burglary and larceny rates, this advantage seems of special significance to the city area.
5. Greater police ability to pursue criminals without being balked by the artificiality of a city-county boundary line.
6. For personnel, more occasions for interesting specialized experience, including civil process work.

7. Improved opportunities for training, more regular working hours, standard rates of pay, and membership in a larger force which could make greater strides for professional status.

A total amalgamation of police services into one force probably could be achieved, given enthusiastic political and professional sanction and reasonable fiscal support by both the city and the county. There appear to be no serious technological constraints. The chief administrative constraint is a big one, however -- who would be the boss and would the personnel of the force which loses its identity be absorbed into the new force? A complicated fiscal barrier could arise if one jurisdiction objects to paying a greater proportionate percentage share than it now pays for policing.

Significant social and political (beyond the issue of who the boss would be) constraints may be expected to surface, probably with great intensity. These will probably focus on such issues, real or imagined, as "faceless government," "centralized authority without commensurate local control," "splintered political control," "the Big Government will run us," and "we want to be policed by our own." In short, total amalgamation will be the most emotional, highly controversial of the four options and the most difficult to achieve. It is almost impractical if either the city or county hedges on any aspect of the program.

A determination of whether or not there are legal barriers which could complicate a countywide police force should be made if this alternative appears to be a likely one for Baker. A preliminary review of the Oregon Revised Statutes was made, though not in depth, because such a dimension exceeded the province of this short technical assistance project. Nevertheless, some observations are in order, though they are by no means conclusive ones, and further research must be done.

First, it appears that the state has a highly utilitarian, indeed commendable, legal vehicle to encourage merger or other inter-local governmental agreements among jurisdictions such as Baker and Baker County. The significant statute is contained in Chapter 190 of the Oregon Revised Statutes, which sets out the groundrules for inter-governmental cooperation and coordination, including a very strong statement of the law's intent in section 190.007:

"In the interest of furthering economy and efficiency in local government, intergovernmental cooperation is declared a matter of statewide concern. The provisions of ORS 190.003 to 190.110 shall be liberally construed."

Second, ORS 190.020 spells out what an intergovernmental agreement shall contain. The effect of an agreement is identified in ORS 190.030.

Third, section 190.110 indicates that units of local government may reach cooperative agreements with a state agency. It appears, then, that this section would permit local units to reach an agreement with, say, the Oregon State Police for a specified role. It might be dispatching and records-keeping, patrol of unincorporated areas, regional criminal intelligence, major case investigative assistance, etc.

Fourth, section 190.240 advises that there may be rules prescribed by the state's executive department which may in some fashion constrain a state agency from furnishing a local unit some service. A detailed legal review of the merger issue should surely include a study of the executive department's administrative fiats.

Fifth, legal research into merger, contracts, special districts, and so forth must include a review of attorney general opinions issued over the year, for there may be some which are highly relevant to the issues.

Sixth, the authority for city and county units to draw up contractual agreements for specific services is set out in ORS 206.345. This and other sections of the ORS should be checked out against what may be sought by City of Baker and Baker County officials in the way of the contracting option.

Finally, it appears that Chapter 451 of the ORS permits citizens to form special service districts within cities or counties to enhance law enforcement or fire protection. Section 190.753 seems especially relevant to this issue and should be checked.

In summary, it appears that there are no significant legal or policy barriers to constrain the merger of city and county police services in Baker. It also appears that there are no insurmountable barriers to the city and county reaching whatever contractual agreements may be necessary to enhance efficiency and save money. Moreover, it may be possible to bring the Oregon State Police into a more prominent, formalized role by virtue of contracts with the city and/or the county.

Two Forces-One Roof, Consolidated Support Services

The second alternative which the LEIAC should consider is to draw the two forces under one roof, but each retaining its own identity. This option includes drawing the support service roles of communications and records into one locale with one well-trained, adequate staff also responsible for every aspect of jailing. In Oregon, the forces of Corvallis and Benton County have done so, making the move in December, 1976.

There appear to be no critical technological constraints to complicate this program. Moreover, there appear to be few social barriers surfacing to stand in its way, and neither fiscal nor legal problems seem serious. However, space must be found in the courthouse basement, and the Baker city chief and the sheriff must be party to a well-defined agreement about the physical layout of quarters.

