

LAW ENFORCEMENT MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE

WILL CONSOLIDATION OF POLICE AGENCIES AND FUNCTIONS
INCREASE OPERATIONS EFFICIENCY ?

A RESEARCH PAPER
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
MODULE III

BY

MICHAEL ESPINOZA

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEXAS

April 23, 1993

#62



TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Introduction.
 - A. Need for consolidation.
 - B. Issues affecting consolidation.
- II. Police Organizations and their Functions.
 - A. Federal law enforcement agencies.
 - B. State law enforcement agencies.
 - C. Local law enforcement agencies.
 - 1. City police departments.
 - 2. County sheriff's offices.
- III. Texas Department of Public Safety
 - A. Original organization.
 - B. Evolving structure and consolidation.
- IV. Legal Basis for Police Organizations.
 - A. Municipal Law and City Charters.
 - B. State Constitutions.
 - C. Texas State Laws.
- V. Department Size and Efficiency.
 - A. Large vs. Small
 - B. Highly Structured vs. Loosely Structured.
- VI. Obstacles to Consolidation.
 - A. Political Situations.
 - B. Employee issues.

VII. Forms of Consolidation.

A. Total Agency Consolidation.

B. Partial Consolidation by Function.

VIII. Conclusions and Summary

WILL CONSOLIDATION OF POLICE AGENCIES AND FUNCTIONS
INCREASE OPERATIONS EFFICIENCY?

INTRODUCTION

In today's world, with our economy in recession, everyone is cutting their budget, attempting to do more with less and trying to do it better. This may be affecting the government agencies of the various political subdivisions much more adversely than it is the private sector of the business world. Private businesses generally offer a product which is tangible or a service which is in high demand to the general public, with this product or service being sold for a profit. Governmental agencies do not produce revenue, and are funded by public taxes. Although it is true that taxes are being constantly increased at all governmental levels, if unchecked, governmental spending also increases. The purpose of this paper is to explore the various forms of consolidation available to police agencies, and to study some of the past attempts.

Generally, law enforcement and police agencies have not been spared from budgetary restrictions and streamlining. Many times the function of law enforcement within its governmental body is viewed as a necessary evil. The necessity of police service is not disputed, but fair and impartial enforcement of laws may sometimes make citizens who feel they are above certain laws, prefer only the most basic and indispensable police services. These budget constraints and attitudes have in some cases led to situations that some believe will affect police services to the public.

ISSUES AFFECTING CONSOLIDATION

It is only logical to believe that multiple agencies that perform similar or identical functions could operate more efficiently and economically if they consolidated their agencies and functions. Actually, it may seem to be a great waste of funds, equipment and manpower, in many cases, to have a city and county both operate a police function with similar

duties for their officers. The idea of consolidating these operations, or a merger as it might be called in the private business sector, appears to have much merit and feasibility. It seems easy and simple in concept, but thorough exploration the subject reveals that consolidation is far more complex than might be imagined. Exploring the possibility draws attention to distinct differences between public and private sector agencies.

POLICE ORGANIZATIONS AND THEIR FUNCTIONS

The three major levels of law enforcement agencies in this country are the federal, state, and local agencies. Although each have distinct functions, some form of consolidation can be designed for each level. This paper will focus mainly on the state and local level of law enforcement. Each agency could be divided into many specific and detailed functions, but only those functions which have been consolidated or considered for consolidation will be discussed with any detail.

Although police agency functions are generally lumped together by the public, there are distinct differences. A primary difference is the jurisdiction of each agency. The largest of these jurisdictions is national and encompasses the many law enforcement agencies of the federal government such as the Drug Enforcement Administration, Federal Bureau of Investigation and the United States Marshal Service, some of the most recognizable. Secondly would be jurisdictional differences at the state level. Here are many different types of enforcement components such as the state highway patrol and state criminal investigative units. Next in governmental jurisdiction are the counties or parishes of the various states. Incorporated cities with a chief of police, and then towns with marshals or constables.

JURISDICTION AND CONSOLIDATION

When a citizen needs a law enforcement officer, he usually is not concerned whether it is a constable, sheriffs' deputy, state trooper, or city policeman.

His main concern is that someone competent show up to handle a complaint or situation. The more critical the situation, the less the individual is concerned with jurisdictional issues or departmental functions.

