

Onondaga Citizens League

Report #6

THE DELIVERY OF POLICE SERVICES IN ONONDAGA COUNTY:
A REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Approved and Issued

by

Board of Directors
Onondaga Citizens League
July 11, 1984

Onondaga Citizens League, Inc.
c/o University College
610 East Fayette Street
Syracuse, New York 13202
Phone: (315) 423-3291

ONONDAGA CITIZENS LEAGUE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

1984-1985

Helen Anderson
Joseph T. Ash (Treasurer)
Katherine Benedict
Elma B. Boyko
Joyce G. Carmen
Daniel Casey
Max Casper
Samuel Clemence
Robert Collins
Martin M. Duggan
Howard Gartner
John E. Hayes, Jr.
John Hennigan, Jr.
Robert Hennigan (Vice President)
Leo Jivoff
John Kramer
John A. LaVine
Richard M. Lawless
Stephen W. Martin
Sarah McIlvain
Tore Mita
Jean Reeve (President)
Robert C. Schofield
Eleanor Shopiro
Jean Stinchcombe (Secretary)
Paul Welch
Deborah Williams
Helen Zych

Levi L. Smith
Executive Vice President

PREFACE

To the Editor:

During the past six months, about 25 members of the Onondaga Citizens League have been studying and discussing the organization and delivery of police services in Onondaga County. They have heard presentations from and have questioned 13 heads of police agencies (city, county, state, town and village), 10 elected officials and interested people who have special relationships with police services. They also have administered a public-opinion survey on police services.

A report on the committee's findings and recommendations will be completed this week. Following approval by the League's Board of Directors in July, the final report will be published.

It appears that the time may be ripe for some progressive changes in the organization and delivery of police services. In the 15 years I have worked with police officials in regard to training, I have never seen such a spirit of cooperation and serious concern for improvement in interdepartmental relationships. The representatives from the various police agencies have commented frequently during the weekly meetings that this has been a very healthy and valuable experience. Most often, they have agreed on needed reforms.

The League is especially appreciative of the impressive reports and suggestions for coordination or consolidation of services prepared and presented by the city Police Department and the county Sheriff's Department. The documents represent a great deal of work and serious thinking about needed changes.

If the League report receives the support it deserves from legislators, the organization and delivery of police services throughout this county should be improved in terms of reasonableness, efficiency and economy.

LEE SMITH
Executive Vice President
Onondaga Citizens League

610 E. Fayette Street

Reprinted from
Syracuse Post-Standard, June 19, 1984

THE ONONDAGA CITIZENS LEAGUE

In 1978 several members of University College's Thursday Morning Roundtable explored the need for, and the feasibility of establishing a broad-based citizen organization to study and make recommendations on long-range problems facing this county. The idea of such a citizens group was inspired by the successful 25-year history of the Minneapolis-St. Paul Citizens League which has been responsible for initiating many of the progressive developments in that metropolitan area.

After many discussions, 21 persons active in the community and interested in the concept were convened to develop plans for an Onondaga Citizens League. These individuals constituted an advisory board to establish guidelines for the organization, to promote membership, to select a topic for study by League members, to prepare and adopt by-laws for operation of the organization, and in general to oversee League functions during its early months.

The Onondaga Citizens League was incorporated in 1980 and received non-profit tax exempt status in 1981. The League's purpose is to encourage citizen education and involvement in public issues and problems. Members of the League study all aspects of selected public problems, determine the facts, make considered judgments on approaches and solutions, and develop recommendations presented to appropriate responsible persons or offices. The organization's objective is to forestall the development of problems into real crises, not to promote specific legislation or function as a lobby.

The Onondaga Citizens League is open to any resident of the county. While some choose to join to study a specific topic, others join and renew their membership in support of the principle of citizen study of issues of major concern to the community.

The League's first study was "Equality and Fairness in Property Assessment" (June 1979). The second dealt with "Young People in Trouble: How Can Our Services Be Organized and Delivered More Effectively?" (May 1981). The third report considered "The County Legislature: Its Functions, Size and Structure" (August 1981). The fourth analyzed "Declining School Enrollments: Opportunities for Cooperative Adaptations" (July 1982). The fifth report considered "Onondaga County Public Works Infrastructure: Status, Funding, Responsibilities." This study represents the sixth undertaken by the League.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Board of Directors of the Onondaga Citizens League, listed on back of the front cover, wishes to acknowledge the important contributions to this study by the following.

Members of the Study Committee, identified in Appendix 4, dedicated many hours of study and discussion to the development of this report. Their sincere concern about the organization and delivery of police services has been a heartening example of the ideals of the Citizens League. John Kramer, county coordinator, Cooperative Extension, served as chairman of the Study Committee. The League is especially appreciative of his outstanding work in planning the study, inviting speakers, and conducting discussions as the committee carried out its deliberations.

Those who served as consultants to the Study Committee gave freely of their time and expertise to assist in clarifying the issues. Appendix 6 lists these individuals.

University College provided staff support, office space, telephone and other forms of assistance as a public service to implement the work of the League. Shirley Lamanna served as secretary/typist for the project.

Jean Stinchcombe deserves commendation as the coordinator of this study and author of the report.

THE 1984 STUDY COMMITTEE

Members of the 1984 Study Committee on The Delivery of Police Services in Onondaga County began meetings on January 18, 1984. John Kramer acted as chairman and Jean Stinchcombe as coordinator.

The Study Committee held regular sessions every Wednesday (with only one exception) through May 30. During May and June a subcommittee prepared a draft of recommendations that was carefully considered and revised by the entire Study Committee in several meetings in June. The appendices to this report include members of the Study Committee, members of the Subcommittee, and a list of speakers who addressed the Study Committee.

List of Figures

Figure 1.	Town and Village Police Department Personnel.....	5
Figure 2.	Police Coverage on a Population Basis.....	6
Figure 3.	Police Expenditures and Personnel, 1984.....	10
Figure 4.	Syracuse Police Department Budget, 1984.....	10
Figure 5.	Baldwinsville Police Department Budget, 1984.....	10
Figure 6.	Percentage of Sheriff's Calls and County Levy Compared.....	12
Figure 7.	Major Crimes Reported by - Police Agencies - Appendix II.....	24

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface.....	ii
Description of Onondaga Citizens League.....	ii
Acknowledgments.....	iii
The 1984 Study Committee.....	iv
List of Figures.....	v
Highlights of Report.....	1
Who are the Providers of Police Services?.....	2
What Services are Performed.....	7
What are We Paying for Police Services?.....	9
What Services are Coordinated or Shared?.....	14
How do Elected Officials, Police Chiefs, and Citizens View Police Services?.....	15
Findings: What Should be Done to Improve Police Services, Their Organization and Delivery.....	17
Recommendations.....	17
Appendices	
I. 1983 Operating Budgets for Police Departments.....	23
II. Major Crimes Reported by Police Agencies.....	24
III. Results of Three Opinion Surveys.....	25-30
IV. OCL Study Committee on Police Services.....	31
V. OCL Study Committee's Subcommittee on Recommendations...	32
VI. List of Speakers to OCL Study Committee.....	33
VII. Glossary.....	34

THE DELIVERY OF POLICE SERVICES
A REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report focuses on the delivery of police services in Onondaga County. From its inception this study emphasized a review of what services are actually provided and how. What is our current pattern, and what should be attempted for the future?

The study of police services was broken into five categories: 1.) Who are the providers of police services? 2.) What services do these agencies provide? 3.) What do these services cost, and how are costs allocated? 4.) What services are now shared or coordinated between agencies? 5.) How do citizens, elected officials, and police chiefs evaluate police services, their organization and delivery? 6.) What should be done to improve the delivery of police services in Onondaga County?