The principal barrier to the two forces-one roof consolidated support services alternative is administrative in nature. However, it does not appear insurmountable if the principals resolve to give the option a chance to work. The big problem to resolve is this: the records and communications personnel will also handle all jailing and jail security. This included booking prisoners (in the presence of a uniformed officer or investigator) and making regular after-hours rounds in the facility. When they are jailors, the records personnel should be agents of the sheriff, as they execute very important work in his name. Hence, they should be under the sheriff's supervision during these times. When on records and communications roles, however, roles which will preempt most of their time, they should be subject to the direction of the ranking city police officer on duty. The city force is the only one which has a ranking person on duty at all times, regardless of the hour.

By any yardstick, this arrangement will call for a dual supervisory arrangement which is far from ideal. Trying it seems warranted, however, for several reasons. First, the mere presence of the jail and juvenile detention quarters in the basement of the county courthouse mandates that records and communications must be located there, too. There is simply no alternative short of total new quarters. Second, the sheriff by statute is the county jailor and cannot readily surrender that role. Third, the city's records system is by far the most adequate, modern one in the two jurisdictions. Its personnel are skilled in records and communications operations and mechanics on a more substantial scale. Moreover, the records system could easily be expanded to encompass the county's anticipated input, plus civil records-keeping as well. So it seems realistic to expect the city to assume responsibility for records and communications roles, the sheriff for jailing.

A chief clerk should be selected and made responsible for supervising the records and communications portion of the system once it is designed and implemented. This includes presiding over and keeping fingerprint files of applicants and criminals, criminal history and photographic records, and a master name index file for criminals and another setting out names of victims and complainants in police matters.

It is suggested that the LEIAC consider the records-communications-jailing alternative as part of a carefully programmed demonstration project to run for a predetermined period with the prospect of continuation, revision, or termination at critical dates along the way. It is

recommended that the merger be programmed for an experimental period of perhaps 18 months. This is really a field test with the opportunity to go back to separate systems should the program be confronted with so many irreconcilable programs that repair is impossible. Of course, an experimental program or field test assumes that all the necessary advance planning and staff work has been carefully completed before the experimental period begins. Should the program fail, it may well do so because of inadequate will power not the failure of concept. This must be guarded against and monitored.

Three standard textbooks should be the basis of designing the countywide records system should one be decided upon. There are: The Manual of Police Records, A Police Records System for the Small Department, and Preliminary Investigation and Police Reporting. While not a textbook, a fourth publication is important when the new records system is designed. This is the Oregon Uniform Crime Reporting (OUCR) Instruction Manual, the revised edition, published on July 1, 1976 by the Oregon State Justice Data Analysis Center and the Law Enforcement Data System.^{6/}

Data needed for uniform crime reporting in Oregon are readily available through a good record-keeping system. A basic records system should include:

1. Permanent records of crime, traffic, administrative matters, and other activities considered necessary.
2. Control for recording and counting every complaint received.
3. Reports of the investigation of each complaint received.
4. Information on persons arrested, charges made, dispositions, and other facts about the arrested person including age, sex and race.

^{6/} Specifically, these texts are: FBI, The Manual of Police Records (December, 1972), 61 pp., and may be obtained by request through any FBI resident office; Donald G. Hanna and John R. Kleberg, A Police Records System for the Small Department, (Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, revised edition, 1974), 125 pp.; and John G. Nelson, Preliminary Investigation and Police Reporting (Beverly Hills, California: Glencoe Press, 1970), 513 pp. The Oregon publication is available through the Executive Department's Data Systems Division, 240 Cottage Street, SE, Salem, Oregon, 97310.

Ideally, the storage of property and evidence should be closely coordinated with the records and communications unit because it is a logical extension of these processes. Also, the same physical facilities should be used to house all recovered property, other than evidence, if this can be arranged in the courthouse basement. This may be impossible to implement, however, given the severe limitations on headquarters facilities facing both the county and city. If so, it will end up in Baker police space at city hall. But eventually, surely should a new judicial services building become a reality, there would be but one property and evidence control center for the city and county, presided over by personnel in the support services division.

A Joint Judicial Services Building

An improvement of far longer range should be evaluated by the LEIAC as it studies both the total merger and two force-one roof alternatives. This is the justification for drawing both forces and many other criminal justice units countywide into a yet-to-be-planned joint Baker County judicial services building.

