

LAW ENFORCEMENT MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE

A FEASIBILITY STUDY
FOR A K-9 DIVISION
FOR THE
VICTORIA POLICE DEPARTMENT

BY

MICHAEL TATUM

VICTORIA POLICE DEPARTMENT

VICTORIA, TEXAS

JANUARY 1990

#198

A FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR A K-9 DIVISION FOR THE
VICTORIA POLICE DEPARTMENT

The Victoria Police Department has a Patrol Division of around forty licensed police officers. The Patrol Division is divided into four platoons consisting of two supervisors, one lieutenant, one sergeant, and ten patrol officers.

On the average, during a ten and a half hour shift, there are from seven to nine officers for a city population of approximately sixty thousand people.

In an effort to better utilize the department's manpower, new programs have been implemented, including the use of specially trained officers in a Traffic Safety Division, and full time Crime Prevention Officers. The latest program was the development of a Telephone Response Unit to handle walk-in calls at the police station and also take certain types of calls over the telephone.

The implementation of these programs has allowed the actual patrol officer more time to concentrate on more serious incidents and more time for actual patrolling of the officer's zone.

The following is a feasibility study into the development of a K-9 Division for the Victoria Police Department again aimed at increasing the time officers have to devote to patrolling. Agencies now utilizing K-9 Units report a significant reduction in the time spent on building searches, apprehension of suspects, and detection of drugs and other contrabands.

The earliest known time when dogs were used for police work in the United States was in 1907 through 1911 by the South Orange Police Department in New Jersey.¹ Several other police departments were identified as having K-9 Units during that time, including New York City.²

According to Samuel Chapman's research, An Update on United States and Canadian Police Dog Programs, there have been two distinct periods ranging from 1907 to 1947 and 1954 to present, when police dogs were used.³ The reason given for the seven year period of no K-9 Units between 1947 and 1954 was cited by Samuel Chapman as a "lack of properly trained and functional dogs."⁴

Of the departments having K-9 Units in the early era, the most often cited reason for the forming of the units was the public's outcry over outbreaks of burglaries and prowlers in the cities.

In 1909, the people of New Haven, Connecticut had experienced just such an outbreak. By April 1910, two police dogs were put on night patrol and assigned to two districts having the highest incidents of these crimes.

By late 1910, New Haven, Connecticut Police Chief Henry D. Crowles reported in "The City Yearbook 1910," "no burglaries have occurred in the infested districts since the dogs were put there... The dogs have also been used in other localities for the purpose of breaking up gangs of rowdies and hoodlums who congregated in the outlying districts... The result has been that we have accomplished a great deal by the use of the dogs along these lines..."⁵

The reason given for the termination of the dog program in New Haven was the fact that the dog handlers grew tired of being

assigned to night duty. The program was then terminated for administrative reasons.

Other departments along the eastern seaboard also developed K-9 Units in the Early Era, most notably being Baltimore, Maryland. In 1914, Baltimore established a program using two Airedales from Great Britain.

The dog's handlers were assigned to two districts in plain clothes riding bicycles. These two dogs were used until 1917. Although they were not credited with a single capture, it was reported that crime in these two districts dropped off considerably during that time period.⁶

The years 1954 to 1978, which Samuel Chapman cites as The Modern Era, saw 632 programs started in over 600 different departments across the United States.

As a tribute to the effectiveness of the K-9 Units, Samuel Chapman noted that in 1961 the Johnstown Pennsylvania Police Department started a K-9 Unit, but discontinued it in 1964 at the insistence of then Mayor Kenneth O. Thompkins. Mayor Thompkins declared that the city did not need dogs to enforce the law. However, eight years later the unit was restarted in an answer to rising crime.⁷

In 1963, Modesto, California formed a four dog unit, but terminated it in 1967 because two of the handlers left the force and other officers had been complaining about dog hairs and odor in the patrol units. Here again, in 1980, Modesto, California started another unit including nine dogs and one supervisor.⁸

In 1955, the Los Angeles Police Department had decided not to form a K-9 Unit, but by 1980 they rescinded that decision. The Los Angeles K-9 Unit has since grown into one of the featured units in the United States, having multi-jurisdictional authority.⁹

Of all the departments cited by Samuel Chapman as having K-9 Units, both during The Early Era and Modern Era; they all seemed to have returned to using dogs on their forces, citing the effectiveness and cost efficiency of the dogs as the major reasons.