HIGHLIGHTS

QUESTIONS

1. Who are the providers of police services?
2. What services do these agencies provide?
3. What do these services cost, and how are costs allocated?
4. What services are now shared or coordinated between agencies?

ANSWERS

1. In Onondaga County 19 agencies at the state, county, city, town, and village levels provide police services.
2. In addition to major police functions--patrol; criminal investigation; traffic control; youth services; vice and organized crime control; and community service--police departments provide a wide range of other services in response to citizens' calls.
3. In 1984 approximately \$44.8 million are being spent on police services; 80 per cent (or more) of this expenditure goes for personnel.
4. Although Onondaga County has multiple police departments, these agencies cooperate in investigative activities, communications systems, training programs, provision of laboratory service, and sharing specialized personnel and equipment.

5. How do citizens, elected officials, and police chiefs evaluate police services, their organization and delivery?

6. What should be done to improve the delivery of police service in Onondaga County?

5. A complicated yet effective system of decentralized, local police service draws widespread approval. Assets are seen in police departments' knowledge of communities, rapid response time, and local control and responsibility.

6. Continuing, improved coordination among agencies should be achieved by an advisory council of police and elected officials working with an independent office of county government. Headed by a coordinator from the field of law enforcement, this office should encourage close working relations among agencies and provide auxiliary services for local police departments. Greater coordination of specialized as well as auxiliary services will make the present system both more effective and more efficient.

I. Who are the Providers?

Policing in Onondaga County dates to the area's early development. A sheriff has served the county since 1794; the position of sheriff became an elective office in 1846. During a period of almost two centuries, fifty-five sheriffs have held office. The Syracuse police department's early history can be traced to 1827, when two constables earned \$25.00 a year for their service to the "village." By 1892 Syracuse was a city, served by 80 patrolmen.

Few town or village police departments existed until the mid-twentieth century. As suburban development accelerated after World War II, outlying areas established patrols or volunteer police forces that became independent departments. In 1962 county executive John Mulroy proposed a county police department to equalize service and remove a burden from town and village taxpayers; the idea was dropped in the county legislature.³ During the 1960s town and village departments grew rapidly in response to calls from an increasing population; the decade of the 1970s saw the development of⁴ modern and professional police forces at the town and village levels.

Nineteen different agencies provide police services in Onondaga County today. This total includes eleven village police departments; five town police departments; the City of Syracuse police department; the Onondaga County sheriff's department; and the state police.

1 The Onondaga County Sheriff's Department, historical leaflet.

2 Syracuse Police Department, cover letter to annual report, 1977.

3 John Mulroy, statement to the OCL Study Committee, Apr. 25, 1984.

4 League of Women Voters, Patterns of Government in Onondaga County, p. 54.

VILLAGES

Of fifteen villages in Onondaga County only four do not have police departments. The eleven villages that do have their own departments include: Baldwinsville; East Syracuse; Fayetteville; Jordan; Liverpool; Manlius; Marcellus; Minoa; North Syracuse; Skaneateles; and Solvay. Of the village departments, Fayetteville, Manlius, and Minoa also contract to provide police protection to portions of the Town of Manlius, a system that will be changed if the three elected village boards and the town board approve a proposal to create a town police department.

TOWNS

Of the county's nineteen towns, only five have police departments: Cicero; Clay; Camillus (in this instance the village has no police department); DeWitt; and Geddes. Towns in the southern part of the county, including areas with new residential development, do not have town police departments. These towns are, for example, Lafayette, Pompey, Otisco, Tully, and Fabius, areas served primarily by the state police. Populous towns not served by town police include Onondaga (population, 17,824) and Salina (population, 34,551, excluding the village of Liverpool within its borders.)⁶ These areas rely primarily on the sheriff's department for police services.

Town and village police departments vary greatly both in budgets and number of full time officers. Although some of the departments are quite small, the towns of DeWitt and Clay have sizeable police budgets. (For 1983 operating budgets, see Appendix 1; these figures do not include fringe benefits and retirement costs.) The number of full time and part time officers and civilians employed by town and village police departments is seen in Figure 1.

CITY

The Syracuse police department serves the 170,105 residents of the city as well as about 57,000 commuters, of whom 51,000 live in Onondaga County. The department is composed of the office of the chief and the bureaus of administration, general services, and field services. The city has 469 budgeted positions for sworn personnel, of which 427 are now filled; there are 201 budgeted positions for civilians.

⁵ Post-Standard, June 7, 1984.

⁶ Population figures are from the 1980 census.

⁷ Syracuse Police Department, Report, presented to OCL; figures on commuters are from the Syracuse-Onondaga County Planning Agency.

COUNTY

The office of sheriff is a constitutionally mandated position in New York State. The sheriff's department is the chief law enforcement agency of county government. The department serves the county through a civil division, a criminal division, and a jail division; an administrative division serves the other three divisions. The criminal division, which is particularly of interest for this report, is divided into the following units: road patrol; criminal investigation; abused persons; youth aid; and special enforcement units including helicopter pilots and observers, divers and boat patrols, snowmobile patrols, and canine unit.

The sheriff's department patrols areas in the county outside the city of Syracuse. Only on request or in an emergency do sheriff's deputies cross lines to enter the city or those villages that have police departments.

The department has 427 sworn personnel and 71 civilian.⁸

STATE

The state police was organized in 1917 as a rural department designed to serve areas without police services. The state police will not assume primary responsibility in the city or in any village that has a police department; they will enter only upon request from the city or village in the event of emergency. The state police do patrol towns but attempt to make the coverage overlap with town police services as little as possible.⁹

⁸ Onondaga County Sheriff's Department, 1984 Adopted Budget and 1983 Statistics.

⁹ Information is from Major G.C. Dunne, Troop D, State Police; presentation to OCL Study Committee, Feb. 8, 1984.

Figure 1.
TOWN AND VILLAGE POLICE DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL

<u>Town or Village</u>	<u>Fulltime Officers</u>	<u>Part-time Officers</u>	<u>Fulltime Civilians</u>	<u>Part-time Civilians</u>
V/Baldwinsville	11	1	3	yes
T/Camillus	13	1	2	no
T/Cicero	0	10	0	yes
T/Clay	19	8	3	yes
T/DeWitt	23	0	2	yes
V/Fayetteville	12	3	3	no
T/Geddes	11	2	0	yes
V/Jordan	0	2	0	yes
V/Liverpool	7	7	1	no
V/Manlius	10	0	4	no
V/Marcellus	1	7	0	yes
V/Minoa	7	2	1	no
V/North Syracuse	11	6	4	yes
V/Solvay	11	0	5	yes
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
totals	136	49	28	9Y 5N

Source: Presented to the OCL Study Committee by Timothy Paul,
Police Administrator, Village of Baldwinsville - data for 1981

Figure 2.

Police Coverage on a Population Basis

<u>Locality</u>	<u>1 Fulltime Officer per # Residents</u>
Onondaga County (sheriff's department excluding City of Syracuse..... and villages with police departments)	585
City (Syracuse).....	398
V/Baldwinsville.....	586
T/Camillus.....	1,871
T/Cicero*.....	-
T/DeWitt.....	1,019
V/East Syracuse.....	487
V/Fayetteville.....	392
T/Geddes.....	1,035
V/Jordan*.....	-
V/Liverpool.....	407
V/Manlius.....	524
V/Marcellus.....	1,870
V/Minoa.....	520
V/North Syracuse.....	725
V/Skaneateles.....	697
V/Solvay.....	649

* T/Cicero and V/Jordan have no fulltime officers.