The one multi-purpose structure concept is not new to the county. Baker Police Chief Humphress made such a proposal in 1976, and it has merit, though probably not in the short range. Rather, it is suggested that the LEIAC view the possibility of a judicial services building as a long-term goal. This is because there should be more evidence of city-county pooling short of merger (or perhaps total police merger) and full use of the present county courthouse with its minimally adequate adult and juvenile quarters (assuming their construction) by both forces under one roof. If, after years, the improvement proposals work out, then the justification for a judicial services building will have virtually compelling merit. This "proving phase" would also give the county court and city officials the chance to plan for its location, financing, design, and so forth. The "proving phase" will also allow the identification and resolution of operational bugs in either the total merger or two forces-one roof programs, once implemented.

Several considerations are pertinent should the LEIAC or subsequent groups in Baker County begin to plan for a criminal justice building. First, if funds are to be spent, they should be committed for a planned, utilitarian total facility, adequate well into the 21st century. Patchwork has been the hallmark of both city and county law enforcement and jail facilities; the time is nearing for a new, amalgamated, multi-purpose structure.

Second, the new structure should have sufficient room so that it may become a true judicial services center for the city and county. It should be designed to house the city and county's courts and court clerks, and the offices of the prosecuting attorney and public defender. There should be sufficient additional room planned for not just judicial offices and jury rooms but for personnel whose mission is presentence

investigation and both adult and juvenile parole and probation personnel. Mental health, other public health, other public health, a detoxification center, welfare and food stamps programs and so forth could be housed under this same roof, too. The structure should be a judicial services center in the truest possible sense. It seems reasonable to include those elements suggested by the Baker chief in his late 1976 appearance before the consolidation committee.

Third, if after this technical assistance report is reviewed and a tentative decision is made to proceed with long-range planning for new facilities, the services of an architect should be sought. A special caution is required in this respect. Many architects are familiar with general public building needs and are skilled in responding to them. However, there are few who are competent in the areas of designing detention and rehabilitation facilities, or even judicial services centers -- and these are costly to construct or, later, to remodel. Oregon's jail standards and other detention requirements and concepts changed dramatically in 1973, and a thoroughly competent corrections specialist should also be involved in the planning^{4/} Accordingly, it is recommended that city and county officials at the outset seek the consulting expertise of architects associated with the National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture^{5/} to set up some facilities guidelines and assess the feasibility of moving ahead with long-range building plans and financing.

National clearinghouse personnel are available on a short-term basis to help local governments when requested for specific evaluative missions. Hundreds of agencies have used their services most effectively over the past five years. The facilities planning mission in Baker would qualify as the kind of circumstance where the national clearinghouse staff could provide valuable assistance. These personnel serve at no cost to the local units, the U.S. Department of Justice defraying costs through a grant to the national clearinghouse. The Oregon Law Enforcement Council in Salem can help the Northeast Oregon Law Enforcement Council of Baker secure assistance from the national clearinghouse.

^{4/} Jacob Tanzer and Amos E. Reed, Jail Standards and Guidelines for Operation of Local Correctional Facilities (Salem: The State of Oregon, Department of Human Resources, September 1, 1973), 100 pp., xerox.

^{5/} The National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture, 505 East Green Street, Suite 200, Champaign, Illinois 61820. Telephone (217) 333-0312. Brian N. Nagle is the resident police specialist. Mr. Nagle's article, "Considerations in Constructing or Renovating Police Facilities," featured in the April, 1977, FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, sets out several of the considerations mentioned above. It should not be taken as precisely illustrative of every need in Baker city and county, but merely as a guide to important issues.

Fourth, the county and city should give careful consideration to the location of the new judicial services building. The location must assure maximum accessibility to the principal problem area of Baker; it must be located within easy public reach; there must be adequate off-street parking for police, courts' and citizens' vehicles; and land should be available for future additions to the building. Ideally, the location should be as close to the present courthouse as possible.