Other agencies at all levels of government, from small towns to large military bases, also report that they have found the use of dogs to be very cost-effective, saving many man-hours in the on-going fight against crime.¹⁰

One question asked most often is: Why the use of dogs in police work? It has been reported that some breeds of dog's sense of smell is over one million times more sensitive than a human's nose.¹¹ A dog's hearing is also reported to be from twenty to fifty times more keen than the human ear.¹²

For instance, J.L. Hickman reports that narcotic dogs have been able to detect small or large quantities of narcotics that have been covered in shaving creme, submerged in gasoline or buried under a foot of dirt with no problem. Trained dogs have even located narcotics in factory sealed tuna cans.¹³

Since 1987, the Maryland State Fire Marshal's Office have been using dogs as a proven arson investigation aid. The conditioned dogs can respond to an odor of accelerants with greater accuracy than current field accelerant detective devices and they can also differentiate between accelerants and similar chemical gases

normally found at a fire scene.¹⁴ In training the arson dog, the handler takes the dog to a fire, which has already been determined to have been caused by accident, and allowed to walk around the fire scene to become accustomed to the odor of burned items. The handler may also "set up" the area by placing one or two drops of gasoline or another type of accelerant to reinforce the dogs ability to seek and find.¹⁵

An example of the success of the Maryland Fire Marshal's program can be cited in the successful investigation of a \$5 million dollar fire of a lumber company and seven other businesses. After nearly two days of extensive work by Fire Marshals, an arson canine was called to the scene.

In less than one hour the dog "pointed" to an area previously determined to be the origin of the fire and where suspected flammable liquids had been poured. With the assistance of the dog, the fire marshals were able to conclude that the blaze was incendiary.¹⁶

Another positive factor in the use of police dogs is the obvious fact that very few humans can outrun a dog at any distance.

In establishing a K-9 Unit there are three main areas to be considered.

The first of these areas is the establishment of carefully developed policies and procedures for the unit to follow. In this day and time of civil suits being filed against police, the use of force should be of primary importance as a policy.

Police dogs should not be used in the apprehension of intoxicated subjects or in subjects suspected of having mental

problems. The main reason for this would be the inability of the suspects to understand commands or heed them. If a dog is to be used to apprehend intoxicated subjects, it should only be when another offense is involved.¹⁷

When using a dog to apprehend fleeing suspects or overcome resistance by arrestees, due consideration should be given to the nature of the offense, danger to the public should the subject escape, officer safety, and any other alternative methods of apprehension.¹⁸

Police dogs should only be used in crowd control only when necessary to prevent death or injury to innocent people, or to prevent assaults on police personnel.¹⁹

When using police dogs to search for lost children a responsible supervisor should first determine if there are extenuating circumstances such as evidence of foul play, or the reason to believe grievous harm will be suffered by the child if not located.²⁰

Other police personnel should pet the dog only in the presence of the handler and under no circumstances should personnel tease or harass the dog.

When a police dog is called to a scene, all other officers present should heed the directions of the handler.²¹ The handler should be the only person giving commands to the dog and only in emergency circumstances should any other officer give commands to the dog.²²

In establishing procedures for the use of the K-9 Unit all requests for the unit should be made through and under the review

of the unit supervisor. Examples of when the K-9 Unit would be used would be in searching of buildings for possible offenders, tracking of suspects, searching for suspects or evidence in large open areas, some crowd control (see above), and lost persons.²³

When an officer does request assistance from the K-9 Unit, any arrest effected or evidence located should be handled by the requesting officer. The dog handler should only submit a supplemental report in which he documents all action of the canine unit. If the K-9 Unit initiates some type of police action, then the handler should make out all necessary reports.²⁴

Another important factor in the development of the K-9 Unit is the selection of personnel interested in becoming handlers in the unit.

Prospective K-9 handlers should display a strong interest and commitment to the program, have a above average job performance, be committed to engage in regular and rigorous training, and finally be open to constructive criticism.²⁵ The handler should be an enthusiastic, high energy type person to better motivate the dog. In order for the dog to remain interested in the job at hand, he has to be motivated or else he will soon lose interest in the search.²⁶

Dog handlers should be in good physical condition and be able to work with a minimum of supervision. He should have the full cooperation from his family members and, with that, be willing to devote personal time to working with the dog. The dog's physical comfort and well-being should be put above the handler's own.