**Town figures exclude village populations served by their own police departments.

II. What Services are Performed?

Village, town, city, county, and state police forces all provide a range of services, although they differ greatly in what they are able to do in any one field. Police services were described to the Study Committee as falling into the following major categories: 1.) patrol; 2.) criminal investigation; 3.) traffic control; 4.) youth services; 5.) vice and organized crime control (special enforcement); and 6.) community services.¹⁰

Patrol: Speakers described patrol as the fundamental police function. Patrol is not simply inspection but, rather, an effort to deter crime and enforce criminal statutes and local ordinances and codes. Included in the patrol function are such varied activities as security checks of business, surveillance of public parks and property, and rapid response to emergencies and crises ranging from drownings to fires and family fights. Citizens' calls to police are answered as quickly as possible. By patrol police develop a knowledge of people and places, investigate changing or unusual circumstances, and deal with misconduct when it happens.

Criminal Investigation: This service is increasingly specialized, particularly in the larger departments. Included in this function are those critical processes at the scene of a crime, such as collecting evidence, photography, and plaster casting. Other investigative activities are obtaining written statements from victims and witnesses; interrogation of suspects; obtaining and executing search warrants; apprehension and arrest of wanted persons; preparation of court cases against criminal defendants; and cooperation with other law enforcement agencies to exchange information and use specialized resources.

Traffic Control: Traffic control is a major albeit unpopular function performed by police departments. In this field police departments identify the causes of traffic hazards and congestion and seek remedies. Laws are enforced by warnings, traffic tickets, and custodial arrests. When accidents occur, police respond by appearing at the scene, providing first aid, and identifying causes. Other special activities include planning and coordinating traffic control for special events such as parades, games, and rallies, educating school children about pedestrian, bicycle, and driving safety, and assisting stranded motorists and disabled vehicles.

Youth Services: For many years police departments have maintained special services for youth. These involve the investigation of crimes involving youth as the victim or perpetrator; the preparation of cases for Family Court; maintaining confidential files on juvenile offenders; conferring with juveniles and parents; and working with social service agencies that deal with youth.

Vice and Organized Crime Control (Special Enforcement): This field includes investigating vice activities such as drug abuse, prostitution, and gambling; maintaining files on known vice offenders; and cooperating with other agencies in investigation and special enforcement against vice.

¹⁰ This summary of police services follows presentation to the OCL Study Committee by the following police chiefs: John McClellan (Oneida); Timothy Paul (Baldwinsville); Larry Fleming (Camillus); and Rocco Femano (Solvay).

Community Service: Police departments offer a variety of school and community programs, including police speakers at public meetings, assistance to local organizations, residential areas and businesses, and educational activities for the public.

Although these general services are performed by local departments, the emphasis and degree of activity differs according to the nature of the community and the size of the police department. The smaller departments are by necessity generalists, and their officers are primarily involved in patrol. As major law enforcement agencies the Syracuse police department and the Onondaga County sheriff's department have specialized units dealing with criminal investigation: narcotics, vice and prostitution; youth and child abuse; and community services. The state police offer a wide spectrum of services, albeit without the emphasis on community services. The city, county, and state police departments also have unique technical units, including special personnel and equipment.

Syracuse Police Department

The Syracuse police department has a fully staffed and equipped security and bomb squad available for special security events and prepared to investigate explosive devices and respond to bomb threats. The city's mounted patrol is used to control parades and assemblies and patrol parks and creeks. Also available is an armored personnel carrier.

Syracuse is one of the few cities outside of New York City to operate a crime laboratory. The Syracuse Police Laboratory, staffed by the city police department and two persons from the sheriff's department, has specialized equipment for the analysis of alcohol, drugs, flammable residues, and hair. Humorous examinations and analyses for all agencies are conducted at the Syracuse Police laboratory.

Onondaga County Sheriff's Department

As required by New York State law, the sheriff's department provides a jail to hold prisoners awaiting judicial process; the jail is used by all law enforcement agencies as well as counties that do not have a maximum security jail.

The department has a number of specialized units, some of which are warrant investigation; special enforcement (including navigation and snowmobile patrols and an underwater search and recovery team); explosive devices disposal and special weapons and tactics team; a canine team to assist patrol efforts; aviation (helicopter service) to assist patrol and to provide emergency transportation to local hospitals, and highway safety.

The sheriff's department also operates a laboratory that offers crime photography, fingerprint examinations, firearms examinations, and ballistic comparisons. This laboratory offers some but not all of the services provided by the Syracuse Crime Laboratory; the sheriff department's laboratory does not do chemical analysis.

11 Information on the Syracuse police department's and the OCSD's specialized personnel, services, and equipment is from reports submitted to the OCL Study Committee; information on the state police is from a presentation by Major G.C. Dunne, Feb. 8, 1984.

State Police

The state police are organized to function as generalists in rural areas. Troop D, including the seven-county area of Onondaga, Oswego, Jefferson, Lewis, Madison, Oneida, and Herkimer counties, follows this pattern. The state police nonetheless draw upon specialized services including scuba divers; aircraft (three helicopters); canine unit (four bloodhounds for tracking and shepherds trained to detect drugs and explosives); and mounted patrol. The state police have laboratory services and equipment located in Albany; but because of the availability of the Syracuse Crime Laboratory and the Onondaga County sheriff's department laboratory, local agencies are unlikely to use the state facility.

Police as a Service Agency

Despite diverse personnel and equipment with which to combat crime, police officials from all levels of government informed the Study Committee that more than seventy-five per cent of their time is spent on service calls, or requests for service that are not crime-related. Police routinely respond to reports of accidents, animal complaints, cat-in-tree emergencies, locked vehicles, children missing in shopping areas, and citizens needing ambulance service. Chief Thomas Sardino estimated that in the city of Syracuse only eighteen to twenty-two per cent of police time is spent on criminal matters. Larry Lynch, director of police in DeWitt and professor of criminal justice at Onondaga Community College, informed the Study Committee that smaller departments may devote as much as ninety per cent of their time to service. Although town and village departments handle a significant number of major crimes (See Appendix2), service is a primary function that justifies their operation.

Whether in a large city or a small village, the police role touches many facets of community life. Over the years police have assumed public responsibility in circumstances such as death notification, truancy, suicide, and domestic crises. Alcohol-related problems of teenagers present another recent area of police involvement; assistance to mentally disoriented or disturbed persons is yet another. Police departments, moreover, act as referral agencies for citizens needing advice or assistance from other governmental or social agencies.¹²

III. What are We Paying for Police Services?

A significant percentage of all public expenditures at the local level goes to police services. For the city of Syracuse, 24.2 per cent of the 1984 budget is devoted to police protection. At the county level the sheriff's department accounts for 8 per cent of the budget. Towns and villages with police departments are spending about 15-25 per cent of their budgets on police, without fringe benefits and retirement being included. Total expenditures for 1984 are seen in Figure 3.

12 Discussion follows presentations by the following police officials: Thomas Sardino; William Peverly; Larry Lynch; Larry Fleming.

Figure 3.

<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Police Expenditures and Personnel</u>	
	<u>Expenditure</u>	<u>Sworn Personnel</u>
Villages and towns (estimated)	\$6.8 million	201
County sheriff's department	13.5 million	427
Syracuse police department	22.5 million	426
State police in Onondaga County	2.5 million	90
	<u>\$45.3 million</u>	<u>1,144</u>

Personnel costs consume the overwhelming percentage of police budgets. Typical of labor intensive fields police work produces budgets in which 80-90 percent of expenditures is devoted to salary, wages and fringe benefits. A breakdown of the Syracuse police department budget for 1984 is seen in

Figure 4.