Fifth, the interior of the new structure should be planned to make possible sound operating procedures with a minimum of cost. Offices should be arranged with reference to particular operations and their inter-relationships to companion operations. Offices should be accessible to the public and to court, welfare, health, parole, and police officers in direct proportion to the use which the public and others make of them. Offices and courts should also be arranged for convenience in handling property, records, and prisoners. The new building should centralize dispatching and records-keeping for the sheriff's department and that of Baker. Moreover, the new building should also be designed so that the public enters the jail only after clearing through the dispatching center, a point of initial control and visitor screening. An officer bringing a prisoner in for booking should enter the security perimeter through another secure area free of public view. So besides adequate jail facilities and a detoxification unit, a booking room could also be designed for use as a visiting room, which would permit relatives and attorneys to visit prisoners without inconveniences and hazards involved in entering the cell blocks proper and without the necessity of constant supervision during visits. Prisoners could also be fingerprinted and photographed in the booking room, well within the jail's secure area, by the records-communications-jail staff with the arresting officer standing by.

Closed circuit television and audio devices should be installed in the new building, especially in the security areas. Video pictures and audio ports should be continuously sight and sound monitored at the dispatch desk. Cameras and listening devices should be located not just at all points of entry to the building but cover all places where possible security problems may arise as well as to overlook or scan detention dormitories. Of course, these devices should not be located at the visiting and counseling locations.

If the Baker County Sheriff's Office and the Baker Police Department are not amalgamated functionally, both departments still could be housed under one common roof. All that would be necessary is sufficient partitioning within the judicial services building to give each force its own quarters and identity, while allowing for sufficient space and access for amalgamated operations such as radio/telephone communications, countywide records-keeping and jailing. This is merely a design problem to be resolved after the political decision regarding whether or not to amalgamate has been reached.

Contract Policing

The third alternative which the LEIAC membership should evaluate as a means for possibly improving police field services if the present county and city forces are not totally merged is the implementation of a contract policing agreement. This method would call for implementing machinery which would enable Baker County police cars and deputies to patrol and respond to calls in Baker, replacing the police of this city by virtue of a contract with the city.

In synopsis, a contract policing arrangement in Baker County would see the city and county reach an intergovernmental service agreement which would call for sheriff's personnel to police the city. Present city personnel could be offered the opportunity to join the sheriff's force assuming, of course, conditions of service standard for sheriff's personnel. The precise role and assignment of any officers accepted for police duty by the sheriff would be up to the sheriff. There may be ranking roles for the present city lieutenants and police chief, but these would have to be designated by the sheriff. In short, the contracting option would have the effect of consolidating the county into one local police force -- the county.

Contract law enforcement programs are neither new nor especially costly. For example, Los Angeles County, California, has had some 30 contract policing agreements for years. So have Fulton County, Georgia; Wayne County, Michigan; and communities which are located within these jurisdictions. The Connecticut State Police has provided contract police service for 46 small settlements in sparsely populated sectors across that state since World War II, with generally satisfactory results.^{7/}

As envisioned, contract law enforcement in Baker County would find the county police playing an exclusive role, except that the OSP would still help out. Assuming a highly developed, well-equipped and trained force, the county's police personnel would provide a predetermined level of police service to a designated incorporated area -- Baker -- all in accord with terms of a contract. The contract should be reviewed regularly, at least annually, to be sure that cost is equitable with service requirements and so that any changes in police or community needs may be reflected. County and city officials could move as far as they wished with the contract concept. The Baker County force appears to be the only logical agency to provide contract service anywhere in the county.

^{7/} The concept of contract policing is set out and discussed in: The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Task Force Report: The Police (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), pp. 106-108. It is also treated in: The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Police (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1973), pp. 101-116.

The contracting option wherein the county police assume responsibility for actually patrolling Baker and handling all criminal investigations may not prove to be a viable option. There may be too much citizen concern and worry that the "high volume" force has been put out of business, and the longer range concern that politics may pervade city policing since the sheriff is elected, not appointed. The issue of employee benefits and rights and the fate of ranking Baker personnel would probably weigh on the acceptability of this alternative, too. Nevertheless, it should be studied as an option along with the others.

No Further Merger

The fourth option which warrants study by the LEIAC is to leave the two forces essentially as they stand now, suggesting that the two go their own way and make improvement as needs arise individually. This option signifies that the two forces have opted to follow the path of least resistance and have not faced up to the larger and longer range issues of modernizing police services in Baker County.

Such a course would probably be the product of irreconcilable administrative or political barriers between the sheriff and police chief. This eventuality should be guarded against and the principals are advised not to take such a strident polar position on important issues where they could suffer personal trauma should they find it necessary to abandon an earlier position. In short, the LEIAC and other community leaders are going to find that avenues to police improvement center around a series of mediated decisions which will stem from protracted negotiations. These will often be intricate and potentially emotional. Hence, hard positions by the principals should be avoided.

