

120544



U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice



Office of the Director

Washington, D.C. 20531

"EFFECTIVE POLICING IN THE 1990s"

AN ADDRESS

BY

THE HONORABLE JAMES K. STEWART, DIRECTOR  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE

BEFORE

THE COLORADO SPRINGS POLICE DEPARTMENT'S 1989 STAFF CONFERENCE

1:15 P.M.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1989

THE COLORADO SPRINGS MARRIOTT  
COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO

NOTE: Because Director Stewart often speaks from notes, the remarks as delivered may vary from the text. However, he stands behind this speech, as printed.

120544  
4H5021

120544

**U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice**

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this ~~copyrighted~~ material has been granted by

Public Domain/NIJ

U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the ~~copyright~~ owner.

Thank you, Chief Jim Munger, and all of you from the Colorado Springs Police Department's Command Staff, for inviting me to spend some time with you today.

Being here with you is like coming home. I cut my teeth in law enforcement in Oakland, California. I began as a patrol officer and wound up as commander of the Criminal Investigations Division -- 15 years altogether -- so I remember something about what it is like being a police officer and police manager.

It is like the applicant who was being interviewed for a police job and was asked, "If you were by yourself in a police car and were being pursued by a desperate gang of criminals in another car doing sixty miles an hour along a lonely road, what would you do?"

The job applicant looked puzzled for a moment, and then replied, "Seventy."

We have all shared experiences like that, I am sure.

But being here today is like coming home for another reason. You know what Robert Frost the poet, said home is . . . home is a place where, when you come back, they have got to let you in.

Well, as a former police officer, there is nothing quite as satisfying or comfortable as coming back to a group of fellow criminal justice professionals. In my 8 years as Director of the National Institute of Justice, I have done a lot of traveling and speaking around the country. And I have made it a point to stay in close touch with police departments -- with everyone from the Chief to the Patrol Officer on the street. As NIJ's Director, I

have also consistently promoted collaboration between the police and research communities in order to highlight policy relevant issues.

When I see a group like this, then I know I am with some of the best professionals in the business. And there's no doubt that you are among those professionals.

It is important, therefore, that you reach out for new ideas and information that can help you do your job even better. This includes the results of policy-relevant research. The research that can be most useful is based on assessments of how well various police programs and policies work.

There is a lot to talk about. I am sure you already know the bottom line -- the times, they are a changing. Being a police officer or manager today is not what it was like twenty years ago, when I and many of you here joined the ranks.

Police in recent years have had to react to an onslaught of developments and demands -- to name just three: affirmative action suits, court rulings like the Miranda case that revolutionized our ability to collect and present evidence; and an explosion of civil liability litigation.

Another reason things are different, I am proud to say, is the work my agency has done.

For those of you unfamiliar with our mandate, the National Institute of Justice is the principal criminal justice research agency located within the U.S. Department of Justice. Many of

you may never have heard of us -- but I am willing to bet that all of you are familiar with one of our most noteworthy contributions to the criminal justice system -- the bullet proof vest. A thousand police officers are alive today because of it. By a conservative estimate, it has saved half a billion dollars in death benefits that would have been paid if those officers had been killed because they were not wearing that protection. Those savings, in lives and dollars, have more than paid back the initial research investment of ten million dollars that produced that vital piece of equipment.

The National Institute of Justice continues to play a significant role in developing and testing new knowledge about police work, responding to the needs of police managers and aiding them in the development of new knowledge. At NIJ, we have funded research in the hard sciences that has led to the development of voiceprints and the exciting possibilities of DNA identification. NIJ also boasts the largest criminal justice repository in the world -- the National Criminal Justice Reference Service, located in Rockville, Maryland. The NCJRS has a data base information system on such topics as law enforcement, victims, courts, corrections, drugs, juvenile justice, and statistics. We also have the AIDS Clearinghouse for law enforcement. NCJRS also disseminates -- free of charge -- criminal justice publications on many of these topics. We will be happy to give you more information if you wish to be included

on the NCJRS mailing list.

Let me spend just a few moments with you to apprise you of an NIJ program that may catch your attention -- The National Institute of Justice Visiting Fellowship Program.

Each of you in this room is here because you are considered among the best in your department. And that is what we are looking for at NIJ. We are looking for a few good souls who wish to take advantage of an unparalleled research opportunity to help solve critical operational problems in criminal justice agencies or advance our understanding of complex crime control issues.

As an NIJ Visiting Fellow, you will be able to devote all your time for six to eighteen months to indepth study, research, and analysis of your topic. Along with full financial benefits including relocation expenses, we will also provide office space, a personal computer, and easy access to library resources and computerized data bases and data sets.

You will have the opportunity to work with NIJ staff, other Fellows, and national criminal justice leaders, and have at your fingertips the full information resources of the Nation's capital.

Who should apply? Researchers with broad, extensive criminal justice experience -- and you -- practitioners with at least a bachelor's degree and strong operating-agency experience in such areas as police, courts, corrections, probation, and victim services. Candidates typically propose research with immediate or long-range policy implications. Research designs can

be quantitative, qualitative, comparative, or historical -- propose what you think is required to do the job! Competitive selection is based on candidates' individual backgrounds and experience and the quality and viability of the proposed project.

Visiting Fellowship awards are made two ways: either to individuals or through your agency.