The many differing federal agencies in our government still share federal jurisdiction so that they can legally operate anywhere within the boundaries of the United States. The functions of each of these agencies differ so much that, in some cases, the officers of one federal agency may have no idea that officers from another federal agency are performing a particular function. Frequently, the functions of these federal agencies bear little resemblance to the duties of local police, duties that are usually closer to citizens' law enforcement needs.

Each state has at least one form of police agency. They each vary in the actual size of the departments and what each department is assigned to do. However, each state does have a highway patrol department, whether it is an entity in itself, or a part of a

larger organization, as in Texas. As outlined in the Texas Department of Public Safety General Manual:

The State Highway Motor Patrol of Texas and its personnel, property, equipment and records, now a part of the Highway Department of the State of Texas are hereby transferred to and placed under the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Safety, and are hereby designated as the Texas Highway Patrol, and as such constitute the above mentioned division of the Department. ¹

The majority of the states also have a criminal investigative unit which can be a part of the highway patrol, or a separate state agency itself. The duties and responsibilities of these units vary widely from state to state. Some are superior to and override local governments, and others do not.

Local governmental agencies under state jurisdiction include county governments, incorporated cities and towns and villages. Although most counties usually include more than one city, each of these cities has a unique law enforcement department. The county law enforcement function is usually limited to taking care of unincorporated areas and certain specific responsibilities that may be assigned to the county government by law.

SCOPE OF DUTIES AND CONSOLIDATION

A police department is charged with such duties as maintaining peace and order, protection of the public, detection and prevention of crimes and traffic enforcement responsibilities. The task of maintaining peace and order could easily consist of three or four specialized divisions such as a special weapons attack team or crisis intervention group.

At the local level detection and prevention of crime produces its own specialization with such teams as crime stoppers, neighborhood watch, or a community services section. The traffic control responsibilities of a large city are immense. This function alone produces such specialization as a patrol division, an accident investigation division, a radar patrol division and school zone patrol division.

These listed are general and include only a fraction of the duties required. There are, however, more specific duties preformed by city police departments which could be defined under the following general statement: "A municipal police department

enforces city ordinances that pertain to their jurisdiction after being adopted by the council . . . and provides the security in municipal court." ²

The functions and duties of a sheriff's officer can be generally defined very similarly to those of a city police officer. Many of his/her duties are specified by the type of environment being served. If the officer is in a county or parish which has large populations outside incorporated cities, or has several medium sized cities which are not large enough to have specialized units, then the duties may very well be the same as in a large metropolitan city. Less population, or large cities in the county, can make the sheriff's duties more specific.

Some operational exceptions exist, as in Virginia:

The county performs no functions within the corporate limits of the city and exercises no jurisdiction over city residents. City residents pay no taxes to and generally receive no services from the county government." ... "Cities and counties in Virginia are independent of each other in the same manner as two counties else where are independent and coequal units." ³

The system used in Virginia is rather unique, and in a way creates a vehicle for the use of consolidation to streamline operations.

In addition to responsibilities similar to those of city police officers, sheriff officer's duties are somewhat greater in that they are not only responsible for county court's security, but in most cases state courts as well. They serve civil process from these courts, and are ". . . responsible for transporting prisoners to and from the State Correctional Facilities for reasons of imprisonment, bench warrants, etc." ⁴

The largest functional difference between a city police department and a sheriff's office is the maintaining of jail facilities. Some city governments do maintain a jail, but as a rule, it is small and designed as a temporary holding place. Some of the larger cities do manage a jail which is a very large operation, much larger than many medium county jail facilities, but again, this is more an exception than a rule. A sheriff is responsible for maintaining a jail which is designed to hold prisoners for up to two

years in some cases. These are not all the differences in duties and responsibilities of these types of agencies, but they do demonstrate that major differences exist, and must be taken into account.

The above described functions including scopes of responsibility, and jurisdiction are important to consolidation if it is to be efficient and effective. Like functions must be grouped together, the categories of responsibilities need to be defined, and each agency needs to be confident that it has the legal jurisdiction to enforce laws in the area affected by the consolidation.

THE TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY

One of the largest examples on consolidation in Texas is very often not recognized as such. Beginning with its creation, the Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS) was a consolidation of several state agencies, and periodically, internal consolidation occurs to make operations more effective.

