

LAW ENFORCEMENT MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE

A REPORT WITH RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING
LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL STAFFING
AND PAY COMPARISONS OF SELECTED CENTRAL TEXAS CITIES
WITH POPULATIONS UNDER 20,000

A LEARNING CONTRACT
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
MODULE I

BY
RICHARD E. DEPRIEST

ROBINSON POLICE DEPARTMENT
ROBINSON, TEXAS
MARCH, 1990

#56

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
A SURVEY OF CITIES IN MCLENNAN COUNTY, TEXAS	1
TYPE AND AMOUNT OF DEMAND FOR SERVICES	3
FINANCIAL RESOURCES	5
PERSONNEL RESOURCES	6
CITY CHARACTERISTICS	8
PAY AND BENEFIT CONSIDERATIONS	9
DATA INTERPRETATION	10
CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS	11
APPENDIX 1. Summary of Raw Data from Survey Forms	14
APPENDIX 2. Summary of Comparisons Drawn from Raw Data	16
APPENDIX 3. Survey Forms	18
SOURCES CONSULTED	35

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Survey Communities	3
2. Demand for Services	5
3. Financial Resources	6
4. Total Police Officer Resources	7
5. Patrol Officer Resources	8
6. City Characteristics	9
7. Pay and Benefit Considerations	10
8. Summary of Raw Data from Survey Forms	15
9. Summary of Comparisons Drawn from Raw Data	17

INTRODUCTION

A survey was conducted in February, 1990, of Cities under 20,000 population in McLennan County to obtain information for comparison of specific areas of the Law Enforcement service provided by these cities. In particular, this study compares personnel staffing and pay issues, as well as some factors that have an effect on these issues, for selected Central Texas Cities with fewer than 20,000 residents.

The results of this survey can be beneficial to City Police Planners in two areas. First, it can offer insight into the competition for recruitment and retention of personnel. In order to compete effectively it is desirable to have an overview of pay and benefit offerings of those positions drawing from the same labor pool. Secondly, an analysis of staffing may provide insight on effectiveness, or desired response, of the police function.

This paper is not intended to provide specific recommendations. It is one resource for consideration in examining options. It can assist in determining strengths, weaknesses and areas for improvement.

A SURVEY OF CITIES IN MCLENNAN COUNTY, TEXAS

McLennan County, (The Heart of Texas, home of Baylor University, The Texas Ranger Hall of Fame, and the State Champion Robinson Police Pistol Team) consists of twenty (20) communities, sixteen (16) of which provide a local Law Enforcement service. The survey of personnel and

pay issues reported in this paper involved a survey of all twenty (20) cities. Fifteen (15) of the cities providing Law Enforcement services furnished information for this report. One city refused. Of the fifteen (15) cities from which information was obtained, fourteen (14) were surveyed for complete information concerning pay and personnel questions. One city was surveyed for wage-comparison purposes only, since it was a city over 20,000 population and not strictly within the scope of the intended comparison.

The raw data for this report were obtained by telephone from the City Secretary and, in some cases, from specific information provided by the Chief of Police, or other person as indicated on the survey form.¹

The cities surveyed represent a broad service range, varying widely in the amount of serious crime, in total requests for service, and in the quantity of resources committed to address these problems. The availability of the information requested also varied widely between cities - some information was totally unavailable.

The cities in McLennan County that provide Law Enforcement services are listed in Table 1 in order of population.

¹The survey forms are attached as Appendix #3. A one page summary of the raw data from the survey forms is attached as Appendix #1. A one page summary of comparisons drawn from the raw data is attached as Appendix #2.

Table 1.--Survey Communities

City	Population
1. Waco	106,000
2. Hewitt	9,200
3. Robinson	8,662
4. Woodway	8,500
5. Bellmead	8,200
6. McGregor	4,513
7. Lacy Lakeview	2,752
8. West	2,600
9. Mart	2,400
10. Beverly Hills	2,089
11. Northcrest	2,000
12. Lorena	1,500
13. Moody	1,385
14. Bruceville-Eddy	1,038
15. Riesel	900
16. Crawford	610

TYPE AND AMOUNT OF DEMAND FOR SERVICES

If these cities are ranked in the order of the Uniform Crime Report (UCR) Total Crimes Index - a state maintained index of serious crimes per city - and then considered in terms of total calls for service, an impression of the amount of police activity of the city can be obtained (with numbers adjusted to 100,000 population for purposes of direct comparison).

The percentage of serious crimes, (UCR Index/total requests for service) further shows the relative response of the law enforcement activity. The percentage of serious crimes ratio suggests where the relative amounts of time are spent in local law enforcement. The UCR Index of serious crimes per 100,000 population varies from eight (8) to 336 in the surveyed cities (see Table 2). The higher the UCR number, the higher the amount of index crimes per citizen.