City and county fiscal decisionmakers will probably play a major role in determining which options appear most viable. This is a major reason why the LEIAC membership should include non-police city and county officials. These persons, whose compatible goals include providing the public the best police service at the least expense, may influence the selection of options through the power of the purse.

V. AN ACTION PROGRAM

A number of suggestions for improvement of police services have been made in this technical assistance report. Each is designed to increase efficiency, economy, effectiveness, and quality of police service within Baker County. Some will be regarded as major innovations locally and, if embraced, require dramatic changes in traditional practices. Others constitute relatively minor improvements. All, however, will require some positive action for their implementation.

The expensive and time-consuming task of data collection and analysis has been initiated with this report. There will probably have to be some additional effort handled by either the Oregon Law Enforcement Council or locally by the Northeast Oregon Law Enforcement Council staff. A collaborative effort may be undertaken. But the issue now is: "In what way will this information be used to improve local police?" This question must be answered by police officials with all deliberate speed so that the accumulated information can be used to its greatest advantage.

To successfully bring law enforcement in Baker County to an improved level, the LEIAC must make a report on what alternatives should be implemented. Then decisions for implementation must be reached. Certain programs must be implemented before others, and material acquisitions made at appropriate times. The following comments are intended to suggest priorities for various improvements and to establish a guide to the implementation of others once the action program has been selected. Obviously, some suggestions and proposals will involve a series of action, and consequently the mention of any one of them includes by implication the remaining related and accompanying points in their logical sequences of implementation.

Steps to be Taken Locally

The first step in causing anything to happen as the result of this report is to be certain that all persons who will be deciding what course to follow have a thorough understanding of the document. They must read the report, talk about the report, assess the prospective impact of various action alternatives, and so forth. Persons reading the report must establish a common understanding of not just the document and its ramifications but be certain that there are effective inter-departmental communications. Without communication, there can be no common ground for understanding and cooperation, and relationships may be strained and awkward with unfortunate consequences for the effectiveness of the forces in Baker County.

After the familiarization process has taken place, the Law Enforcement Improvement Advisory Council should begin its deliberations. It will be a very important, hard-working council (as was the original consolidating study committee during its one year of life), and its members

must understand and accept that before appointment.

The third step to be taken is for the LEIAC to agree upon which option is most prudent to adopt and implement. When that judgment is made, there should be a suggested schedule of implementation developed based on such realities as: 1) drafting of appropriate legal documents; 2) their execution; 3) the retraining of parsonnel; 4) the acquisition of required space and equipment; and so forth. A crucial element at this point is to submit any contracts to the district attorney's office, the office of the State Attorney General, and to any other proper persons for review and, hopefully, approval in accord with provisions of the Oregon Interlocal Cooperation Act.

Next is to reach accord about the ranking officers of the city and county forces -- who is going to be what, with what title, and who the undersheriff and sergeants are to be, pay rates, etc., if the advisory council opts for a countywide force. Preparations must be made to train these persons to be competent to assume the responsibilities set out for them. They should not be formally appointed to their new roles until the implementation date is set, space is readied, and everything appears to be in order.

The next measure is to select the person responsible for serving as the director of support services if the advisory council opts to recommend moving the two forces under one roof at the courthouse basement and to consolidate records and communications for the city and county forces along with the jail. This is an important selection, since fully amalgamating the support services of both forces must be preceded by the design and centralization of an adequate, yet simple, central records system. This will probably be the hardest of all recommendations to bring to fulfillment. It will take not just time, but immense patience and understanding.

The Law Enforcement Improvement Advisory Council must set a target date for formally initiating the new program, conditional upon the execution of any necessary agreements or contracts and a go-ahead from whatever persons and agencies must approve. A detailed implementation plan should be drafted, disseminated, reviewed, redrafted, and then readied for execution. This is a proper role for the local council's staff employee working closely with the advisory council's leadership group.

Longer range (but within about three months of implementation) plans should be made to upgrade the force's overall training, especially in state-mandated jail training, records processes, criminal investigation, patrol procedures, report writing, and so forth.