Recent visiting fellowship projects have included research into the police-prosecutor team concept, a study of child abuse prosecution and investigation; changes in the structure and activities of traditional organized crime; and development of a law enforcement manager's profile. The police-prosecutor team concept research was conducted by Lt. John Buchanan of the Phoenix, Arizona Police Department. Lt. Buchanan's research was the feature article in the May/June, 1989 issue of NIJ Reports.

Lt. Buchanan's work underscores why NIJ encourages police to apply under this program.

To obtain a program description and applications, you may call the NCJRS or Dr. Richard Rau, Visiting Fellowship Program Director. (These numbers are listed in the handouts I have brought with me.)

\* \* \*

Twenty years ago, there was little or no systematic, objective information available on crime and criminal justice policies. Field experiments in criminal justice were rare. Police Departments operated largely on the basis of tradition -- they did things in a certain way because they always had done them that way.

In the past two decades, however, the National Institute of Justice has spearheaded professional research -- policy relevant research -- that already has brought about major advances and changes in policing and other areas of the criminal justice system.

NIJ has come up with better ways to police neighborhoods to make them safer and to reduce the fear of crime. We have shown through research that some traditional police practices don't work as well as police thought they did for so many years, and we have come up with some new ones that do work., I will talk more about that a little later.

Another example. Drug abuse -- probably the country's number one social and criminal problem today -- certainly the number one problem for police agencies around the country.

Through research, we have established a clear link between drug abuse and crime. We have shown that drugs can dramatically increase an individual criminal's predatory and violent behavior -- that criminals commit four to six times the number of crimes



when they are using drugs as when they are drug free.

We have translated those findings into positive programs that local criminal justice systems can use to reduce crime by getting criminals off drugs. I'll talk more about that later, too.

These are just some examples of professional research in areas important to policing, and how that research pays off. I will mention others as I go along.

The point is that research like this has made it possible for managers and chiefs and officers on the street to make decisions based on accurate, objective information about the state of policing and police tactics.

Those are the kinds of decisions that are required today and will be even more in the future. As we prepare to move into the 21st Century, it is appropriate to take stock of where we are and where we are going in policing.

Where do we fit into society? What is the proper role of the police in the United States today? What is the role the police managers must take if law enforcement in this community is to be effective?

The basic answers to those questions are the same as they were when our Nation was founded. Unlike many other countries today, the American police still have their responsibility of civil authority. You are the front-line source of justice in our country -- justice, the tie that binds a community together.

But what is a community these days?

One of the major factors that is influencing police management decisions now -- and will in the future -- is the nature of the major social and demographic changes underway in many of our urban communities. These changes are having a pronounced effect on policing strategy and tactics. The changes are also influencing the public's understanding and attitudes about the role and responsibility of the police.

I am talking, for one thing, about the growing concentration of multiple minority groups, many of them non-English speaking, in many urban areas.

Many departments across the country find themselves policing a city of minority communities instead of one overall community. As Studs Terkel said in his American Dream:

"In Los Angeles, there is a little cafe with a sign: Kosher Burritos. A burrito is a Mexican tortilla with meat inside. Most of the customers are Black. The owner is Korean. The banker is a WASP. This is what's happening in America today, there is a melding of cultures."

This certainly will influence the relationships between the police and the citizens they serve. Communication alone between police and non-English speaking groups presents special challenges both in defining problems and promoting effective responses in the community.

I am also talking about the development of an underclass in many of our urban areas, along with social problems associated with higher crime rates -- and the related concern of more of the general population being exposed to gangs and drugs.

This will increase citizen fear of crime and violence and clearly is an issue that has to be addressed in a comprehensive manner.

Then there is the growing isolation of some of the middle-class -- and the upper class -- in privately-policed residential areas and facilities like shopping malls. This may influence the perception of citizens regarding the benefits of their public police.

And finally, demographically, we are seeing an aging of the population, a phenomenon that may lead to an increase in problems such as family abuse of the elderly and increased fear among citizens who are in this age group.

In all of these areas, police actions and responses are more likely to be effective if they are developed in a planned and systematic manner based on sound policy decisions. There is also a need for greater coordination and collaboration between the criminal justice system and other parts of society in dealing with drugs, crime, and fear. And when it comes to decision-making, we can learn some lessons from the past.

(Many of the problems police face today are the result of poor management decisions and policy choices that were made

earlier in the criminal justice system. Now, we are paying the consequences.)

For example, as crime began to increase over the last several years, the public and criminal justice professionals began to prioritize crimes -- to give some crimes more "status" than others. Homicide, rape and robbery moved up the list, while such crimes as public disorders, abandoned cars, prostitution and gambling came down. Police began to pay less attention to the so-called "harmless" crimes -- public intoxication, truancy, loitering, spitting on the sidewalk. Now we have learned that such "signs of disorder" can generate increased fear of crime.

And then, there were drugs.

In the 1960s, as pressures were building on the criminal justice system to relieve overloaded court dockets and crowded jails but also pay more attention to the "major" crimes, the system put drug use and possession on the low end of the status list, too. They were considered "victimless" crimes. The drug laws stayed on the books, but they were not vigorously enforced. And the rest, as they say, is history.

Now, the country is being asked to debate the question of making illicit drugs legal. We are being asked to surrender in the drug war.

I say that instead of decriminalizing drugs, we need to recriminalize them. I mentioned earlier the link between drug use and crime. Let's go after the drug users and pushers, not

just wink at them.

Two things have handicapped us in dealing with drug abuse in the past. First, it wasn't seen as a societal problem, but as something to be handled by the criminal justice system and public treatment programs. Both systems were overloaded, and often they didn't coordinate their efforts effectively.