The DPS was originally created by the forty-fourth legislature in 1935. In an attempt to consolidate and more efficiently run the state government, Governor Alred created this Department with the intent of placing all state law enforcement functions within its jurisdiction. As its anchors in law enforcement, Governor Alred included the Texas Rangers and the State Highway Motor Patrol. As stated in the DPS General Manual:

The Texas Ranger Force and its personnel, property, equipment and records, now a part of the Adjutant General's Department of the State of Texas, are hereby transferred to and placed under the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Safety, and are hereby designated as the Texas Rangers, and as such, constitute the above mentioned division of the Department. ⁵

A similar section was inserted at the same time to include the State Highway Motor Patrol and changed its name to the Texas Highway Patrol.

The laws creating the Texas Department of Public Safety were written with the future in mind and allowed for much expansion within the Department. They prescribed the Public Safety Commission's creation and responsibilities as well as their duties and powers.

The Commission shall formulate plans and policies for the enforcement of the criminal laws and of the traffic and safety laws of the State, the prevention of crime, the detection and apprehension of violators of the laws, and for the education of the citizens of the State in the promotion of Public Safety and law observance. ⁶

The act also included and detailed the duties and powers of the Director and Assistant Director. It allowed for the creation of several bureaus including the Texas Ranger division and the Texas Highway Patrol division. It included the power to appoint the heads of these divisions and bureaus. As the 1935 legislation stated, "It shall be the duty of the Director with the advice and consent of the Commission

to appoint the Chiefs of the several bureaus . . . " 7

In total, provision was made for a well planned, smoothly operating agency.

CHANGING TRENDS AND EVOLVING STRUCTURE OF THE TEXAS DPS

Certainly, the individuals who actually wrote the document which created the Texas Department of Public Safety did not know what the future held for the State of Texas, but attempted to plan for future changes. In the years from its creation in 1935, the Texas DPS underwent several minor changes mostly dealing with district boundaries and increase in personnel. As a new function was added, it was preformed by an existing bureau, or division, until a specialized unit could be created to administer it.

In this evolving structure, the Texas Department of Public Safety expanded to three major divisions including a Traffic Law Enforcement Division, a Criminal Law Enforcement Division, and an Administrative Division. These three major divisions

are further partitioned into smaller more specialized services.

The Traffic Law Enforcement Division developed from the original Texas Highway Patrol into a multifaceted division which included a Highway Patrol Service, License and Weight Service, Drivers License Service, Motor Vehicle Inspection Service, Safety Education Service, and a Communication Service with their supporting staffs.

The Criminal Law Enforcement Division expanded from the original Texas Rangers to a division consisting of the Texas Rangers, the Narcotics Service, Criminal Intelligence Service, Motor Vehicle Theft Service, and a Polygraph Service. (The last session of the legislature moved the Texas Rangers from the Criminal Law Enforcement Division to a separate and independent division directly under the Director's Office.)

The Administrative Division is the third and by far the most diverse of the three divisions. It consists of "Staff Services, Inspection and Planning, Driver and Vehicle Records, Crime Laboratory, Crime

Records, Data Processing, and the Division of Emergency Management." ⁸

Intense specialization of this kind tends to create a pool of knowledge in the respective fields that is generally not possible by other departments. The professional reputation of officers of the Texas Department of Public Safety in specific disciplines is widely recognized and anticipated by smaller departments that depend upon larger entities for specialization.

Potential Consolidation Opportunities in the Texas DPS

Under the current organizational structure, all ranks (trooper, corporal, sergeant, lieutenant, and captain) in the different Traffic Law Enforcement (TLE) Division services which include highway patrol, drivers license, license and weight, and safety education are equal in pay and status. The difference is in assigned duties and the chain of command. The same is true for the ranks of sergeant investigator, lieutenant, captain, and commander in the Criminal Law

Enforcement (CLE) Division services of narcotics, intelligence, motor vehicle theft and polygraph.

The specialization has created small units, some as small as ten employees, which have a great disparity in the span of control of the supervisors. Consolidation of these varied services into their parent division and removing the designation of highway patrol trooper, or drivers license sergeant and replacing it with simply TLE trooper and TLE sergeant would not necessarily affect the specialization expertise which develops. This form of consolidation of the Texas DPS services would better utilize the supervisory ranks in the department where currently, a typical highway patrol captain may have upwards from 72 subordinates while his counterpart in license and weight may only have 30 subordinates.