Some equipment expenditures will be necessary to expedite the improvement of services, regardless of what action program alternative is taken. Required early in any implementation process are:

1. Arrangements for adequate space should the forces be merged either totally or in terms of support services.
2. Bringing radio and telephone facilities together should merger occur.
3. Uniforms for personnel and suitable personal equipment.
4. Acquiring evidence-crime scene kits and photographic gear for placement in patrol units. Training field supervisors as crime scene technicians must be scheduled if the council decides to implement a countywide force.
5. Lesser items of equipment -- typewriters, desks, cabinets, etc. -- should be assigned priorities and considered as part of a general capital improvement type of program. Emergency circumstances are sure to arise, though careful planning will generally anticipate needs and prevent disruption of a logical step-by-step program.

The LEIAC early in its deliberations, must decide if the two forces are to be drawn under one roof. If so, space arrangements must be initiated. Longer range, and for later in its deliberations, the advisory council may wish to address the issue of planning for a judicial services building. This is not one of the urgent, immediate decisions to reach, but it cannot be allowed to lag, since the fiscal and facilities implications have serious long-range significance.

The State's Role

Any improvement in Baker city and the county's police services of necessity implies a partnership in state-local action programming. For example, the state performs some crucial services for county and city forces statewide. Training is a prime example. The provision of crime laboratory services and the reception and publication of state criminal activity statistics are other notable examples. Traffic law enforcement, some criminal investigations and accident investigation across Baker County, outside the city, by the OSP, is still another illustration.

The Oregon Law Enforcement Council has a prominent role in improving police services locally. In the past the council has helped the Baker-based Northeast Oregon Law Enforcement Council's criminal justice coordinator translate the interests and needs of city and county forces into action programs and helped underwrite costs. These state and local bodies may continue to be instrumental in modernizing program, equipment, and facilities and perhaps in helping to defray part of the costs for whatever option is selected.

The proper role for the State of Oregon, then, is to provide information, perhaps funds, and legislation review and legal opinions required to implement cooperative police services. State officials should not attempt to force or mandate any form of police service improvement, however. Rather, its important role is one of facilitation or assistance when such assistance is requested by local citizens through the Northeast Oregon Law Enforcement Council.

The National Advisory Commission

Suggestions made throughout this technical assistance report are in accord with standards and recommendations set out in the 1973 report, Police, a document prepared by the U.S. Justice Department-funded National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals.^{8/} These recommendations also appear to be in accord with the State of Oregon's police standards and goals program. Baker County and city officials, with the technical assistance of the state, should make conscientious efforts to bring their forces up to the standards set out in Police and also in the state's program. By so doing, the county and city will enhance the prospect of attracting both state and federal (LEAA) funds for improvement. The future of police in the county looks good, given the sanction of local political decisionmakers and a cohesive effort by both forces and the Oregon State Police as a team committed to excellence.

Conclusion

Baker and Baker County face a difficult, but potentially promising, period. Persons favoring the retention of long-existing traditional police programs and procedures will be vocal. There may be friction over some issues arising between the sheriff and city police chief. A period of some confusion and uncertainty is inevitable. Some mistakes will be made. But much of the confusion, suspicion, misunderstanding, and misperception may be forestalled through widespread reading and discussion of the report by leaders from across the county. A mood of conciliation is important to achieve and maintain.

^{8/} The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Police (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973), 668 pages. One standard, number 5.2 addresses combined police services and says: "...At a minimum, police agencies that employ fewer than ten sworn employees should consolidate for improved efficiency and effectiveness."

Results will, in general, be proportionate to the effort and investments that are made. The monetary costs of an improved policing program can be expected to be nominally greater (but not overwhelmingly so) at least at the outset but perhaps less later. For soundly based and administratively supported new programs, some financial assistance may be available through the Oregon Law Enforcement Council by means of applications submitted by the Northeast Oregon Law Enforcement Council. The state's law enforcement council has already shown an awareness of the importance and the potential of police services in Baker County and is not likely to withdraw support. In the main, however, Baker County and the city must and should depend on their own pooled financial and personnel resources to accomplish the tasks that need to be done. Outsiders cannot make these moves for them.

The success of any improvements will depend not upon speed, but in large part upon good judgment, determination, cooperation, and sheer hard work on the part of the county, city civic leaders, public officials, the police themselves and the Oregon Law Enforcement Council staff.

END