Second, we had no national base line of current information on what kinds of drugs were being used by the criminal population. We never had an objective profile of drug-using offenders.

I am happy to say we are overcoming these handicaps.

Research funded by the National Institute of Justice has helped spur people across the country to question and rethink how we view drug-related crime and drug-using criminals.

As the Department of Justice's chief research branch, NIJ itself has shifted its efforts. Sixty percent of NIJ's research funding today is directed at drugs.

Our research agenda encompasses both treatment and enforcement. We are examining drug-crime links, identifying trends, assessing innovations such as using civil laws and sanctions against dealers and sellers, and gathering data on how to make prevention, treatment, and enforcement work better.

We, too, are continuing to learn what works, and what doesn't.

Our nation's view of the drug problem has changed in the last year or two. President Bush, Attorney General Dick Thornburgh, William Bennett, and members of Congress on both sides of the aisle -- are saying the problem clearly needs a collaborative effort.

The President's new national anti-drug strategy calls for a partnership between criminal justice and the rest of society. It specifically calls for one between criminal justice and treatment. It calls for reducing demand as well as supply.

Research has a great deal to offer in the anti-drug effort. NIJ, for example, has a national program for measuring recent drug use among the people who are the greatest risk to society -- those arrested for crimes. It's called the Drug Use Forecasting Program, or DUF for short. I mentioned earlier the need for information about drug use by criminals and criminal suspects. The DUF program is providing that information. DUF, developed and operated by NIJ, is co-funded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance.

DUF involves obtaining anonymous voluntary interviews and urine samples from a sample of the people arrested at each city's central booking facility every three months. To make sure that a range of felony offenses are represented, arrestees charged with drug offenses are intentionally undersampled.

For this reason, DUF estimates of drug use represent the minimum of what would be found in the total arrestee population,

which contains many more people charged with drug crimes.

DUF response rates are consistently high. More than 90 percent of the arrestees approached agree to be interviewed. Of these, more than 80 percent also voluntarily provide a urine specimen.

There is no coercion of arrestees. They remain anonymous. No names are taken. The information that is obtained is not used against them, and their cases are not affected by whether or not they provide a specimen.

We use the EMIT immunoassay system, a highly reliable testing system, and analyze the specimens for ten drugs.

Within three months after the DUF data are collected, NIJ sends each city a computer-readable data file that is, in effect, a unique profile of that city's arrestees.

The data from DUF are showing us all sorts of useful things. Let me tell you about some of them. Overall, about 70 percent of arrestees are testing positive for one or more drug. The actual percentage varies across the country. But in every city, it's nearly twice the number who admit to recent drug use.

One surprise in the national data is how much the type of drugs used vary from city to city. PCP has been detected primarily in Washington, D.C., and St. Louis. Amphetamines are limited mostly to San Diego and Portland, Oregon. Female arrestees everywhere are much less likely than males to be

marijuana users, but are just as likely to be involved in hard drugs.

Information about these geographic and gender differences can help treatment organizations allocate funding and decide what types of treatment are needed.

No one has been able to find reasons for these differences. They are areas for researchers to look at further.

As you know, drug use is a dynamic situation, changing all the time -- city to city, week to week, month to month. But DUF gives us regular repeat monitoring, so we can track trends for each city and nationwide.

Some people have speculated recently that heroin use is becoming popular again. DUF has not found any evidence of that yet in the arrestee population, however. We will keep watching the quarterly DUF results for signs of any increase.

DUF is revealing other important trends. One is the spread of drug use among women, particularly of cocaine. During the last quarter of 1988, higher percentages of women arrestees than men tested positive for cocaine use in New York, Washington, Kansas City, Portland, and San Diego. And in interviews, among those women who report injecting drugs, exceptionally high proportions report injecting cocaine. This finding highlights the potential for an additional set of problems -- addicted infants, HIV-positive infants, and increases in child neglect.



Because DUF tracks trends and patterns, it can tell us more than just what drugs are being used. We hope to use it to track the effectiveness of our efforts to educate, treat, enforce, and to seize drugs.

If, as has been the case for the last several years, drug use among arrestees continues to go up, we will know our efforts with that group have not been effective. We will need either to intensify them, or to try something else.

Up to now, DUF has been used mostly like a thermometer -- basically taking the temperature of the country. I'd like to see it used as a barometer -- as a predictor -- of better weather or of more storms in our fight against drugs.

One study we sponsored through the Institute for Social Analysis shows DUF has this potential -- to predict crime rates six months to a year in advance. The study was done by Adele Harrell, a researcher now at the Urban Institute. It also suggests that trends in arrestee drug use, as measured by urine tests, may be able to predict trends in drug-related child abuse cases, emergency room admissions, and overdose deaths by up to a year in advance. These are clearly areas where more research needs to be done.

Several NIJ studies suggest that for drug-involved offenders, their early drug-use and crime history may predict how effective treatment will be. Treatment seems to work best for offenders who were not heavily involved in crime before their

addiction.

We are in a position to marry the best of criminal justice supervision with the best of drug treatment. I say, let's do it.

When a judge refers a person to treatment, let's use testing to be sure the person stays drug free, as most good treatment programs do today. If the offender doesn't participate and cooperate, let's use the leverage we have. Make him face criminal justice consequences, such as a proceeding for contempt of court.

After all, when we're trying to help people already in the criminal justice system, we're going after the drug users who represent the most serious threat to our society. Their continued drug use has almost immediate repercussions on the rest of us.