The handler's family must also cooperate with the maintenance and upkeep of the dog and they should be willing to allow the

handler the time to devote working with the dog. Each dog should be worked with about one to two hours each day to keep him sharp and ready to go to work at any time.

At the Nassau County, New York Police Department, Sergeant Richard Snizek says, "Our K-9 Unit officers take their dogs home with them-they're like family pets." Behind most successful dog/handler teams, there's a loving spouse-probably a couple of kids, a nice backyard, and relaxing evenings with the family in front of the television.²⁷

The dogs will be much happier when they are part of a family. They are just like regular dogs, only they know when their handler puts on that uniform it is time to go to work.

The final selection to be made is the dog itself. Only a few breeds possess the necessary qualities for police work. The main breeds being German Shepherds, Dobermans, Rottweilers, Weimaraners, Labradors, and Golden Retrievers.

The dog should be from one to three years old and should weigh at least seventy to ninety pounds. Ideally the dog should be of a dark color so it won't be easily seen at night.²⁸

The dog should also receive a thorough physical checkup by a veterinarian including X-rays of the hips and elbows and a urinalysis for any internal disorders. The X-rays are necessary to determine if the dog suffers from hip dysplasia. Hip Dysplasia is a hereditary disorder in some breeds which cause the hip joints to come out of socket, rendering the dog useless and requiring extensive veterinary care.²⁹

Once the dog has been selected for its physical attributes, his temperament should be considered. The dog must be good around children, because at some time it will surely come in contact with them on the street. It must be friendly, since it will be going out in the public and the squad room and people will want to pet it. If the dog bites someone on the street unnecessarily, the department will be liable. The days of the vicious police dog are over.³⁰

In addition, the dog should be tested in unfamiliar conditions, such as riding in a car, exposure to gun fire, walking on slippery surfaces, and working in quiet areas. His desire to fetch something should be high so that it can concentrate on locating its objective, although it may be difficult and take a long time.

When a dog has passed all the other requirements, then training should begin. The first phase of training should be basics in obedience. This would include sitting down and standing at the handler's side, heeling on and off leash, jumping, retrieving, down and stay, and finally group training.³¹

The next phase should be training in general searches, protection, apprehension, tracking, building and crime scene searches, and vehicle searches. The dog should also be trained in exiting a vehicle, both through a door or a open window. He also, should be trained in protection of the handler, and crowd or riot control.³²

Finally, the dog should be trained in the specialized areas which are needed for the department whether it be narcotics, bombs, weapons, or accelerants in arson cases. Dogs can be cross trained

in all these areas with the only drawback being the time and money spent in the training.

The most significant factor holding most departments back from the use of police dogs has been the threat of liability. In the use of police dogs for apprehension, the key factor is using only "the amount of force necessary to overcome the suspect for the crime committed."³² This is, of course, the same rule of thumb governing an officer in any apprehension he makes. Generally, most felon-type crimes will warrant the use of a dog.

A police officer using a baton or even a gun would be more force than that of a dog bite. The baton can fracture or break bones and, of course, the gun will produce serious injury or even death.

If a dog bites a suspect, all that will usually occur is some puncture wounds which might require some stitches, and usually these will heal in a short time. If more serious injuries occur, this is probably a result of the suspect fighting with the dog.

In 1984, the U.S. Court of Appeals upheld that using a properly trained police dog to apprehend a felony suspect does not constitute use of unlawful deadly force by the law enforcement agency. The ruling came in a suit filed after the death of a burglary suspect who had been bitten in the neck by a police dog. In attempting to apprehend the suspect, who was hiding in a darkened building, the K-9 handler called out two warnings before releasing his dog with the command "find him".³³

The dog found the suspect hiding under a car and seized him by the neck. He was pronounced dead on arrival at the hospital. The

administrator of the suspect's estate sued the K-9 handler and the metropolitan government, contending that the use of the dog constituted unlawful deadly force, and to use such force under the circumstances violated the suspect's Fourth Amendment right against unreasonable search and seizure.³⁴

A panel of three judges of the Cincinnati, Ohio based 6th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that the dog handler did not intend to inflict serious harm and could not have known that his dog would kill the suspect. The court did rule that if the handler's safety was not in jeopardy, then a verbal warning that the dog would be used was a must.³⁵

As in all cases of this type, the courts expect a complete and concise report regarding the incident including any injuries the dog might have inflicted. Departments using K-9 Units should develop a standard bite report form which documents any and all injuries caused by the dog to the suspect. These reports will also be helpful to the handler should he later have to go to court.