The same could be done in the CLE division where it would relieve the situation in which a Sergeant Investigator in a DPS office which has a Lieutenant and Captain there, but in another service is responsible to a supervisor a hundred miles away. The Texas DPS legislative appropriations are not divided

less than major division levels, and this type of consolidation would not require legislative action to implement. Stronger working relations among the specialized trooper and investigator functions would evolve, creating a more effective and efficient operation.

LEGAL ISSUES AND POLICE ORGANIZATIONS CONSOLIDATIONS

There is nothing which involves a change in structure that is not affected by legal concerns. Even a minor agreement between two agencies to handle an insignificant duty, which can be handled by one for both, could lead to a long bureaucratic controversy with a mass of red tape. This is a necessary process, since two or more governmental entities are involved, and each has their own charter or constitution that is affected. City charters are established by incorporation, and specific and definite boundaries are defined. City governments cannot pass ordinances or laws that affect people or territory outside their area.

Major change can only be effected by the passage of some sort of legal document by the governing body, and this applies to consolidation as with any issue. In some cases, it becomes necessary for the question to be put before the general population, especially when it involves more than one government entity. In the attempt at city and county consolidation in Sacramento, California, Glen Sparrow of the University of California who researched the effort relates,

The issue of the election or appointment of the chief law enforcement officer was argued repeatedly . . . For the November 1976 general election, the board of supervisors was required by the charter to place on the ballot the question of whether there should be an elected or an appointed chief law enforcement officer, which would combine both offices. ⁹

This particular issue was placed before the public because it could not be decided by either governmental body without claims of abuse.

Cities are chartered by the authority of the state constitutions, and the constitutions can be altered.

The Texas State Constitution contains the following provision,

All political power is inherent in the people, and all free governments are founded on their authority, and instituted for their benefit. The faith of the people of Texas stands pledged to the preservation of a republican form of government, and, subject to this limitation only, they have at all times the inalienable right to alter, reform or abolish their government in such manner as they may think expedient' (Emphasis added.)¹⁰

This seems to provide relief for the issue, however ". . . in 1934, the Texas Attorney General ruled that any office established by the state constitution could not be abolished."¹¹ The office of sheriff is established by the Texas Constitution (which can be and has been amended), and also by many other state constitutions. "The office of sheriff dates back to ninth-century England and is the one office which is universally found in all forms of county government."

¹²

Although the Texas Constitution included the process for change at its inception, in California it was in 1970 that the constitution was changed to allow this type of consolidation. "The replacement section

consisted of two sentences: Section 6, (a) A county and all cities within it may consolidate as a charter city and county as provided by statute. (b) A charter city and county is a Charter City and a Charter County. Its Charter City powers supersede conflicting Charter County powers."¹³

The county governments of Texas are governed by a County Judge and a Commissioners Court. Their jurisdiction encompasses the entire county, including any cities in that county. Traditionally, the city police enforce laws within city limits, and the sheriffs' office handles law enforcement outside city limits. There has been concern, due to this jurisdictional issue, about whether in the event a consolidation between city and county law enforcement agencies, the city law enforcement agency must yield to the county. It appears that the city would be restricted in its jurisdiction to the city limits.

Actually, it should create a new entity that services the entire area. This issue was addressed by the Texas courts in 1987. The Texas Court of Criminal Appeals reviewed a theft case in which the suspect was

arrested by a municipal officer outside his city, but still in the county in which the city was located. Judge Campbell delivered the opinion of the court which stated in part: "Therefore, we hold that jurisdiction, in the context of Articles 998 and 999, supra, refers to the geographic scope of a peace officer's power, rights and authority."¹⁴ The opinion went on to answer the question more directly. "Therefore, we hold that Articles 998 and 999 grant city marshals and city police officers county-wide jurisdiction to arrest offenders."¹⁵

Reviewing the Texas Department of Public Safety's consolidation and evolving structure has given us some insight to how consolidation can be a continuing issue. The legal issues affecting consolidation are complex, but as in the examples given, they can be overcome and unfolded.

ADDITIONAL CONSOLIDATION ISSUES: Department Size and Efficiency

Consolidation at any agency, including the Texas DPS is affected by still other issues. One crucial factor concerns the relationships between size,

efficiency and consolidation. In this section, we will probe examples of how these issues effect consolidation.