When criminal justice and treatment professionals have tried to attack the drug problem separately, it's led only to frustration for both. Working together, we can show tremendous results in containing the deadly commerce of drugs on our streets.

\* \* \*

As I mentioned earlier, management decisions and policy choices that were made earlier in our society -- many of them in support of expressions of individual freedoms -- created an environment that attracted the predatory and violent crime we

face today. The collective public decisions to prioritize crime inadvertently resulted in increased crime levels and -- of great importance to police managers today -- increased public fear of crime.

You can sense the fear of crime wherever you go across this country. People feel vulnerable, they are afraid, and it has changed their daily lifestyles.

It also has changed the way they think about protecting themselves. They don't think the police have the resources or the capacity to meet their expectations for safety. So they seek substitutes -- burglar alarms; Neighborhood Watch and Crime-Stopper programs; and private security.

Managing a region's security already is fragmented enough, as you know. You may not even be the primary force. There are school police, transit police, park police, airport police -- and now, in addition to all that, there are private police. That will provide one of law enforcement's greatest challenges in the years ahead.

It used to be (ten or more years ago) that private security mean a solo night-watchman, or a "rent-a-cop." I was one -- back in the 1960s -- for Burns International Security. I worked at Tiffany's, a Beatles concert, for Mia Farrow, and on other less glamorous assignments.

The private security industry has expanded enormously since then and it isn't slowing down. By 1986 estimates, we spent over

\$26 billion on public law enforcement and almost twice that amount (\$51 billion) on private security. Projections are that private security will grow twice as fast as public law enforcement.

Private security has taken over a wide range of former police functions -- crowd control, the transfer of prisoners, and security for parks, sporting events, courthouses, hospitals, libraries and airports -- and even prisons.

As the industry has grown, so has its professionalism. It attracts many former members of traditional law enforcement -- Robert McGuire, former New York City Police Commissioner, now the Chairman of Pinkerton Security; and Bud Mullen, former head of the Federal Drug Enforcement Administration, now runs a private security firm in New York.

The National Institute of Justice has identified several areas of cooperation between public police agency and private security operations -- burglar alarm service calls; employee theft; shoplifting; white collar crime; and certain anti-terrorism activities, like airport security.

We need to develop more effective coordination and better information-sharing in all these areas. There are many opportunities to move in that direction right now, but on both sides there is a natural tendency to protect one's own turf. But a defensive stance is not necessarily the most effective one in the long run. In many cases, both sides could do a better job

if they interacted more, sharing information and ideas. If they don't, two separate justice systems might develop.

If policing is going to provide citizens with a better quality of life, and less fear, other elements will have to be considered, such as working with persons who are making parallel efforts. This could include more useful collaboration with private security agencies.

In Los Angeles, when you buy an alarm for your house, you also buy a service. The private security company is required to guarantee you an armed response within two minutes. The fee is included in your alarm system charge.

It works a little like cable TV. Each security company gets a franchise to serve a specific area. If you want security in that area, you've got to buy from that company. The company must staff that area with its security people.

When the alarm goes off, an armed private security officer responds within two minutes, although the police also get the alarm. The security officer arrives, looks around the yard and says, "Aha, it's a cat that set the alarm off." He calls in and reports it.

Or he arrives, and sees there's a broken window and an entry. In that case, he calls the police to dispatch a unit while he waits.

This does three things. It saves the police an enormous amount of time responding to alarms, about 98 percent of which

are false. It provides the owner of the house with a guaranteed fast response, even if it is only a cat. And it puts the cost burden where it belongs -- on the owner of the house. It's a great idea. And it's particularly a great idea because most police patrol is now in the poor neighborhoods. There's very little patrol in the middle-class and upper-class areas. This gets the people there thinking they really lack in security, and they object to paying higher taxes for police services, when they're already paying as much or more for private security. Having the private security people around helps give the community a greater sense of equity, even among those who don't subscribe to the alarm service.

In general, more effective collaboration between police and private security should provide benefits to both groups. With this in mind, we are currently examining developments in private security in order to determine what opportunities exist to establish more effective information sharing and greater coordination between police and private security agencies. (This is the current Bill Cunningham effort which is a follow-on to his earlier Hallcrest Report.)

There are also other areas where coordination involving law enforcement is being addressed by the National Institute of Justice. This includes the coordination of police efforts with the actions of citizens and other community agencies as well as coordination between police and the private business sector. I

would like to speak briefly to each of these areas since they highlight the need for a more comprehensive and coordinated approach to the problem of drugs, crime, and fear in our society.

For example, NIJ is looking at TNT -- the Tactical Narcotics Team -- in New York City. Teams of 117 NYPD officers converge on a small area of the city, saturate the area, do buy/busts, and get rid of the drug traffickers. Then people from other city agencies move in, to clean up the area, and to get landlords and businesses to fix up their properties. They try to complete the job in a 90-day period through a cooperative and coordinated approach to quality-of-life issues by police, citizens, and other municipal agencies. Then they move on.

TNT has been operating for the last year or so in Queens, and on Manhattan's Lower East Side. It starts in South Brooklyn in October or November, and we're funding the Vera Institute of Justice to evaluate it there. They're selecting three neighborhoods -- two to get the treatment, and one to serve as a control.

One thing we want to see in New York is how long the effect lasts after the 90 days. When does the problem re-emerge? When should the police go back in to reinforce the cleanup? How many officers need to be sent back in -- two, fifteen, seventy?