A department should keep detailed records on all their dogs/including training received, and any certification the dog or handler receives. A simple daily training evaluation should also be kept. Of course, most departments already keep training records on their officers as a guard against liability suits; so keeping records on their dogs would not be that much of a problem.

The U.S. Border Patrol requires that its handlers and dogs receive semi-annual recertification. This recertification is conducted by a team of professional instructors and done to show the courts that their dog teams are kept proficient in all their

fields.³⁶ Other agencies report similar practices ranging from semi-annual to annual certification.

Research into the liability of departments in regard to dog bites seem to indicate that agencies being sued have experienced problems with the handler's mismanagement of the dogs, instead of the dogs being too much force. In the case Kerr v City of West Palm Beach, three individuals brought suit against the city, its former police chief and two police officers alleging that they had suffered serious injuries after being apprehended by dogs of the West Palm Beach Police Department. The plaintiffs claimed that the departments K-9 Unit used excessive force in the apprehension, in violation of the fourth and fourteenth amendments of the United States Constitution, and sought compensatory and punitive damages pursuant to 42 U.S.C § 1983 on behalf of themselves and a class of similarly situated individuals. They also claimed that the departments K-9 Unit was unconstitutional per se, in violation of the principles governing the constitutional use of force.³⁷

The case involved three plaintiffs, Josh Terrell, Jimmy Jerome Arnold, and Uwayne Kerr. In the early morning July 7, 1982, Josh Terrell was drunk and fell asleep in the front yard of a residence. He was awakened by police activity and barking so he moved to some bushes beside the house, where he laid down.

The police were in the area due to a burglary and because they thought the burglar was still in the area, they called in the K-9 Unit. The dog located Terrell in the bushes and was ordered to "get'em" by the handler. The dog attacked Terrell, locking onto his arm. The handler then ordered the dog to pull back which the dog

did dragging Terrell out.³⁸

Once Terrell was in the open; the dog was ordered to release him, which the dog did. Terrell then got up and moved toward the officer, who knocked him down with a flashlight. After the officer had handcuffed Terrell, the dog bit him again, this time on the thigh. Terrell was not the suspect the police were looking for in the burglary.³⁹

On November 24, 1982, Jimmy Jerome Arnold stole some fishing rods and reels from a vehicle. After doing so, he thought he heard police cars coming and started to run. Eventually, he tried to hide by climbing a small tree in a backyard.⁴⁰

Jimmy Arnold was located in the tree about six feet off the ground by a K-9 Unit. When ordered down, he did not respond, so the officer pulled him down by pulling his leg. On the ground, Arnold was forced onto his stomach on the ground. The officer then released Arnold who remained spread eagle on the ground.⁴¹

At this point the police dog attacked, locking onto Arnold's arm. Eventually, the officer ordered the dog to release but the dog failed to obey. Only after the handler hit the dog over the head with a flashlight did the dog release.⁴²

On the night of July 14, 1984, Uwaine Kerr was walking through a park in West Palm Beach. As he passed an old boathouse, he was spotlighted by an officer. Kerr froze and then attempted to hide in some bushes. The officer, along with his dog, then got out of the car and ordered Kerr out. Kerr began running and, after leaving the park, apparently thought he had lost the officer. He stopped to urinate against a building, at which time he heard someone behind

him say, "Sic him." Kerr was attacked by the police dog and suffered wounds to the upper thighs of both legs. Eventually no charges were filed against Kerr.⁴³

In this case the court found that the West Palm Beach K-9 Unit's overall bite-ratio was fifty percent. Eighty-five percent of the bites involved individuals suspected of a non-violent felony or misdemeanor.

The ruling handed down was that the K-9 Unit was not unconstitutional. The court, however, did find the city officials and the officers liable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (1982).⁴⁴ The court also cited apparent inadequacies in both the department's training of the K-9 Unit and its policies.

In another case which occurred in Alabama, a suit was brought against an agency after the plaintiff alleged that he had been deliberately attacked by a police dog after already being handcuffed. Here again, the court found that the K-9 Unit was not unconstitutional; but, that the agency and handler were liable for using excessive force.

As for the legality of searches conducted by K-9 Units, the courts have upheld that the dog's search is an extension of the officer's senses much like binoculars and metal detectors. As long as the search does not violate the Fourth Amendment, the courts have accepted dog searches as legal. The courts recognize that a trained dog's indication or alert is probable cause, and that any contraband found is admissible evidence. Records of the dog's previous successful searches can be admitted to court to establish the dog as an expert witness.