The size of the taxing jurisdiction providing resources obviously determines the extent of the resources (equipment, training, pay) available to its police services. The issue of large and small seem simple, but is really complex. Gary Cordner, who explored the size of police agencies as it relates to investigative effectiveness concluded that: "The relationship between police agency size and investigative effectiveness appears to be less simple and straightforward than might have been anticipated."¹⁶

In his article in the Journal of Criminal Justice, Cordner also reported that:

During the 1960's and 1970's the proliferation of small police departments was regarded by some observers as an impediment to efficiency and effectiveness. The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (1973) expressed this viewpoint in its recommendation that departments with ten or fewer officers be eliminated . . . among the presumed drawbacks of small agencies were lack of

expertise in special aspects of policing, inadequate equipment, low quality personnel, wasteful administrative duplication and general ineffectiveness. ¹⁷

The issues Cordner raised were regarded by some to be justification for consolidation, however, many of these problems or issues can in some cases be attributed to poor management of the inefficient agencies. The diversity of each small agency makes it difficult to make general judgments which would affect them all.

It is undisputed that independent agencies must have some form of organization and administrative personnel. This creates the duplication which can lead to ineffectiveness and inefficiency. For example,

" . . . in Los Angeles County there are 43 separate law enforcement agencies. Five municipal departments police 85 percent of the population, . . . leaving 15 percent of the residents to pay for 38 separate agencies." ¹⁸

Horgan brings proportion to the issue when he states, "Since most departments are small (80% have less than 10 men), they operate, to a great extent, independently of each other." ¹⁹ Usually, smaller agencies exist because they are responsible for a

small city. In Texas, or other states where population is sparsely located in areas, this may be the only city in a county, and there is no one to consolidate with other than the county law enforcement which is sometimes unwilling to assume the responsibility. The size of the agency usually reflects the size of the population. Large and small agencies each have peculiarities. For example,

In rural areas, people are more apt to recognize suspicious behavior for what it is. They are familiar with intended victims and may even recognize the suspects. There is generally a small number of suspects, investigators are familiar with all the crimes in the area, and investigators can recognize a small piece of information and are more able to use it to its capabilities.²⁰

The larger agencies also have their unique problems. Robert Langsworthy, who explored the size and structures of police departments reported that: "The larger agencies had to assign more personnel to administrative functions and as they did so, the proportion of supervisory personnel went down."²¹

In a study conducted by John Crank on patterns of

consolidation, he mentions two observations concerning size.

Finally, nine communities abandoned the public safety concept over the decade encompassed in this research. Though the small size of this group prevents firm conclusions, two trends were noted. Generally, these organizations were larger than surviving consolidated agencies . . . Also, with two exceptions, these organizations were not fully consolidated.²²

OBSTACLES TO CONSOLIDATION

In the forgoing sections, major arguments for consolidation have been set forth. Prominent among these were efficiency and effectiveness. In this section, the major obstacles to consolidation of police agencies are identified and their significance is analyzed.

No decision has ever been made which was free from opposition. This begins in the home with children, and extends to the highest forms of government. Consolidation also faces obstacles which in some cases are not in the best interest of the community.

Local Politics

The politics of government can be powerful, and in most cases, this is the largest barrier to the consolidation of two agencies from different governmental entities. Some attempts at consolidation endeavored to leave intact both of the governmental structures and only consolidated the service. One governmental entity was assigned responsibility for

the service. Disproportionate service could result, depending on who the chief law enforcement officer of the new agency was. Especially if it was a city official who was more concerned with residents inside the city.

In his research on the Chesapeake and Virginia Beach merger, Temple noted that in order to avoid the issue of no representation, it was necessary to find a chief enforcement officer position which could run on a county wide election. The attempt in the Chesapeake and Virginia Beach case was to find or create an elective office that could be used to replace the office of sheriff. This office had to be included in the city charter to avoid changing current structure. The county government also attempted to find a similar elective office. Temple described how the issue was resolved:

Usually, the principal - deputy trade off provided an equitable, if not especially democratic solution regarding jobs. One exception was the office of county sheriff which because of the requirements of the state constitution, could not be duplicated in a city framework. This difficulty was overcome . . . by resurrecting an office that had almost disappeared in Virginia, the position of high constable. . . . A third

elective office, that of City Sergeant, tied in with the sheriff-high constable arrangement. As specified in the consolidation agreement of both Chesapeake and Virginia Beach, the County Sheriff was to complete his unexpired term of office; then there would be an election for the post of High Constable/City Sergeant.²³