Let me emphasize that TNT is a special operation. The neighborhood whose residents scream the loudest gets the treatment.

There aren't enough resources to put it into an area that's decrepit and dying; it goes into areas that are begging for help, that are highly receptive and highly supportive. People don't want the police to leave. That's why the 90-day limit. TNT has yet to be tried in an entrenched dope-dealing, dope-using neighborhood.

And a real evaluation has yet to be done, of course. But over the next two years we should be able to know what works.

Another example involves police working productively with housing officials, tenants' associations, and citizens' groups to help residents of public housing deal with crime and drug trafficking in Chicago. Their approach is being picked up in other cities, too, such as Denver, New Orleans, and Washington, D.C.

Picture the situation. The buildings have no lobbies. You just walk into open stairwells, and up into the building. It's an ideal place for drug dealers. It's a great place for law-abiding people to be victimized. Criminals can just walk through and do what they want. It's a design that delivers more victims to the predators.

Is it any wonder that violent crime in these buildings is four times the city average? That up to 40 percent of the units are unoccupied -- and up to 20 percent of the occupants are there illegally?



The Chicago Housing Authority decided to try dealing with the source of the problem, rather than continue to respond to complaints. It set out to secure these places that appeared to be unsecurable. It picked some of the worst buildings, and has gone through them in a program called Operation Clean Sweep. The Chicago police help. About 50 of them make a ring around one building early in the morning. The housing authority people board up every possible exit except one. In that one, they put a metal detector. As people come out of the building for any reason, they've got to go through the metal detector. A police officer is stationed on each floor. Then the housing people go through every apartment. They check the lease and the occupancy, and they identify repairs to be made later. People who don't belong are put out. If the housing people see some obvious things in an apartment, like guns or dope, they call the police officer on that floor. The officer takes custody, and tries to determine if an arrest can be made.

Meanwhile, other housing people build a wire mesh lobby with big heavy doors on it. About three in the afternoon, everyone in the building who is there on a proper lease and is still inside is evacuated. They go out to a mobile van, and they are processed for photo ID cards. As people who went to work or elsewhere in the morning return, they too are processed for photo ID cards. No one can get back inside unless they have an ID card.

A security guard then mans the door, and checks ID cards. Visitors must have a pass, which they can get only if a resident comes to the lobby, and vouches for them. Some residents have also become involved in patrolling the buildings.

In the four or five buildings where the housing authority has done this, it claims to have totally eliminated both illegal occupancy and victimization. Not counting cost of the police time, the authority says it costs about \$150,000 a building to sweep and secure it, and to make repairs.

A program in Seattle provides another example of useful collaboration. In late 1987 the Seattle Police Department inaugurated a partnership program with the residents and business people of the South Precinct with the goal of halting physical decay and enhancing neighborhoods by reducing crime. This partnership was formed between the Seattle Police Department and the South Seattle Crime Prevention Council.

A sub-committee of the Council meets weekly with the precinct commander to identify locations with specific public safety problems. The problems are described in detail to officers, and also to personnel from central police units that cooperate and enhance patrol officers' activities in the problem areas. The community has set up a "hotline" for residents to report problems to the Council. The hotline phone log is discussed monthly or on an immediate basis, depending on the nature of the problem, with the precinct commander.

As part of the project, the city's Mayor has appointed one representative from more than 14 city agencies to work directly with the precinct commander to find solutions to non-criminal complaints. As a related feature, police notify owners of properties which are found to be involved in the use, sale or manufacture of drugs. A new law provides for the closing and forfeiture of these premises. Furthermore, Land Use Codes are being used to help abate areas around homes piled with rubbish and assorted litter. The citizen's group is encouraging residents to participate in the "Criminal Trespass Program," whereby property owners provide police with blanket agreements to cite and prosecute trespassers.

A basic tenet of the Seattle Program is that police alone or the community alone cannot do the whole job needed to successfully carry out the comprehensive program of neighborhood policing. Fortunately, the community has the ear of the legislators and can intercede to support local and state measures that help the police do its job. In this regard, representatives from the Crime Prevention Council met with State legislators of five surrounding districts to support proposed legislation allowing the abatement of rock houses, allowing one-party consent to the monitoring of illegal drug sales, and allowing the expedited eviction of drug dealers and drug users from dwelling units.

NIJ has also addressed a number of other forms of useful collaboration between police and the community. For example, NIJ research found that business sector participation in crime control through Crime Stoppers Programs was effective and beneficial for both criminal justice and business purposes. These Programs have produced a significant number of solutions to previously unsolved crimes and have resulted in the recovery of large amounts of narcotics and stolen property.

Businesses benefit from the satisfaction gained through direct participation in crime fighting and by promoting a secure environment in which businesses can operate more profitably. In addition, they gain public relations benefits from their efforts in solving a serious community problem, as well as from the cooperative relationship the program engenders among business, the media, and the police.

In general, the most useful crime prevention activities involving businesses include providing an influential link between the community and the police and other city services; providing private security patrols or supporting local resident patrols; participating in local Neighborhood/Business Watch programs; conducting or arranging for police to conduct security surveys of local residences and commercial establishments; disseminating neighborhood newsletters and other crime prevention information to local residents; sponsoring local youth employment and recreation programs; and organizing and participating in

Neighborhood Security Committees made up of police, local residents, businesses, and other community organizations and institutions.