Syracuse Police Department, 1984

	<u>Expenditure</u>	<u>% of budget</u>
<u>salary and wages</u>	\$13,816,089.00	61%
<u>fringe benefits</u>	6,848,079.00	30
<u>operating expenses</u>	1,408,313.00	6
<u>capital improvement</u>	515,150.00	3
	<u>\$22,587,631.00</u>	

The budget for the sheriff's department is presented somewhat differently, but a breakdown of expenditures for the criminal division shows 79 percent devoted to personnel and 21 percent to non-personnel needs.

The Baldwinsville village police department's budget for 1984-85 offers yet another example. (See Figure 5.)

Figure 5.

Baldwinsville Village Police Department, 1984

	<u>Expenditure</u>	<u>% of budget</u>
personnel	\$284,394.00	66%
fringe benefits	104,688.00	25
non-personnel	39,534.00	9
	<u>\$428,616.00</u>	

The pattern of expenditures in Baldwinsville, a village department with eleven fulltime officers, is virtually identical to that in Syracuse, a city department of 426.

With the greater part of their budgets going to personnel, police departments have had few areas in which to make economies. Inflationary pressures have been felt both in rising salaries and wages and in mounting costs for supplies and contracted services. The village of East Syracuse has seen its police budget increase from \$149,804 in 1979-80 to almost \$260,000 in 1984-85.¹³ In the Town of Manlius, which contracts with the villages of Minoa, Fayetteville, and Manlius for police services, payments have gone from \$241,270 in 1979 to \$616,552 in 1984.¹⁴ At the county level, county executive John Mulroy informed the Study Committee that expenditures for the sheriff department's criminal division increased by almost \$4 million in a four-year period. Expenditures for criminal investigation alone increased from \$1.5 million in 1980 to \$3.4 million in 1984, Mulroy reported.¹⁵

Despite rising costs, villages such as East Syracuse and Liverpool have chosen to maintain their own departments. In East Syracuse the village has provided its own policing for sixty years. Liverpool rejected a 1980 proposal to have police services provided by the sheriff's department.¹⁶ The village departments of Minoa, Fayetteville, and Manlius are now moving toward the creation of a town police department as described to the Study Committee by Town of Manlius supervisor Richard Lowenberg. According to Donald Crossett, mayor of Minoa, "Most people these days are expecting some type of police consolidation because they realize it's difficult for each individual village to staff a fully-equipped village department."¹⁷ The village of Solvay and the Town of Geddes police departments are also considering consolidation.

Service by multiple agencies presents another cost examined by the Study Committee. Some residents in the county pay only once--for service by the sheriff's department. Those residents with a town or village department pay twice to support the local department as well as the sheriff's department. Revenue from city taxpayers supports the sheriff's department, although the sheriff does not operate within city lines except in emergencies. Nor does the sheriff enter villages with established police forces. Towns with police departments receive assistance, while other towns rely wholly on the sheriff's department. (See Figure 6.)

Speaking for the county, county executive Mulroy and chairman of the county legislature Nick Pirro explained that there is no exact way to allot public services according to dollars contributed. Residents travel frequently throughout the county, thereby benefiting from the sheriff's services no matter where they live. Special services of the

13 Suburban Life, March 14, 1984; these figures do not include fringes.

14 Post-Standard, June 7, 1984.

15 John Mulroy, statement to OCL Study Committee, Apr. 15, 1984, Mulroy outlined this increase for the criminal division: 1980, \$5 million; 1981, \$5.9 million; 1982, \$6.6 million; 1983, \$6.8 million; 1984, \$8.9 million.

16 James Moore, mayor of village of Liverpool, statement to OCL Study Committee April 11, 1984.

17 Post-Standard, June 7, 1984.

Figure 6.

Percentage of Sheriff's Calls & County Levy Compared

<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>% of sheriff dept.'s calls rec'd</u>	<u>% of county levy raised</u>
<u>Towns</u>		
CAMILLUS	4.15%	5.42%
CICERO	7.2	4.84
CLAY	10.82	10.58
DEWITT	8.58	10.66
Elbridge	.89	1.04
Fabius	.30	.43
GEDDES	3.78	4.26
Lafayette	1.04	1.08
Lysander	3.57	3.00
Manlius	1.85	7.03
Onondaga	10.89	4.04
Otisco	.75	.43
Pompey	1.08	1.23
Salina	27.44	8.64
Skaneateles	1.30	2.50
Spafford	.40	.58
Tully	.75	.76
Van Buren	6.27	2.29
SYRACUSE	6.96	29.85

Sources: Onondaga County sheriff's department breakdown of calls by jurisdiction, presented to the OCL Study Committee. The Onondaga County Finance Department prepared information on the percentage of the county levy raised by townships and by the city.

*Towns with police departments are capitalized.

sheriff's department are made available to other police departments on a short-term basis. The county sales tax provides yet another form of equity. The sales tax, which in many areas is dedicated wholly to county government, is divided among county, city, and town governments; the¹⁸ resulting revenue-sharing helps to finance local police departments.

Local police service remains an added cost for those communities that want it. Residents are entitled to this choice if they are willing to pay for it, said speakers from every level of government. Assets attributed to a town or village police department are intimate knowledge of the community by police, personal service and attention to residents' needs, rapid response and local control and responsibility. Given multiple agencies, however, a systematic, coordinated approach to patrol is imperative, as is sharing of information.

Sheriff John C. Dillon's decision to establish a substation at Onondaga Hill, possibly to be followed by substations in southern Cicero and western Salina, will improve the logistics of patrol by reducing fuel costs and travel time.¹⁹ Of town and village officials addressing the Study Committee, one expressed willingness to forgo the community service of a local department and save dollars by receiving police protection from a sheriff's substation.

IV. What Services are Coordinated or Shared?

Little known to the public, coordination of auxiliary and specialized services for police departments is well underway.

Data Processing and Records

In the field of data processing and records several computerized systems exist and a major advance is now pending. The Onondaga Law Enforcement Information System (OLEIS) was created in the early 1970s. OLEIS is an on-line computer system that provides information on active warrants and criminal history to participating agencies. Only the Town of Clay and the village of Skaneateles do not belong to OLEIS.²⁰

Another system is the New York State Police Information Network (NYSPIN), which allows participating agencies to access the New York State police information network. This system provides a sharing of information between the National Crime Information Center (FBI, NCIC), the Department of Motor Vehicles, the Division of Criminal Justice Services, and the National Law Enforcement Teletype System (NLETS).

The Prosecutor's Management Information System (PROMIS) tracks misdemeanor, felony, and DWI cases from arrest through disposition for the

18 John Mulroy and Nick Pirro, statements to OCL Study Committee, April 25, 1984.

19 Herald-Journal, March 20, 1984.

20 Information on OLEIS and other systems comes from the Syracuse police department; Onondaga County sheriff's department; and other agencies.

district attorney's office and police agencies. Data available from this system includes general case description and information on incidents, trials, defendants, co-defendants, witnesses, police officers, charges, bail, arrests, motions, sentences and dispositions.

Local law enforcement agencies are now planning a new system known as the Complaint History Arrest Incident Reporting System (CHAIRS). This is a state-aided project to be tested in two counties, of which Onondaga County is one. CHAIRS will be designed to serve the needs of law enforcement and criminal justice agencies in a truly regional information system. The system will be interfaced with the district attorney's PROMIS system as well as other existing on-line systems. CHAIRS will generate uniform crime reports and maintain indices to shared police files. The system will also provide officers in the field access to major data bases.

The technology of CHAIRS is also consistent with the eventual introduction of a central emergency police number for citizens. The new enhanced 911 systems (E-911) have computerized features that provide automatic identification of the location of the phone and address, thereby avoiding dangerous confusion caused by multiple use of the same street name.

Communications

The Syracuse police department maintains a central communications division; this system has the capability to communicate directly with all other law enforcement agencies.