Ineffective Structure

An example of ineffective consolidation is reported by Brett Hawkins in his book detailing the city and county consolidation in Nashville. Adverse situations arose where residents were receiving poor and inadequate service from the new entity and turned to private services. Hawkins reports:

Finally, the area's suburbs, like other suburbs in the early stages of metropolitan growth, were and largely remain without the usual municipal services such as fire and police protection, garbage collection, and in some cases, water supply. In most Nashville suburbs, fire and police protection, and garbage collection were provided and still are, on a private subscription basis.²⁴

Other than private subscription services, the city government would have little recourse other than to plead with the county to provide the needed service.

"In this Nation, the autonomy and control of police agencies by local government remain an overriding concern and are a major cause of opposition to total consolidation of law enforcement agencies."²⁵

This is an extreme which could easily be overcome with properly negotiated contracts.

Union Opposition

Police unions also provide opposition to consolidation. "Unions oppose mergers because they claim it will hurt morale, reduce operating efficiency and lead to numerous law suits over employee benefits."²⁶ An obscure concern could also be the concern for loss of jobs. In most cases, individual police officers are content with the situation as it exists, and are reluctant to change, which is a normal human reaction. For some it will result in demotions (generally this will be in the smaller departments). The absorbed department may have a feeling of being conquered, and their officers feel subordinate. The officers in the larger agency may have a tendency to

convey attitudes of superiority over the absorbed officers. In his book on management, Max Richards notes, "While only general tendencies are shown, managers ought to be aware of constrained operations that could be freed by further differentiation and, at the same time, knowledge of slack that can be consolidated."²⁷

Agency Rivalry

McAninch and Sanders conclude that "factors influencing the opposition to consolidation by either of the agencies was affected by their size and who would receive more benefits."²⁸ These concerns can be eliminated by one not absorbing the other, but by both coming together and forming a new department where all the participants have an equal standing.

FORMS OF CONSOLIDATION

Some forms of consolidation have proven to be more acceptable than others. In this section the more acceptable forms are reviewed and their relative advantages are discussed.

Complete Consolidation of Function

In his research on the merger of the Westchester County Police in New York, Desanto concluded that they had retained their local autonomy by holding an election on the referendum. Both departments had a budget of about three million dollars. The issue of the chief law enforcement officer was resolved by the sheriff becoming "Commissioner/Sheriff" and being appointed, not elected. The Westchester Police Department was mostly traffic enforcement oriented, and usually called the sheriff's office who was mostly criminal investigation oriented when an investigation was needed. Both agencies worked well together before the attempted consolidation. The chief of police

became a chief of the traffic division which was for the most part the original police department. The Westchester Police Department and the Westchester Sheriff's Office became "The Department of Public Safety of Westchester County" Desanto also noted it took about five years for the merger to be complete.²⁹

Consolidation need not be of the complete and total type attempted by some governments. Total consolidation offers the greatest challenge in that every detail must be taken into consideration and accounted for, or as stated by Glendening and White, "reorganization plans to be successful, should permit all major groups involved to gain or to think they will gain from the change."³⁰

Partial Consolidation Approaches

The more simple and less opposed type of consolidation is the partial consolidation. This method entails the consolidation of similar functions

that both or all agencies need and can profit from readily. The most common and popular form of this type of consolidation is with the communication service which includes receiving calls from the public and dispatching response units. At first glance, this seems to be the simplest and most useful form of consolidation. In his research which inquired into consolidation of police services, Robert Landon reports that: "Consolidation of communication services depends on few agencies or small area. Failure results where the opposite occurs."³¹

A familiar form of communications consolidation is the inception of the 911 emergency system. This system receives calls from the public and dispatches the appropriate agency. Other agencies maintain their communication services, but it is predominantly used for the routine functions of internal activity.

Another form of partial consolidation is in laboratory services. By consolidating this function, two or more departments can combine their funds for purchase of better and higher technologically advanced equipment. This is very attractive, but again caution

must be exercised, "Lab services work good in theory, but as responsibility goes up, then efficiency is reduced and priorities must be set."³² Another consolidation alternative for the laboratories is to create a regional or county wide basis.