There have also been some exciting forms of collaboration between the police and the private sector in promoting security within commercial settings. After riots in 1965 tore apart Watts, national retail chains were afraid to come back in. Neighborhood businesses that tried to stick it out were faced with the reality that residents who left the inner city to buy groceries also bought other goods and services "on the outside." Many inner-city merchants failed. Fear poisons commercial environments just as it does residential communities.

In the past few years, however, the Alexander Haagen Company of Los Angeles has brought safe shopping back to Watts and nearby neighborhoods. Mr. Haagen has become justly famous in both real estate and criminal justice circles.

Alexander Haagen has built or re-built three shopping centers in and around Watts. Last November, he opened the Baldwin Hills Crenshaw Plaza in another predominantly black neighborhood where people once were afraid to shop. All the centers were built in partnership with community redevelopment agencies.

Haagen builds shopping centers around the concept of environmental security. Each center is enclosed by an ornamental iron fence, six to eight feet high, with a small number of

remotely-controlled gates for pedestrians and vehicles. The gates are opened at 6:30 a.m., and closed at 10:30 at night.

Closed-circuit TV cameras and infrared motion detectors are monitored from a security tower, which gives security guards a panoramic view of the entire center and its parking lots. Lighting levels are three to five times the industry standard. But Haagen avoids the look of a fortress. Ornamental shrubs, trees, and flowers screen the security features.

Each Haagen shopping center has its own security force, of course. Like other employees, the guards are hired mostly from the surrounding neighborhood. They are paid \$7 to \$10 an hour, and are very well trained.

But here's what is distinctive.

Three of the shopping centers also house substations of the Los Angeles Police Department. The Baldwin Hills center contains district homicide and traffic bureaus, as well as a patrol detail.

That's 300 officers, plus civilian support personnel, occupying 22,000 square feet. Haagen designed and furnished the space to LAPD specifications ... for free.

These substations are NOT shopping-center specific. They serve the entire community and district. How many police leaders, strapped for space and furniture, have thought about this kind of partnership?

The numbers show how well the concept works. In a one-year period, the Vermont-Slauson shopping center had one burglary, three thefts involving autos, no purse-snatchings, and one attempted robbery. A similar-sized center in the Los Angeles suburbs would expect to have eight burglaries, 70 thefts of or from autos, and four robberies. Moreover, Vermont-Slauson is in the center of a community whose own crime figures are very high.

The economic numbers show success, too. Vermont-Slauson's annual sales exceed \$350 per leasable square foot; the Martin Luther King center's run about \$250 to \$300. The figure for a comparable suburban shopping center is \$200.

This kind of crime prevention through environmental design is particularly worth thinking about if your community seems always short of money for police space. You might be able to get the space you need by persuading six or eight shopping centers to let you set up satellite stations.

So here are two examples of co-production of community security. One involves shopping centers in poorer neighborhoods. They are thriving oases in areas where people have been afraid to shop, afraid to leave their car, because they would come back out and find their car or the tires gone. The other example is in public housing -- as I mentioned earlier -- where police spend a day helping to secure a building, so they no longer have to spend all night there making arrests.

In both examples, note that police are not the primary people involved. They are support people, but by providing support, they help eliminate policing problems. And they help improve the quality of life and reduce fear among citizens.

\* \* \*

NIJ's research on a community's response to crime and fear has reinforced the view that police, citizens, and the private sector acting together co-produce the level of safety and security in a community. Informal social control and community actions in support of the police can be instrumental in reducing both the incidence and the threat of crime.

NIJ research has also shown that citizens' actions often are critical in influencing criminal justice outcomes. When citizens are willing to report crime, identify suspects and testify in court, police efforts are more likely to be effective overall.

Further, our research has also shown that fear of crime can be reduced in a community when police address the signs of disorder such as litter, abandoned cars, evidence of alcohol and drug abuse, and loitering groups -- the very types of situations that were assigned low priorities through bad policy decisions earlier. In short, when police and the community work together and coordinate their efforts to deal with crime, disorder and fear, the results they achieve are greater than the sum of their individual efforts.



\* \* \*

I would also like to say a few words now about the significant role that the National Institute of Justice has played in developing and testing new knowledge about police work and in responding to the needs of police managers and aiding them in the development of new knowledge.

The police have many proud and important traditions -- traditions that have been central to our role as peacekeepers in the community.

But tradition is not a fail-safe guide to the best course of action. If we weren't willing to test traditions, doctors would still be using whiskey as an anesthetic and football players would still hesitate to throw a forward pass.

But while it may sound like a great idea in theory to question tradition, as we all know, it can turn out to be nearly impossible in practice. It's here that research is essential. We need research to provide the hard evidence about what works and what doesn't work -- evidence which gives police managers the authority to make changes in their operations.

There have been two important traditional beliefs in policing that I especially want to focus on today. Number one, random patrol deters crime. Based on that belief, over the years police departments invested in big fleets of patrol cars and personnel increases to staff them. The second axiom that guided police was that rapid response is essential -- both to fight

crime and to build public support. That is the main reason we went to the 911 system.

These two axioms served us well in some respects. Officers and citizens both agreed they were appropriate. The job had always been done that way.

But was it the best way? Could we do better? These two axioms -- the importance of random patrol and rapid response -- had never been tested. Once we began to ask if this was the best way of operating, an evolution in our knowledge began.

I don't call it a revolution because the changes have not yet penetrated thoroughly into police departments around the country. And that's one reason I want to talk about them today.