Total calls for service may indicate the response of the particular department to that city's demand for service, but it doesn't reflect

demand per citizen. By adjusting the total calls to 100,000 population the relative demand can be seen. Thus, woodway with 3476 calls for service has 12% more demand as a city than McGregor's 3047 calls, but 39% less demand per citizen.

The percentage of calls (as adjusted to 100,000 population) that constitute serious crime, as represented by the UCR Index, indicates the percentage of the demand per citizen that is of the more serious nature. A city with a high percentage of serious crime, when compared to a city with a similar demand for service, but with a lower percentage of serious crime, may represent a response to the demand that leaves less time for service (non-criminal interaction) per citizen than would be the case for cities with a comparatively lower percentage of serious crime. The higher the percentage of serious crime, the greater the percentage of calls that are of a more serious nature. The more time spent on serious crimes may lessen the amount of time for service oriented activity.

The higher UCR Index and percentage of serious crime may also reflect on a city's ability, or lack of ability, to prevent or deter some serious crime.

Staffing levels will reflect efforts to address these demands for service, and will be examined later. However, the traditional view of relationships between staffing, resource levels, and crime is accepted. No effort has been made in this present study to deal with innovations in staffing theory or with "productivity" issues of these traditional staffing and pay questions.

Table 2.--Demand for Services

City	UCR Index	Total Calls for Service (1989)	Total Calls for Service - adjusted to 100,000	UCR as a % of Total Calls
1. Bellmead	336	5913	72,110	.47
2. Robinson	141	4474	51,700	.27
3. Hewitt	102	4942	53,700	.19
4. Beverly Hills	100	1530	73,200	.14
5. Woodway	83	3476	40,900	.20
6. McGregor	76	3047	67,500	.11
7. Mart	40	598	24,900	.16
8. Lorena	37	907	60,500	.06
9. West	26	1959	75,300	.04
10. Northcrest	8	1254	62,700	.01

FINANCIAL RESOURCES

The information in Table 2 reflects the type and amount of demand for services (adjusted per 100,000 population for direct comparison). The response to these demands is reflected by the amount of resources used, particularly funding. Ranking cities by police budget amounts tells us the financial resources committed to the demand for services. Total budgets provide the ability to examine the ratio of police funding to total funds allocated.

The recorded property tax base serves as a measure of the willingness, or ability, of the community to provide additional government funding. All cities in this survey were alike in obtaining similar fees, fines, sales tax, grants, etc. as resources.² The discretionary area of funding that varies most is in the use and rate of property tax.

A high percentage of serious crime for a community with a low

²Fees include city income from garbage, sewer, water, cable franchise fees, etc. Fines include payments for traffic and city ordinance violations. Grants include both State and Federal funds.

percentage of allocations devoted to the police budget may suggest an inadequate financial commitment of available funds for police work. A high percentage of an inadequate total budget, or a low or non-existent tax base, with an inadequate total budget may also reflect a low commitment to law enforcement efforts. Finally, a property tax base that is low or non-existent, along with inadequate police funding, may reflect a city's inability, or lack of willingness, to fund City Government in general, and law enforcement in particular.

Table 3.--Financial Resources

City	Police Budget	Total City Budget	Ratio of Police Budget to Total Budget	Property Tax Base	Police Budget per Resident
1. Woodway	\$377,199	\$2,430,980	36.1%	.39688c	\$103.20
2. Hewitt	481,528	1,228,083	39.2	.3643	52.34
3. Bellmead	388,750	1,727,080	22.5	.250	47.41
4. Lacy Lakeview	344,018	1,236,635	27.8	.293	125.01
5. Robinson	335,552	1,180,550	28.4	none	38.74
6. McGregor	255,346	545,230	46.8	.40	56.58
7. Beverly Hills	143,611	317,482	45.2	none	68.75
8. Moody	83,100	140,000	59.4	.3484	60.00
9. Mart	78,800	451,300	17.5	.65	32.83
10. Lorena	43,250	212,890	20.3	.452	28.83
11. Bruceville-Edd	32,424	48,700	66.6	none	31.24

PERSONNEL RESOURCES

The information in Table 3 reflects on the amount of available financial resources committed to meeting the demand for law enforcement services. The personnel commitment to the demand for service is reflected by the amount of police personnel. If we examine, as well, the amount of personnel specifically assigned to the patrol function, the percentages of officers per UCR Index, per population, per square miles of city, involved in calls for service and per citation issued, this further illuminates the personnel commitment.