In the case of Horton v Goose Creek Independent School District a drug sniffing dog was used to sniff students, their lockers, and vehicles parked on the school parking lot. The dog alerted on two students who were then asked to empty their pockets and belongings. No contraband was found.⁴⁵

The students then filed suit against the school district alleging the district's policy on the use of drug sniffing dogs was unconstitutional under the Fourth Amendment right to be free of unreasonable searches.

The United States Court of Appeals ruled in June of 1982 that the use of dogs in dragnet sniff-searches of the students was unconstitutional and the district was ordered to stop the policy. However, the court did rule that the use of the dogs to sniff students' lockers and vehicles on the parking lot was constitutional in that the district had a need to supervise students and maintain an educationally sound environment.⁴⁶

In Jennings v Joshua Independent School District, the school district maintained a program intended to educate students of the dangers of drugs, alcohol, and weapons. The district contracted with a private security firm for the use of a drug sniffing dog. Periodically the dog would be walked through the school parking lot. If the dog alerted on a vehicle, the student was asked to consent to a search of the car. If the student refused to do so, then the student's parents were contacted. If the parents refused consent, then the district would contact the police.⁴⁷

On March 29, 1985, a drug sniffing dog alerted on Naomi Jennings's unattended car in the school parking lot. Naomi Jennings,

as well as her father, subsequently refused to consent to a search of the vehicle.

The police were summoned and the officer was given information on the dog's reliability and training and also a demonstration of the dog working. The officer then contacted the county attorney on the possibility of obtaining a search warrant. Eventually a warrant was issued, but the search showed no object or substance prohibited by law or school policy.⁴⁸

The Jennings then filed a civil rights suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against the School District the City of Joshua, the police officer, the dog handler and the company owning the dog.

In January, 1988, the district court entered a judgement in favor of all defendants. The court recognized the school district's policy as being reasonable citing Horton v. Goose Creek Independent School District.

From other cases recently filed, it appears that the courts are recognizing the validity of a dog used in a search. The defense attorneys appear to have switched tactics from questioning the constitutionality of the dog's search, to challenging the reliability of the dog and attacking the dog's training records. Therefore, it is imperative to keep the dogs properly trained and thorough records kept.

In planning for the purchase of a dog there are two routes to follow. The department may opt to purchase a dog that has already been trained by a professional company or they may choose to obtain the dog and train it themselves.

Professionally trained dogs can run from \$2,500.00 to

\$3,800.00 for a drug sniffing dog and up to \$6,500.00 for cross-trained dogs.

For an example, the Los Angeles Police Department using a cross-trained dog located \$900,000.00 in drug money related to a raid and arrest of a drug dealer. The department put this money into a pot to purchase more dogs and equipment. At \$5,000.00 each, the department could purchase 180 more dogs.⁴⁹

Departments should also consider filing for Federal Assistance in obtaining dogs as the Garland, Texas Police Department did in 1986. A request was made for matching funds to purchase two trained dogs at \$6,500.00. The grant application also applied for related support equipment. The Garland Police Department cited their reasons for purchasing the dogs in this manner as being time, liability, and the fact that the handlers would be trained at the kennel facility.⁵⁰

The reason the Garland Police Department established a K-9 Unit was the fact they had experienced a 50% rise in burglaries in 1985 from 1984, while the calls for officer assistance had increased 22% over the last five years.⁵¹

Benefits expected by the Garland Police Department from the K-9 Unit included reducing the amount of burglaries, as well as saving man hours in building searches. Prior to the K-9 unit, an officer spent on the average of forty-five minutes to search a building. Area departments with K-9 Units reported an average time of ten minutes to search buildings with a dog.⁵²

In a memorandum to Assistant Director R. Rawlinson from Lieutenant P.M. Martinkus dated January 6, 1989, Lieutenant

Martinkus reported a reduction in building burglaries of 50% for the year 1988. This was also reported to save approximately 576.3 man hours by using the K-9 unit.⁵³

Other agencies report obtaining their dogs by setting up a special fund for donations as is the case of the Lincoln, Nebraska Police Department whose dogs were funded totally by donations.⁵⁴ For another approach, some agencies will accept donated dogs that are picked from the animal control center and then train them as needed.⁵⁵

The Austin, Texas Police Department is another department utilizing dogs donated to them for a K-9 Unit. At present, the department has five dogs, four of which were donated and the fifth which was purchased by its handler from a company overseas.