But certainly an evolution has begun in police management. Policing is now increasingly knowledge-driven. Police administrators are increasingly relying on the extensive research and experimentation in policing over the past 15 years.

The foundations of our new knowledge were laid back in the 1970s by a series of investigations into traditional police patrol operations. In an experiment in Kansas City, Missouri, that many of you have heard about, we tested the idea that preventive patrol reduces crime. A fifteen-beat area was divided into three sections: one area was not patrolled at all, officers entered only in response to calls. The second area was patrolled as usual, and the third received greatly increased patrol.

At the end of one year, we learned that the effect of these different deployment strategies was zero. The public's safety wasn't affected. The crime rate wasn't affected. Follow-up experiments in St. Louis and Minneapolis had similar results. While we have all made good arrests as the result of being on random patrol, our studies showed that overall, much random patrol time (maybe as much as 60%) could be better spent on other police activities. The payoff just wasn't there.

In a second study in Kansas City, we looked at rapid response to calls for service. Most departments stress rapid response, and in real emergencies, of course, the faster we get there, the better. But what benefit does rapid response have in the majority of cases which aren't emergencies?

Our study showed that police response time was unrelated to the probability of making an arrest or locating a witness. It wasn't police response time that mattered -- it was the time it took citizens to report a crime. Furthermore, it turned out that rapid response had little to do with public satisfaction.

Having developed some important knowledge about response time, we went a step further. What if police prioritized response based on the nature of the call? In Wilmington, Delaware, we tried such a system. We slowed the response rate down for non-emergency calls. We developed a system that included a thirty-minute delayed response, telephone reporting, walk-in reporting and scheduled appointments.

Crime did not increase. Citizens were satisfied. And the police had more manpower available for other services -- for instance, more officers were available to respond quickly to true emergencies.

The Police Executive Research Forum built on the results of this test and developed a differential police response model which was field-tested. Evaluations showed a substantial savings in resources with no decrease in public satisfaction.

In short, we found there is a better way to operate. Two of our traditional patrol practices turned out to be invalid -- even counterproductive in some cases. If your officers are on patrol or on call all the time, fewer of them are available where they're actually needed.

Police decisionmakers who are armed with the knowledge these studies provide can make better use of scarce resources. A substantial number of departments have changed their patrol operations in ways that reflect this research. Yet many have not. I'd like to quote someone who has made changes -- Chief Neil Behan of Baltimore County. He said:

"Evidence from the Kansas City study, and others since then, has definitely impacted the way in which I allocate resources here in Baltimore. I am not saying that I took the findings "lock, stock and barrel" and implemented them, but the research certainly got me focused on looking at the effectiveness of my own policies and made me do some evaluations of my own....Once I

understood that preventive patrol does not necessarily reduce crime, I became more flexible in using that manpower in other ways, for example, more proactive criminal investigations."

Chief Behan's comment brings us to the logical next step in policing research. If police should not be engaged in random patrol and rapid response to every call for service, what should they do? Changing conventional patrol operations frees up officers and resources for more constructive policing.

I'm going to describe just a few of the possibilities. A recent project conducted in Newark and Houston for NIJ by the Police Foundation has shown that police can substantially reduce the fear of crime and increase citizens' sense of security by seeking a closer bond with the neighborhoods they serve. And this can be done without substantially increasing personnel or spending.

We found a number of strategies that were effective in reducing fear and increasing the sense of security -- including establishing police minicenters in some areas. At these over-the-counter police "stores," citizens can be confident of having ready access to neighborhood police. Other successful strategies were door-to-door contacts with residents to identify local problems, and encouraging police officers to help organize community associations where none exist.

Building on what we learned about closer involvement with the community and increased operational effectiveness, police

research took another important step forward in testing a new policy which we call problem-oriented policing.

Problem-oriented policing is a philosophy of policing as well as a set of techniques and procedures. This approach can be applied to whatever type of problem is consuming police time and resources. It is a way for police to reduce their own workload. [Note: problem-oriented policing is not team-policing.]

Traditional policing regards calls for help or service as separate individual events to be processed by traditional methods. In contrast, problem-oriented policing analyzes groups of incidents -- for instance a continuing problem of auto thefts in one neighborhood, or a pattern of burglaries in a residential complex. Then officers draw upon a wide variety of public and private resources to help solve the problem. This gives police much more scope to use their experience and creativity in solving community problems. It is also truly preventive policing -- in contrast to so-called "preventive" patrol. The Newport News, Virginia Police Department which was headed by Darrel Stephens at the time (now head of PERF) volunteered to be a laboratory for testing this system of policing. The results achieved in terms of solving local crime problems -- and reducing crime rates -- were very encouraging.

As I said, the problem-oriented policing approach can be applied to any problem. Take the problem of repeat calls for service. NIJ funded a study in Minneapolis that analyzed repeat

calls to see if it could discover patterns. We found that 64% of the calls to the department came from just five percent of the addresses in the city. That finding demonstrates the real need for police to analyze their workloads more carefully and to identify the chronic callers that tie up a large proportion of their resources.

In one case, a burglar alarm at one address went off about 75 times during the year. Whenever the officer on duty would appear on the scene, there was never any sign of trouble. What the study turned up was the fact that the alarm was going off nearly every day at around the same time, 5:30 am, 5:45 am. The would-be burglar turned out to be a bundle of newspapers that was being thrown against the front door.

I think the message of police research is clear. We need to be willing to test tradition -- and to break from it, if necessary -- to maintain an efficient police force. Untested policies may well be invalid policies. By empirically testing our policies, we can separate good police practice from bad, and make real progress toward truly preventive measures.