Agreement by the agencies involved as to which functions will be consolidated is an additional form of consolidation and is illustrated by the following example. "In a small county, a PD with 19 officers and an SO with 3 officers created a detective bureau of 4 detectives to handle all county investigations. Both maintained patrol forces."³³ Training academies operated on a regional or county wide basis is another form of consolidation of services.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUMMARY

The benefits of consolidation could provide long lists. In some cases, however, these benefits are only theoretical, in others they are real. Practical applications have provided mixed reactions. The mixed reactions, whether good or bad, in many cases are dependant on how successful the consolidation was in the specific situation where it was applied. Another factor affecting the reactions is the type of consolidation attempted, whether total or partial. It should be noted that the areas and agencies that have achieved success have not entered into it halfheartedly or with a low level of commitment. The results have been lowered costs, better service, and new services. It has helped to develop expertise in investigation of certain crimes, and reduced the duplication of services or functions.

The results have shown that consolidation can improve police efficiency, but this statement cannot

be made without also stating that consolidation will not solve everyone's problems. It should not be chosen to solve issues which it cannot. The fact that it was not, has not, and most likely will not be implemented on a widespread basis is due in part to the desire for autonomy by government entities and the public in general. As stated by Lyons,

Citizen response to major governmental reorganization in metropolitan areas has tended to be very predictable. Most proposals have faced a public that is apathetic, ignorant of local government and what to expect from it, and generally satisfied with the level of government services being dispensed.³⁴

There is also a natural resistance to change by public officials. Some of the opposition to consolidation is superficial, and as costs of government continue to increase, public pressure to decrease costs may cause this resistance to deteriorate.

ENDNOTES

¹Texas Department of Public Safety General Manual, Established 44th Legislature, 1935, revised 1992, 2-3.

²Robert Honeycutt, Personal Interview. Major, Rockport Police Department, Rockport, Texas. 25 March 1991.

³David G. Temple, Merger Politics; Local Government Consolidation in Tidewater Virginia. (Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1972), 14, 15.

⁴Rick Mcleister, Personal Interview. Chief Deputy Aransas County Sheriff's Office, Rockport, Texas. 25 March 1991.

⁵Texas Department of Public Safety General Manual, Established 44th Legislature, 1935, revised 1992, 2-1.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., 2-2.

⁸Ibid. 2-4.

⁹Glen W. Sparrow, Sacramento's Attempt at City-County Consolidation. (Davis, California: Institute of Government Affairs, University of California, 1977) 46.

¹⁰Texas State Constitution, Article 1 Section 2

¹¹Robert E. Norwood, Texas County Government: Let the People Choose 2nd ed. (Austin: The Texas Research League. 1972), 70.

¹²Ibid., 26.

¹³Glen W. Sparrow, Sacramento's Attempt at City-County Consolidation. (Davis, California: Institute of Government Affairs, University of California, 1977) 18.

¹⁴Angel v. Texas, 740 S. W. 2d 727 (Tex.Cr.App. 1987).

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Gary W. Cordner, "Police Agency Size and Investigative Effectiveness." Journal of Criminal Justice 17:3 (1989): 152.

¹⁷Ibid., 145.

¹⁸Rob Wilson, "Proposition 13: Coping with the Taxpayers Revolt." Police Magazine 2:2 (1979): 52.

¹⁹William P. Horgan, "A Look at Local Control and Efforts Toward Consolidation of Police Services." Journal of Police Science and Administration 8:1 (1980): 1.

²⁰Cordner, 153.

²¹Robert H. Langsworthy, "Police Department Size and Agency Structure." Journal of Criminal Justice 13 (1985): 23-24.

²²John P. Crank, "Patterns of Consolidation Among Public Safety Departments." Journal of Police Science and Administration 17 (Dec 90): 287.

²³Temple, 57.

²⁴Brett W. Hawkins, Nashville Metro; The Politics of City-County Consolidation. (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1966), 23.

²⁵Walter M. Francis, "Consolidation Alternatives: Coordination, Cooperation and Sharing." FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin 50:5 (1980): 9.

²⁶Thomas McAninch and Jeff Sanders. "Police Attitudes Toward Consolidation in Bloomington / Normal, Illinois: a Case Study." Journal of Police Science and Administration 16:2 (1988): 96.