The communications division of the sheriff's department is responsible for receiving and dispatching all calls for the sheriff and the eleven towns and villages that make up the Onondaga Law Enforcement Mobile Radio District (OLEMRD or MRD). A communications center is located at the sheriff's headquarters supported by a unit that oversees all technical aspects of the Mobile Radio District (MRD for short).

The villages of Solvay, Fayetteville, Manlius, and Skaneateles chose not to join the Mobile Radio District and instead formed the Western Mobile Radio District. In contrast to the MRD, agencies in the western MRD do their own dispatching.

Only the Town of Clay belongs to neither the MRD nor the western MRD.

Training

The Syracuse police department and the Onondaga County sheriff's department jointly operate the training program at the Police Academy at Onondaga Community College. Both the sheriff and the Syracuse chief are designated New York State Training coordinators for this area. Both departments provide instructors to offer a program of recruit training to all departments in the county.

Crime Laboratory Services

Most agencies in Onondaga County use the Syracuse Crime Laboratory on a fee per unit basis. Other services are provided by the Onondaga County sheriff department's laboratory; this laboratory provides services to towns and villages without charge.

Specialized Services

The investigative process itself is shared through records, communications, and the practice of mutual assistance. As described to the Study Committee by the East Syracuse chief William Peverly, smaller departments provide the basic necessities of patrol, observation, preliminary investigation and follow-up to most offenses.²¹ In major crimes such as homicide, sex offenses, and many robberies, however, local agencies seek assistance from the sheriff, state police, or the Onondaga County Major Felony Unit. The Major Felony Unit is a unit of twenty-two officers from towns and villages and from the sheriff's department that assists local police departments; the unit is funded by the county.

The Arson Task Force is another cooperative venture funded by the county.

Specialized units are loaned in time of need; namely, the city's bomb and armored car units and the sheriff's helicopter and canine units.

V. How do Elected Officials, Police Chiefs, and Citizens View Police Services?

Elected officials at the village, town, city, and county levels described their constituents as enthusiastic about their police departments and police service in Onondaga County generally. Several remarked that they rarely had complaints about police service. In the judgment of these officials citizens want police protection that is "close to the local community." Citizens' primary concern, however, is that the police response be prompt and courteous. No governmental function is considered more important than that of the police. Even so, local governments throughout the county face budget pressures that may lead to modifications, such as the move from village departments to a town department in Manlius.

Recalling a period of sharp rivalry in which agencies competed to answer calls, elected officials and police chiefs now see improved cooperation and communication among police departments. Nonetheless, speakers before the Study Committee identified a number of areas in which sharing and coordination of auxiliary and specialized services would produce economies and enable police agencies to do a better job without altering the basic organization of services.

21 William J. Peverly, statement to the OCL Study Committee, May 30, 1984

To complement the presentations by elected officials and police chiefs, the Study Committee sponsored three opinion surveys. Denise L. Meyer, a student in the Public Affairs Program at Maxwell School, Syracuse University, worked with an OCL subcommittee to develop a questionnaire designed to reveal attitudes and judgments about police services and their organization. Nine hundred and sixty-four surveys were sent to a random sample of residents. Fifty-four surveys were sent to police chiefs and chief elected officials. Almost 20 percent of residents returned the survey; 62 percent of surveys from elected officials and 67 percent from police chiefs were returned. (For the tabulation of results, see Appendix 3.)

As in their presentation to the Study Committee, elected officials and police chiefs agreed on many points. Evaluating the six major services--patrol; criminal investigation; traffic control; youth services; special enforcement (prostitution, gambling, narcotics); and community service--both elected officials and police chiefs ranked the quality in their communities as excellent or good with the sole exception of special enforcement; police chiefs ranked the only fair. Seventy-five percent of elected officials and chiefs considered patrol the most important police function. Elected officials offered a mixed verdict on whether criminal investigation, traffic control, or youth services ranked second in importance. Knowing their own field, police chiefs clearly listed criminal investigation second. Surprisingly, elected officials rated community service programs as least important of the six services; police chiefs ranked special enforcement as least important for town and village departments. Both police chiefs and elected officials felt that the responsibility for special enforcement programs should belong to city, county, and state agencies. Patrol, community service, traffic control, and youth services were seen as appropriate for local departments.

Of elected officials who returned the survey, more than half found some unnecessary duplication in services by police agencies. Most felt that this problem could be rectified by better communication, reassignment of specialized functions among agencies, or merger of town and village departments. More than half of police chiefs answering the questionnaire also saw unnecessary duplication; to solve this problem they, too, recommended improved communication or merger at the town and village level.

Residents were more likely to describe police services as good or fair rather than excellent. Again patrol was overwhelmingly ranked as first in importance, followed by criminal investigation. Over half of residents believed that criminal investigation and special enforcement should be handled by county and state police agencies. Exactly half of these citizen respondents saw unnecessary duplication of services. Those citing unnecessary duplication favored better communication, reassignment of specialized functions, or merger of police agencies at different levels.

VI: Findings: What Should be Done to Improve
Police Services, their Organization
and Delivery?

After reviewing the subject, members of the OCL Study Committee reached several general findings, followed by a number of specific recommendations.

1. The organization of police services in Onondaga County is complicated but generally works well and satisfies the desires of residents and police officials.

The Study Committee found no public demand or convincing evidence in behalf of a metropolitan police force or any other sweeping change. A metropolitan organization is often recommended on grounds of efficiency and economy. Cost-savings are implied, not demonstrated. The Study Committee heard no evidence that a larger organization would be cheaper or more responsive.

2. Many formal and informal means of cooperation between police agencies have developed in the past decade. Although interdepartmental rivalry has existed in the past, the trend is now toward greater coordination and cooperation. This coordination can and should produce better service as well as the economies needed in the face of rising costs.

3. By adopting measures to improve coordination among police agencies at all levels, Onondaga County can retain the best features of the present system (i.e., decentralized service, efficient police response, and local control and responsibility) and at the same time make a united, efficient attack on the criminal activities that so often cross local boundaries; expensive duplication can be avoided without the administrative and salary costs of creating a major new police organization.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. IN GENERAL ONONDAGA COUNTY SHOULD RETAIN THE PRESENT ORGANIZATION OF POLICE SERVICES AS THE BASIS FOR IMPLEMENTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THIS REPORT.

*Police services are performed well according to testimony from citizens, local elected officials, and police chiefs.

*The organization of services fits with public preferences as seen in the results from the three opinion surveys and the performance of towns and villages in creating and maintaining their own police departments.

2. LOCAL ELECTED LEADERS AND POLICE OFFICIALS SHOULD REEXAMINE THEIR POLICE DEPARTMENT'S PRIORITIES AND DUTIES.

*Over the years police departments have assumed numerous functions, many of which are not related to law enforcement. Police departments devote as much as 75 percent (or, in some cases, more) of their time to responding to requests for service. (See page 9) Some of these functions could be appropriately performed by other agencies.

*Local officials should focus on the question of what they want their police department to do. By a process of review some services could be dropped, or emphasis shifted.

3. AS THE BACKBONE OF ANY POLICE AGENCY THE PATROL FUNCTION (See page 7) SHOULD BE PERFORMED LOCALLY.

*In some areas patrol is performed primarily by town and village agencies.

*Recently the city of Syracuse, using a new zone organization for patrol, and the sheriff's department, with the plan for satellite offices, have moved toward the LOCAL, DECENTRALIZED SERVICE THAT THE OCL ENDORSES.

4. POLICE DEPARTMENTS ARE URGED TO DEVELOP A MORE COORDINATED PATTERN OF PATROL ACTIVITIES.

*A more systematic approach to patrol on the part of each department will help to reduce overlap in those parts of the county served by several jurisdictions.