Over the last three years, some thirty-one of us in law enforcement -- including police chiefs, mayors, scholars, and policymakers -- have been meeting periodically at Harvard's John F. Kennedy School of Government for a series of seminars called "The Executive Session on Community Policing." Coming out of the seminars is a series of papers published by NIJ entitled

"Perspectives on Policing." It is our hope that the series will teach how police involvement in the community can solve crimes, build better communities, and increase productivity. In short, how research in this area can help you to work smarter, not harder.

\* \* \*

I also want to mention some other areas of interest with regard to policing and research.

First, less-than-lethal weapons -- a vital issue of deep concern to the police community.

We need a weapon that can supplement the firearm -- one that will put people out of action, when necessary, without killing them. We need to move past the point where, in an emergency, the police officer is forced to deliver a death sentence.

The revolver has been around for about one hundred and fifty years, and hasn't changed much during that time. For many law enforcement purposes, it is obsolete and dangerous -- as much so as if officers had to drive antique cars. It belongs to the horse and buggy age, not to the present.

Look at how other technologies have changed. Doctors who used to tell patients to bite the bullet now can tell them to inhale the anesthetic. Engineers don't have to fiddle with slide rules anymore, since the invention of calculators and computers. Even basketball has advanced with the invention of the unbreakable backboard.



Why haven't police? Why don't we have an alternative to the revolver? Why can't we use force that isn't deadly?

The answer is simple. Nobody has done the research. Nobody has done the testing. The last testing of less-than lethal weapons was done back in 1974. But Congress cut off the investment in hardware testing because a lot of people called saying it was a bad idea. Congress never heard from people who could tell them about the merits of this work.

So until 1986, nothing was done. Then, at the request of then-Attorney General Ed Meese, NIJ held a conference on less-than-lethal weapons. We brought together law enforcement officers, scientists and technicians.

Since then, NIJ has invested \$55,000 in exploratory research. We know about six potentially-suitable compounds that may be effective and safe in stopping human beings relatively quickly.

But the next stage -- doing the testing -- will take an investment up to ten million dollars. That is almost half of NIJ's entire budget -- far more than our agency can afford to spend on less-than-lethal weapons development.

Meanwhile, even though many police departments have moved from the revolver to the semi-automatic, we continue to pay a high price in lives lost, money wasted, and careers cut short. I am hopeful that with the help of the police profession nationwide, we can bring this issue to the level of national

priority that it takes to get the job done.

Another area of interest is forensics, and particularly the promise of DNA identification for use in police work. Although it has been accepted in civil courts in paternity cases, its acceptance in criminal cases has proceeded more slowly because of unfamiliarity and uniformity of the techniques involved.

But it is clear that the uniqueness of DNA's patterns and its potential for near-absolute identification of individuals by biological evidence holds significant promise for investigators-- in sexual assault cases, for example.

NIJ is supporting research to simplify current DNA probe technologies and demonstrate their validity. The use of new technologies should eliminate the need for large sample sizes for identification of blood or other evidence.

Then there is the problem of voice identification.

Sometimes, voice samples are the only evidence linking offenders to their crimes -- terrorists, extortionists, white-collar criminals. Police now can collect voice samples from a wide variety of sources -- telephones, answering machines, other recording devices, the news and entertainment media, and recordings that investigators obtain while they are lawfully gathering evidence. If we could detect and verify the identity of these voices, it would give law enforcement a powerful investigative tool, as well as objective evidence.

The use of forensic voice identification is widespread, but its availability to law enforcement has been limited by its slow growth and the highly-specialized training that is required. Only a handful of qualified persons and agencies can provide the service now.

In Los Angeles County, NIJ is working with the Sheriff's Department on a project called CAVIS -- that stands for Computer-Assisted Voice Identification System. It is a research project to develop an automated, computerized system capable of comparing and identifying recorded unknown voices in criminal cases -- from lewd or threatening telephone calls to kidnapping, extortion, and murder.

Although we need to do further research in this area, the project -- a partnership of Federal, local and scholarly academic research -- is an example of practical research in a real-world laboratory that produces policy-relevant results.

It also demonstrates, along with DNA, the important role that science and technology are playing and are going to play even more in police management and practice. They will be key factors in the policy decisions police managers make. There will be more scientific certainty in investigations and more science-oriented testimony in court, with less reliance on eyewitnesses.

\* \* \*

Well, I have talked a long time and covered a lot of territory. I said at the beginning there was a lot to talk

about.

There is also a great deal that I have not covered -- serial murders, hostage negotiations, white-collar crime -- but I think we are ready to open this up for questions and discussion.

I want to hear from you, because we get our research ideas from people like you in the field -- where the results of our work eventually are applied.

I have tried to focus my remarks today on police management, and to underscore the importance of two elements that are vital to effective police management today and that are going to become even more so -- professional research and sound policy decisions. They work together.

I have given you a number of themes to think about when you consider national trends and developments in law enforcement and effective policing for the future. But what they all come down to is this:

As police managers, you need all the input you can get to help you make informed policy choices in the volatile environment in which you operate. That's the contribution that policy-relevant research makes.

Research in policing has come a long way, too. When we remember that it began systematically less than fifteen years ago, the progress is even more impressive.

In police management and research, we have come far, but we still have a far way to go. I am very confident that, based on

the knowledge and the lessons of the past, modern police leadership will meet the challenges of modern law enforcement.