²⁷Max D. Richards and Paul S. Greenlaw. Management Decisions and Behavior. (Georgetown, Ontario: Irwin-Dorsey Limited, 1972), 308.

²⁸McAninch, 103.

²⁹Joseph A. DeSanto, William P. Stump and Thomas P. Kissane. "The Westchester County Police Merger." The Police Chief 47:10 (1980): 56.

³⁰Richard Martin, Consolidation: Jacksonville, Duval County; the Dynamics of Urban Political Reform. (Jacksonville: Crawford, 1968), 233.

³¹Robert W. Landon, "The Case for and Against Consolidation of Police Services." The Police Chief 46:7 (1979): 24.

³²Ibid., 25.

³³Francis, 11.

³⁴Schely R. Lyons, Citizen Attitudes and Metropolitan Government: City-County Consolidation in Charlotte. Charlotte: Institute of Urban Studies and Community Service, 1972.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Hawkins, Brett W. Nashville Metro; The Politics of City-County Consolidation. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1966.
- Lyons, Schely R. Citizen Attitudes and Metropolitan Government: City-County Consolidation in Charlotte. Charlotte: Institute of Urban Studies and Community Service, 1972.
- Martin, Richard. Consolidation: Jacksonville, Duval County; the Dynamics of Urban Political Reform. Jacksonville: Crawford, 1968.
- Norwood, Robert E. Texas County Government: Let the People Choose 2nd ed. Austin: The Texas Research League. 1972.
- Richards, Max D., and Paul S. Greenlaw. Management Decisions and Behavior. Georgetown, Ontario: Irwin-Dorsey Limited, 1972.
- Sparrow, Glen W. Sacramento's Attempt at City-County Consolidation. Davis, California: Institute of Government Affairs, University of California, 1977.
- Temple, David G. Merger Politics; Local Government Consolidation in Tidewater Virginia. Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1972.

PERIODICALS

- Carson, Dale. "Consolidation: The Jacksonville Experience." The Police Chief 36:4 (1969): 44-45.
- Colby, Peter W. "Intergovernmental Contracting for Police Services." Journal of Police Science and Administration 10 (1982): 35-42.
- Cordner, Gary W. "Police Agency Size and Investigative Effectiveness." Journal of Criminal Justice 17:3 (1989): 145-155.
- Crank, John P. "Patterns of Consolidation Among Public Safety Departments." Journal of Police Science and Administration 17 (Dec 90): 277-288.
- DeSanto, Joseph A., William P. Stump, and Thomas P. Kissane. "The Westchester County Police Merger." The Police Chief 47:10 (1980): 54-57.
- Francis, Walter M. "Consolidation Alternatives: Coordination, Cooperation and Sharing." FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin 50:5 (1980): 9-11.
- Horgan, William P. "A Look at Local Control and Efforts Toward Consolidation of Police Services." Journal of Police Science and Administration 8:1 (1980): 1-4.
- Langsworthy, Robert H. "Police Department Size and Agency Structure." Journal of Criminal Justice 13 (1985): 15-27.
- Landon, Robert W. "The Case for and Against Consolidation of Police Services." The Police Chief 46:7 (1979): 24-25.
- McAninch, Thomas, and Jeff Sanders. "Police Attitudes Toward Consolidation in Bloomington / Normal, Illinois: a Case Study." Journal of Police Science and Administration 16:2 (1988): 95-104.

Varney, Rodney L. "Community Organized Police Service." The Police Chief 47:4 (1980): 46-49.

Wilson, Rob. "Proposition 13: Coping with the Taxpayers Revolt." Police Magazine 2:2 (1979): 49-53.

LAWS AND COURT CASES

Angel v. Texas, 740 S. W. 2d 727 (Tex.Cr.App. 1987).

Texas State Constitution, Article 1 Section 2

OTHER

Honeycutt, Robert. Personal Interview. Major, Rockport Police Department, Rockport, Texas. 25 March 1991.

Mcleister, Rick. Personal Interview. Chief Deputy Aransas County Sheriff's Office, Rockport, Texas. 25 March 1991.

Munoz, Adan. Personal Interview. Sheriff of Kleberg County, Kingsville, Texas. 7 May 1992

Texas Department of Public Safety General Manual, Established 44th Legislature, 1935, revised 1992.