The dogs that are donated have come from private citizens or other agencies where the dog was not working out for their purpose. These donated dogs are then trained within the department by a canine training officer.

As for the kennelling of the dogs, the handlers take them home with them. At the handler's residence is a kennel constructed at the expense of the Austin Police Department. The handlers are responsible for obtaining the dogs' food, which is paid for by the department. If and when the dog needs veterinary care, the handler will arrange for this and most of the local veterinarians will bill the department.

The budget, for the Austin Police Department K-9 Unit, shows a total of \$6,633.00 for the five dogs. Of those budgeted items, medical care and food make up the largest portion.⁵⁶

One other consideration agencies should take into account is transportation for the dog team. The basic vehicle should contain a platform for the dog in place of a rear seat. This platform should be carpeted for comfort as well as to help the dog maintain his balance during any violent maneuvering the vehicle might do. The windows should have wire mesh screens over them to provide fresh air and ventilation during the warmer months.⁵⁷

Any expense incurred by maintaining a K-9 Unit seems to be gained back many times over by decreasing patrol officers' time during searches and money recovered during drug raids. In 1982 to 1983, the Santa Ann Police Department K-9 Unit records showed the following: dog teams made approximately 912 searches, 96 arrests, and were present at 115 public demonstrations which total 10,508 people. The most impressive figure was that the K-9 Unit saved the city 1,564 man-hours. Hours that would have been used by officers if they did not have dog teams. At that time, the Santa Ana Police Department, which is a small department in California, had five dogs on the street.⁵⁸

Consider a smaller city or town without a K-9 Unit. If a commercial burglary occurs, it would take at least two officers to secure the outside and two to three officers to search inside. Such an operation could tie up the whole shift and leave the rest of the city unprotected for up to an hour or possibly more. With the use of K-9 Unit the search time could be cut by at least half as the dog would not have to open every door and look under every box.⁵⁹

As for the feasibility of a K-9 Unit for the Victoria Police Department, it would appear that this would be a very viable

addition to the department. Ideally the dogs would be cross-trained for patrol work and narcotic detection to be better utilized. The dogs from other reported accounts would greatly increase the patrol officers' time on actual patrol duty, and with the department's strong background on training and reporting, it would not take much to incorporate the unit. Not to mention, the care and upkeep of the dogs could be addressed by the handler kennelling the dog at his residence, which would also be less expensive. The handler would have the dog available for daily training at any time, and the dog would have a better personality being in a family situation. A good example to follow in developing and maintaining the unit would appear to be the Austin Police Department K-9 Unit.

According to Brent Butterworth's article in "Law Enforcement Technology," all agencies contacted considered their K-9 programs a remarkable success. Sergeant John Zihlman, of the Dallas Police Department was quoted as saying, "In our first year, the dogs helped us make seizures of roughly fifteen million dollars."⁶⁰

With such glowing reports of success in existing units, one would wonder why there would be any resistance to having a K-9 Unit; but in William R. Koehler's book The Koehler Method of Guard Dog Training, he stated it as being a public relations problem. Mr. Koehler identified two groups of administrators and how they viewed public relations. The first group being administrators who think of good public relations means deference to minority groups, small in number but very vocal. When it would become apparent that a K-9 Unit would be logical, the attitude of these groups was that they

wanted a dog that merely barked, or had rubber teeth."⁶¹

In contrast to these groups is the administrators that view good public relations as giving..."The fullest possible public service to the useful citizens who form the quiet majority."⁶²

In conclusion, I will quote William R. Koehler as he refers to the latter of the two groups in his book. "There is such a chief who heads a dynamic department in a small city completely surrounded by four other cities, two of which are very large. He employs men and dogs in such a fair but positive manner that the undesirable elements respect his town's boundaries in a way that is actually amusing. Citizens proudly compare their community's low crime rate with the rates for the bordering towns. The chief compares them, too, whenever laments are raised against his policies. As he points to the record, he lets one and all know that he'll gladly resign if the community would like to replace him with a more conciliatory man. The voice of approval from the appreciative majority continues to drown out the whines. This chiefs good public relations can be explained in a single word-results!"⁶³