*More defined patterns of patrol will serve to provide assistance from one agency to another in the areas in which it is most needed.

5. IN ADDITION TO PATROL THE OCL RECOMMENDS THAT YOUTH SERVICES (See page 7) AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS (See page 8) BE CONSIDERED LOCAL POLICE FUNCTIONS; TRAFFIC CONTROL (See page 7) IS ALSO A LOCAL FUNCTION WITH THE EXCEPTION OF PATROL OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS. THE OCL RECOMMENDS THAT PATROL OF INTERSTATES #81, #481, #690, and #695 BE ASSUMED BY THE STATE POLICE AS A MORE APPROPRIATE JURISDICTION THAN ANY LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

6. THE OCL ENCOURAGES LOCAL COMMUNITIES TO MAINTAIN THEIR OWN POLICE DEPARTMENTS.

*In the event that rising costs require changes, the OCL recommends that communities consider adjustments that retain the principle of local service, such as those now underway in the Town of Manlius.

*As another alternative the satellite offices being developed by the sheriff's department may offer a form of local service that is an acceptable alternative to communities with smaller police departments.

*In more rural areas the state police department's satellite units such as those in Lafayette and Elbridge offer a focus for police service not provided by any local agency.

Leaving aside patrol, traffic control, youth services, and community relations, the OCL Study Committee identified a number of auxiliary and specialized services that should be offered on a county-wide basis to make the system of multiple police departments work more effectively and efficiently.

AUXILIARY SERVICES

1. Purchasing: The OCL recommends centralized purchasing for equipment such as vehicles, radios, light bars, and shields. This should be done on a county-wide basis to achieve efficiency and cost reductions.

*Centralized purchasing on a county-wide basis was most often mentioned by police officials as a clear and obvious way to achieve economies.

2. Vehicle Impounds: The OCL recommends a single impound facility for all vehicles being held for use as evidence.

*The cost of this facility should be assumed by the county and no fee should be charged to vehicle owners.

*An appropriate site should be identified as soon as possible.

3. Record-Keeping and Data Processing: The OCL recommends centralized record-keeping and data-processing.

*The principle of centralized records and data processing is seen in CHAIRS (Criminal History Arrest Incident Reporting System), a plan by which all local police departments will participate in a system that links their data and makes it available to other departments and criminal justice agencies.

*CHAIRS will appear before the Onondaga County legislature in 1984 and deserves funding as a major advance in shared information and coordination.

4. Communications: The OCL recommends that all towns and villages join the OLEMRD.

*The Western MRD is outdated in the move toward sophisticated and integrated communications system; it should be abolished.

*Centralizing the county and city communications systems is an important second step.

*Computer-aided dispatch should be instituted as soon as possible.

*Because of technical advances including computer-aided dispatch and the system proposed in CHAIRS, the OCL considers it timely to examine the feasibility of an E-911 number. The technology is available to institute centralized access through E-911, and the OCL recommends that this possibility be examined.

5. Crime Laboratory Services: The OCL recommends that the Syracuse police department and the Onondaga County sheriff's department establish a committee to explore consolidation of laboratory services and provision of these services to local law enforcement agencies on a non-fee basis.

*The joint committee should be charged with examining projected needs and expenditures in the crime laboratory field.

*By identifying major investments to be made for equipment and personnel, the joint committee can see that duplication is avoided in the future.

6. Training: The OCL recognizes the central importance of training and urges the county to offer increased funding to improve and extend the program at the Police Academy.

*The program at the Police Academy should be improved in the following ways:

- a. supervisory, administrative and other advanced training should be offered.
- b. a program of continuing education should be developed: departments should be encouraged to send officers back to the Police Academy for in-service training in criminal procedure law and other rapidly changing fields.
- c. firearms training should be offered through the Police Academy.

*The OCL further recommends that town and village police departments have representation and participation in the management, instruction, and curriculum of the Police Academy. As a consequence of this change, the training program would be more varied and suited to the needs of different sorts of departments in the county.

The OCL also addressed coordination of specialized services.

SPECIALIZED SERVICES

1. Loaning of Manpower: The OCL recommends that the specialized services, equipment, and personnel of the Syracuse Police Department and the Onondaga County sheriff's department continue to be made available to other departments.

*Examples of such services are the sheriff's helicopter and canine unit and the city's mounted patrol unit and bomb squad.

*The sharing of expensive and unique services on a short-term, non-fee basis avoids duplication and offers specialized skills to all departments.

2. Narcotics, gambling, and Prostitution: The OCL recommends the creation of a committee consisting of representatives from village, town, city, county, and state police departments to coordinate investigations of narcotics, gambling, and prostitution.

*This committee should be charged with producing more coordinated enforcement and, specifically, sharing specialized personnel, information, and equipment.

3. Child Abuse Services: The OCL recommends a county-wide consideration of the problem of child abuse.

*The present Onondaga County Child Abuse Committee created by the Department of Social Services is an example of a potentially effective vehicle.

*Beyond this committee, however, the OCL urges better communication and cooperation among law enforcement officials.

4. Licensing: A common data system perhaps incorporated in CHAIRS should be instituted to allow cross-checking and information-sharing for pistol permits and other licenses.

5. Investigative activities: The OCL recommends that town and village police agencies analyze their investigative capabilities to determine what kinds of cases they can effectively handle; they should identify the kinds of cases that require assistance or complete responsibility by a larger investigative group.

*The sheriff's department and the state police are encouraged to assist in town and village investigations and to take over cases when requested.

*Cooperative mutual aid efforts already in existence may also be an acceptable alternative.

IMPLEMENTATION

The Study Committee took note of the many ways in which police departments now coordinate services. At the same time the need for closer, continuing cooperation among agencies has long been recognized. Confronted with rising costs and complex problems and responsibilities, police departments should not continue to rely on as hoc solutions that evolve over many years. The current level of cooperation alone can not effectively implement the recommendations of this report. Continued research, persuasion, and negotiation are needed to address long-range needs and make necessary modifications in the organization and delivery of services.

*1. The OCL recommends that an independent office in county government be created to facilitate planning, research, and coordination of police services.

2. The county executive should establish an advisory council to provide guidance in the development and operation of this office. The composition of the advisory council should be as follows: the chief of the Syracuse police department or his designee; the Onondaga County sheriff or his designee; one representative from the town and village police departments to be selected by the president of the Association of County Police Chiefs; one representative from the county legislature to be selected by the chairman of the legislature; one representative from the Syracuse Common Council to be selected by the president of the council; the district attorney; and the medical examiner.

3. Acting in consultation with the advisory council, the county executive should appoint a coordinator to head the new office; the position of coordinator should be filled by a professional experienced in the field of law enforcement.

4. The advisory council and the coordinator should identify and examine present and long-range areas of concern in the delivery of police services.

*It should be noted that the Onondaga County Sheriff's Department dissents from this particular recommendation and has submitted a position paper on this issue.

5. Guided by the advisory council (functioning on a continuing basis), the coordinator directing the proposed independent office should work with affected departments to see that the recommendations of this report are implemented and continued.

6. The proposed independent office in county government should serve as an administrative arm for the county-wide auxiliary services for police departments discussed in this report, e.g., centralized purchasing, training.

Appendix I.