FOOTNOTES

1. Samuel G. Chapman, An Update on United States and Canadian Police Dog Programs, Journal of Police Science and Administration, Volume 11, No. 4 Copyright 1983 by International Association of Chief of Police, Inc., 434
2. Ibid., 434
3. Ibid., 435
4. Ibid., 435-436
5. Chief Henry D. Crowles, City Yearbook 1910, pp. 281-282. As reported by Samuel G. Chapman, An Update on United States and Canadian Police Dog Programs, Journal of Police Science and Administration, Volume 11, No. 4 Copyright 1983 by International Association of Chief of Police, Inc., 434
6. Samuel G. Chapman, An Update on United States and Canadian Police Dog Programs, Journal of Police Science and Administration, Volume 11, No. 4 Copyright 1983 by International Association of Chief of Police, Inc., 434
7. Ibid., 437
8. Ibid., 437
9. Ibid., 437
10. Robert L. Stuart, A Breed Apart, Law Enforcement Technology, Volume 16, Number 4, April 1989, 32.
11. Brent Butterworth, Police Forces Go To The Dogs, Law Enforcement Technology, Volume 15, Number 16, November/December 1989, 27.
12. Ibid., 27
13. J.L. Hickman, The Detective Dog, The Law Enforcement Times, Volume 2 Number 1, Winter 1988, 27.
14. Robert B. Thomas Jr., Deputy Chief Maryland State Fire Marshal's Office. The Use of Canines in Arson Detection, F.B.I. Law Enforcement Bulletin, April 1989, 22;23.
15. Ibid., 23
16. Ibid., 23
17. Captain Gary Barbour, Commander, Patrol Division, Lakewood Police Department, Colorado, Managing Police Canine Operations, The Police Chief, Volume LV, Number 5, May 1988, 49

18. Ibid, 49
19. Ibid, 49
20. Ibid, 49
21. Ibid, 49
22. Ibid, 49
23. Ibid, 49
24. Ibid, 49
25. Ibid, 50
26. Brent Butterworth, Police Forces Go To The Dogs, Law Enforcement Technology, Volume 15, Number 16, 27.
27. Ibid, 27
28. Ibid, 27
29. Robert L. Stuart, A Breed Apart, Law Enforcement Technology, Volume 16, Number 4, April 1989, 30.
30. Brent Butterworth, Police Forces Go To The Dogs, Law Enforcement Technology, Volume 15, Number 16, 27.
31. Robert L. Stuart, A Breed Apart, Law Enforcement Technology, Volume 16, Number 4, April 1989, 30-31.
32. Ibid, 33
33. Ibid, 36
34. Ibid, 36
35. Ibid, 36
36. Richard Moody and Doug Mosier, The Hottest Drug Dogs on the Border, Lawn and Order, Volume 37, Number 8, August, 1989, 40.
37. Kerr v City of West Palm Beach, 875 F2d 1546 (11th Cir. 1989).
38. Ibid, 1,546
39. Ibid, 1,546
40. Ibid, 1,546
41. Ibid, 1,547

42. Ibid, 1,547
43. Ibid, 1,547
44. Ibid, 1,547
45. Horton v Goose Creek Independent School District, 677 F.2d 471 (1982).
46. Ibid, 474
47. Jennings v Joshua Independent School District 869 F.2d 870 (5th Circuit 1989).
48. Ibid, 870
49. Robert L. Stuart, A Breed Apart, Law Enforcement Technology, Volume 16, Number 4, April 1989, 32.
50. Information received from Lieutenant Don Martin, Garland Police Department.
51. Ibid
52. Ibid
53. Lieutenant P.M. Martinkus, Yearly Recap of Canine Building Burglary Reduction Effort, Garland Police Department Memorandum, January 6, 1989.
54. Brent Butterworth, Police Forces Go To The Dogs, Law Enforcement Technology, Volume 15, Number 6, 28.
55. Robert L. Stuart, A Breed Apart, Law Enforcement Technology, Volume 16, Number 4, April 1989, 30.
56. City of Austin Police Department, K-9 Unit Budget, 1990.
57. Robert L. Stuart, A Breed Apart, Law Enforcement Technology, Volume 16, Number 4, April 1989, 31.
58. Ibid, 33
59. Ibid, 33
60. Brent Butterworth, Police Forces Go To The Dogs, Law Enforcement Technology, Volume 15, Number 6, 26.
61. William R. Koehler, The Koehler Method of Guard Dog Training, New York, New York, Howell Book House, Inc., Copyright 1967, 68.

62. Ibid, 68

63. Ibid, 69