1983 Operating Budgets

Onondaga County sheriff's department	- \$10,025,127
O.C. sheriff's dept. criminal division	- 6,800,000
Syracuse police department-	\$14,054,000
East Syracuse village	- 250,962
Jordan village	- 12,643
Solvay village	- 373,270
Baldwinsville village	- 299,307
Fayetteville village	- 356,082
Manlius village	- 313,809
Marcellus village	- 65,110
Liverpool village	- 210,000
Skaneateles village	- 163,500
Minoa village	- 260,179
North Syracuse village	- 350,600
Camillus Town	- 332,046
Cicero Town	- 95,770
Clay Town	- 673,550
DeWitt Town	- 614,307
Geddes Town	- 307,208

SOURCE: Tom Dydyk, legislative analyst, Onondaga County Legislature

NOTE: These figures are for operating budgets only and do not include fringe benefits and retirement.

APPENDIX II.

Figure 7

MAJOR CRIMES REPORTED BY POLICE AGENCIES

(Murder; Negligent Manslaughter; Rape; Robbery; Aggravated Assault; Burglary; Larceny; and Motor Vehicle Theft)

January 1983-December, 1983

<u>Agency</u>	<u>1983 operating budget*</u>	<u>Total Major Crimes</u>	<u>Major Crimes per Fulltime Officer</u>
O.C. sheriff's department	\$10,025,127	2893	9.1
(excluding jail division) Syracuse police	\$14,054,000	11669	27
v/East Syracuse	250,962	190	27
v/ Jordan	12,643	0	0
v/ Solvay	373,270	218	19.8
v/ Baldwinsville	299,307	304	28
v/ Fayetteville	356,082	238	19.8
v/ Manlius	313,809	212	28
v/ Marcellus	65,110	28	28
v/ Liverpool	210,000	58	8.3
v/ Skaneateles	163,500	32	8
v/ Minoa	260,179	159	22.7
v/ N. Syracuse	350,600	280	25.5
T/ Camillus (also covers village)	332,046	428	32.9
T/Cicero*	95,770	286	-
T/Clay	673,550	699	37.8
T/DeWitt	614,307	989	43
T/Geddes	307,208	324	27.8

* Budget figures are for operating budgets only; fringes not included
*Nothing is computed for T/Cicero, because it does not
use fulltime officers.

Source: State of New York, Division of Criminal Justice Services,
Uniform Crime Reporting, January 1983 through December 1983,
Part I, Crime Index.

Appendix III

SURVEY OF CHIEF ELECTED OFFICIALS ON POLICE SERVICES IN ONONDAGA COUNTY

- (1) Does your community have its own police department?

12 Yes 9 No

If no, which police agency would people in your community rely upon most?

1 Village 1 Town 0 City 3 County 4 State

- (2) How well do you feel the following services are being provided by the police agency primarily responsible for serving your community:

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Police Patrol	<u>7</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>
Criminal Investigation (e.g. robbery, burglary, rape, etc.)	<u>4</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>
Traffic Enforcement	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>
Youth Services (e.g. diversion, apprehension, counseling, etc.)	<u>4</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>
Special Enforcement Problems (e.g. drugs, gambling, prostitution etc.)	<u>3</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
Community Service Programs (e.g. school programs, speaker's bureau, etc.)	<u>4</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>

- (3) Please rank the following services from 1-6 (with one being the most important) in the order of their importance to you.

	1	2	3	4	5	6
<u> </u> Police Patrol	15	1	2	1	1	0
<u> </u> Criminal Investigation	2	5	8	1	3	1
<u> </u> Traffic Enforcement	2	4	3	7	2	2
<u> </u> Youth Services	0	4	4	7	4	1
<u> </u> Special Enforcement Problems	0	4	2	3	6	5
<u> </u> Community Service Programs	1	2	1	1	4	11

- (4) Which agency(ies) do you feel should provide the following services? Please check as many as appropriate.

	Village	Town	City	County	State
Police Patrol	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>
Criminal Investigation	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>14</u>
Traffic Enforcement	<u>8</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>10</u>
Youth Services	<u>7</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>5</u>
Special Enforcement Problems	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>8</u>
Community Service Programs	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>5</u>

(Over)

- (5) Do you feel there is unnecessary duplication among police agencies?
12 Yes 9 No
- (6) If you answered yes to the previous question, what do you feel should be done to rectify this situation?
4 Better communication and coordination among police agencies while maintaining the existing structure.
1 A reassignment of specialized functions to individual agencies.
(e.g. drugs to one agency; murders to another, etc.)
Mergers of the following agencies:
3 Town and village: please specify communities _____
4 Town, village, county
0 Town, village, county, and city
Other _____
- (7) Do you feel more, less, or the same amount of public funds should be spent on police services?
5 More 0 Less 15 The same
- (8) Do you feel taxes should be increased in order to increase police services/protection?
8 Yes 13 No
- (9) Concerning the involvement of citizens in providing police services (e.g. neighborhood watch programs, etc.) would you like to see
16 More 0 Less 5 The same
- (10) Do you currently encourage citizen involvement in such things as a neighborhood watch program?
15 Yes 6 No
- (11) Other Comments: _____

SURVEY OF POLICE CHIEFS ON POLICE SERVICES IN ONONDAGA COUNTY

- (1) Concerning your agency, how well do you feel they are performing the following services:

	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>
Police Patrol	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Criminal Investigation (e.g. robbery, burglary, rape, etc.)	<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>
Traffic Envorcement	<u>7</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Youth Services (e.g. diversion, apprehension, counseling)	<u>7</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>
Special Enforcement Problems (e.g. gambling, drugs, prostitution, etc.)	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>
Community Service Programs (e.g. school programs, speaker's bureau, etc.)	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>

- (2) Please rank the following services from 1-6 (with one being the most important) in the order of their importance to you.

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
<u> </u> Police Patrol	8	1	1	1	0	0
<u> </u> Criminal Investigation	1	6	1	2	0	1
<u> </u> Traffic Enforcement	0	2	3	1	4	1
<u> </u> Youth Services	0	2	5	2	2	0
<u> </u> Special Enforcement Problems	0	1	0	3	0	7
<u> </u> Community Service Programs	2	1	1	1	4	2

- (3) Which agency(ies) do you feel should provide the following services?
Please check as many as appropriate.

	<u>Village</u>	<u>Town</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>State</u>
Police Patrol	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>
Criminal Investigation	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>
Traffic Enforcement	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Youth Services	<u>7</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>
Special Enforcement Problems	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>9</u>
Community Service Programs	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>

- (4) Do you feel there is unnecessary duplication among police agencies?

7 Yes 5 No

- (5) If you answered yes to the previous question, what do you feel should be done to rectify this situation?
- 2 Better communication and coordination among police agencies while maintaining the existing structure.
- 0 A reassignment of specialized functions to individual agencies.
(e.g. drugs to one agency; murders to another, etc.)
- Mergers of the following agencies:
- 5 Town and village; please specify communities _____
- 0 Town, village, county
- 0 Town, village, county, and city
- Other _____
- (6) Do you feel more, less, or the same amount of your community's operating budget should be spent on police services:
- 4 More 0 Less 7 The same
- (7) If your level of funding were increased, which service would receive the greatest increase in emphasis?
- | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u>4</u> Police Patrol | <u>3</u> Youth Services |
| <u>2</u> Criminal Investigation | <u>0</u> Special Enforcement Problems |
| <u>1</u> Traffic Enforcement | <u>3</u> Community Service Programs |
- (8) If your level of funding were decreased, which service would receive the largest reduction?
- | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <u>4</u> Police Patrol | <u>1</u> Youth Services |
| <u>0</u> Criminal Investigation | <u>3</u> Special Enforcement Problems |
| <u>0</u> Traffic Enforcement | <u>3</u> Community Service Programs |
- (9) Concerning the involvement of citizens, in providing police services (e.g. neighborhood watch programs, etc.) would you like to see
- 9 More 0 Less 3 The same
- (10) Do you currently encourage citizen involvement in such things as a neighborhood watch program?
- 11 Yes 1 No
- (11) Other Comments: _____
- _____
- _____

SURVEY OF RESIDENTS ON POLICE SERVICES IN ONONDAGA COUNTY

FINAL TOTAL PERCENTAGE

- (1) Which police agency would you most often notify for assistance:

16.3 Village 17.4 Town 13.1 City 20 County 33.2 State

- (2) Concerning the agency you checked in question number one, how well do you feel they are performing the following services:

	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>
Police Patrol	<u>19.7</u>	<u>48.4</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>6.9</u>
Criminal Investigation (e.g. robbery, burglary, rape, etc.)	<u>20.4</u>	<u>52.7</u>	<u>21.5</u>	<u>5.4</u>
Traffic Enforcement	<u>23.7</u>	<u>51.6</u>	<u>19.9</u>	<u>4.8</u>
Youth Services (e.g. diversion, apprehension, counseling, etc.)	<u>10.5</u>	<u>44.4</u>	<u>34.6</u>	<u>10.5</u>
Special Enforcement Problems (e.g. drugs, gambling, prostitution etc.)	<u>17.5</u>	<u>46.4</u>	<u>29.5</u>	<u>6.6</u>
Community Service Programs (e.g. school programs, speaker's bureau, etc.)	<u>18.9</u>	<u>47.4</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>7.7</u>

- (3) Please rank the following services from 1-6 (with one being the most important) in the order of their importance to you

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Police Patrol	<u>64.5</u>	<u>20.3</u>	<u>6.8</u>	<u>4.5</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>1.1</u>
Criminal Investigation	<u>31.1</u>	<u>36.1</u>	<u>23.2</u>	<u>5.7</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>1.1</u>
Traffic Enforcement	<u>.6</u>	<u>22.7</u>	<u>28.4</u>	<u>17.0</u>	<u>16.5</u>	<u>14.8</u>
Youth Services	<u>3.4</u>	<u>7.9</u>	<u>13.5</u>	<u>33.7</u>	<u>32.6</u>	<u>8.9</u>
Special Enforcement Problems	<u>.6</u>	<u>11.2</u>	<u>22.9</u>	<u>29.6</u>	<u>21.2</u>	<u>14.5</u>
Community Service Programs	<u>0</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>5.9</u>	<u>10.8</u>	<u>24.6</u>	<u>56.9</u>

- (4) Which agency(ies) do you feel should provide the following services?
Please check as many as appropriate.

	<u>Village</u>	<u>Town</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>State</u>
Police Patrol	<u>22.0</u>	<u>18.6</u>	<u>17.5</u>	<u>23.1</u>	<u>18.8</u>
Criminal Investigation	<u>11.7</u>	<u>12.4</u>	<u>18.9</u>	<u>26.9</u>	<u>30.1</u>
Traffic Enforcement	<u>20.4</u>	<u>18.6</u>	<u>18.4</u>	<u>22.2</u>	<u>20.4</u>
Youth Services	<u>22.2</u>	<u>19.6</u>	<u>18.1</u>	<u>23.9</u>	<u>16.2</u>
Special Enforcement Problems	<u>13.1</u>	<u>11.8</u>	<u>15.5</u>	<u>27.3</u>	<u>32.3</u>
Community Service Programs	<u>23.2</u>	<u>20.8</u>	<u>18.9</u>	<u>21.7</u>	<u>15.4</u>

Total Mailed	-	964
Total Return	-	191
% Return	-	20%

(Over)

- (5) Do you feel there is unnecessary duplication among police agencies?

49.7 Yes. 50.3 No

- (6) If you answered yes to the previous question, what do you feel should be done to rectify this situation?

28.7 Better communication and coordination among police agencies while maintaining the existing structure.

12.8 A reassignment of specialized functions to individual agencies.
(e.g., drugs to one agency; murders to another, etc.)

• Mergers of the following agencies:

6.4 Town and village: please specify communities _____

27.7 Town, village, county

24.4 Town, village, county, and city

Other _____

- (7) Would you like to see more, less or the same amount of money spent on police services in your community:

44.1 More 1.6 Less 54.3 The same

- (8) Would you be willing to pay higher taxes for more police services/ protection?

48.1 Yes 51.9 No

- (9) Concerning the involvement of citizens in providing police services (e.g. neighborhood watch programs, etc.), would you like to see

81.0 More 1.6 Less 17.4 The same

- (10) Would you personally be willing to get more involved in such things as a neighborhood watch program?

79.6 Yes 20.4 No

- (11) Other Comments: _____

Appendix IV.

OCL STUDY COMMITTEE ON POLICE
SERVICES

Helen Anderson	Charles Paul
Joseph Ash	Tim Paul
David Bench	William J. Peverly
Janet Besse	Jean Reeve
Fred Bobenhausen	Frederick Scharoun
Elma Boyko	Roger Scott
Vern Brand	David Seib
Harold Brown	Eleanor Shopiro
Leo Capria, Jr.	Lee Smith
Richard Carbery	Jean Stinchcombe
Daniel Casey	Sidney Tuthill, Jr.
Robert Collins	Ed Van der Water
J.E. Cominolli	Deborah Williams
Donald Crossett	Helen Zych
E. Robert Czaplicki	
John Dillon	
Charles Gabriel	
E.J. Gendzielewski	
John Hayes	
Michael Haven	
Robert Hennigan	
John Kramer	
John LaVine	
Larry Lynch	
Thomas Maroney	
Sarah Stuart McIlvain	
Tore Mita	
Peter Moffa	

Appendix V.

OCL Study Committee's
Subcommittee to Draft
Recommendations

Robert Collins

John Kramer

Thomas Maroney

Tim Paul

Jean Reeve

Frederick Scharoun

David Seib

Lee Smith

Jean Stinchcombe

Deborah Williams

Appendix VI.

LIST OF SPEAKERS

Harlan McEwen, President of New York State Police Chiefs' Association
and chief of police, village of Cayuga Heights

John Mulroy, county executive, Onondaga County

Nick Pirro, chairman, Onondaga County Legislature

Chester Sim, president, American Society of Industrial Security,
Onondaga County chapter, and director of security, Agway

John Donovan, director of security, General Electric

William J. Peverly, chief of police, Village of East Syracuse

Larry Fleming, chief of police, Town of Camillus

Timothy Paul, police administrator, Village of Baldwinsville

Rocco Femano, chief of police, Village of Solvay

G.C. Dunne, Major, New York State Police, Troop D

Fred Scullin, U.S. attorney, U.S. attorney's office, Syracuse

Richard Lowenberg, supervisor, Town of Manlius

James Moore, mayor, Village of Liverpool

Kenneth Mokrzycki, deputy mayor, City of Syracuse

Suzanne D. LaLonde, League of Women Voters

John Dillon, sheriff, Onondaga County

Larry Lynch, director of police, Town of DeWitt, and professor of
criminal justice, Onondaga Community College

Thomas J. Sardino, chief of police, City of Syracuse

Jeffrey D. Straussman, professor of public administration,
Syracuse University

Richard Carbery, commissioner of public safety, Chittenango, and
director of the Criminal Justice Forum,
University College

Frederick Scharoun, first deputy chief of police, City of Syracuse

John McClellan, chief of police, City of Oneida

Appendix VII.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CHAIRS	-	Complaint History Arrest Incident Reporting System
MRD	-	abbreviated version: Mobile Radio District
NLETS	-	New York Law Enforcement Teletype System
NYSPIN	-	New York State Police Information Network
OCL	-	Onondaga Citizens League
OLEIS	-	Onondaga Law Enforcement Information System
OLEMRD	-	Onondaga Law Enforcement Mobile Radio District
PROMIS	-	Prosecutor's Management Information System
Western MRD-		Western Mobile Radio District