Table 4.--Total Police Officer Resources

City	Total Police Personnel	Number Officers per UCR Index Event	Number Officers per 1000 Population	Number Officers per Square Mile	Calls for Service per Officer	Citations per Officer
1. Waco	180	37.5	1.70	2.12	N.A.	N.A.
2. Woodway	16	5.2	1.88	3.81	217	144
3. Hewitt	15	6.8	1.63	2.12	329	157
4. Bellmead	11	30.5	1.34	N.A.	537	234
5. Robinson	9	15.7	1.04	.25	497	233
6. Lacy Lakeview	7	22.6	2.54	2.71	N.A.	194
7. McGregor	6	12.7	1.33	N.A.	508	122
8. Beverly Hills	5	20.0	2.39	.45	306	N.A.
9. Mart	4	10.0	1.67	N.A.	150	96
10. Northcrest	4	2.0	2.00	N.A.	314	N.A.
11. West	4	7.0	1.54	N.A.	490	27
12. Lorena	3	12.0	2.00	1.2	302	284
13. Moody	3	N.A.	2.17	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
14. Bruceville-Eddy	1	N.A.	.96	N.A.	898	310
15. Riesel	1	N.A.	1.11	N.A.	480	240

N.A. = Not Available

The total number of police personnel, as shown in Table 4, represents administrative, investigative, support and patrol services. We can break this down more specifically to ratios of field personnel, or patrol officers, as opposed to total police personnel, as indicated in Table 5. Cities with a low number of officers per population and per square mile may have more difficulty meeting the demand for services than cities with a correspondingly higher number of officers. A more accurate indicator of the ability to meet demand, is that demand as represented as calls for service per officer. The higher the figure, the more time spent responding, to calls for service, and less time for officers initiated activity. The number of officers per UCR Index event reflects the serious nature of per officer response.

The higher the number, the more frequent the response is of a serious nature.

Table 5.--Patrol Officer Resources

City	Number of Patrol Officers	Number of Patrol Officers per UCR Index Event	Patrol Officers per 1000 Population	Patrol Officers per Square Mile of City	Calls of Service per Patrol Officer	Citations per Patrol Officer	Patrol Officers as a % of Total Officers
1. Woodway	12	7	1.41	2.56	290	191	75.0%
2. Hewitt	11	9	1.20	1.55	449	214	73.3
3. Bellmead	8	42	.98	N.A.	739	321	72.7
4. Robinson	6 $\frac{1}{2}$	22	.75	.18	688	323	72.2
5. Lacy Lakeview	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	29	2.0	2.13	N.A.	246	78.6
6. Beverly Hills	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	22	2.15	.41	340	N.A.	90.0
7. Mart	4	10	1.67	N.A.	150	96	100.0
8. McGregor	4	19	.89	N.A.	762	183	66.7
9. Northcrest	4	2	2.0	N.A.	314	N.A.	100.0
10. West	4	7	1.54	N.A.	490	27	100.0
11. Lorena	3	12	2.0	1.2	302	284	100.0
12. Moody	3	N.A.	2.17	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	100.0
13. Bruceville-Eddy	1	N.A.	.96	N.A.	898	310	100.0
14. Riesel	1	N.A.	1.11	N.A.	480	240	100.0

N.A. = Not Available

CITY CHARACTERISTICS

Information about individual cities that may reflect differences in demand for service may be indicated by the make-up of the city. Different communities may routinely expect, or demand, different levels of response from the police. For example, some cities routinely refuse to respond to non-injury accidents, while others respond and complete reports regardless of the amount of damage involved. Citizens, over time, react accordingly in their calls for service.

Calls for service per citizen reflects the citizen's perception of appropriate police response and can vary from community to community. Those communities with a higher incident of crime might be expected to generate more calls for service than those with fewer serious incidents. Table 6 records several factors which may or may not affect demand for services, and resources necessary to meet that demand.

Table 6.--City Characteristics

City	Population	Square Miles of City	Income Level	Racial Characteristic	Population Density	Calls per 1000 Population	Citations per 1000 Population
1. Bellmead	8220	N.A.	M	50/50	N.A.	721	313
2. Beverly Hills	2089	11.0	LM	W	190	732	N.A.
3. Bruceville-Eddy	1038	N.A.	M	W	N.A.	865	299
4. Hewitt	9200	7.08	M	W	1299	537	256
5. Lacy Lakeview	2752	2.58	LM	50/50	1067	N.A.	492
6. Lorena	1500	2.5	M	W	600	605	569
7. Mart	2400	N.A.	LM	50/50	N.A.	249	159
8. McGregor	4513	N.A.	LM	60/40	N.A.	675	162
9. Moody	1385	N.A.	M	W	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
10. Northcrest	2000	N.A.	LM	50/50	N.A.	627	N.A.
11. Riesel	900	N.A.	M	W	N.A.	533	267
12. Robinson	8662	36.26	LM	W	239	517	242
13. Waco	106,000	85	N.A.	N.A.	1247	N.A.	N.A.
14. West	2600	N.A.	M	W	N.A.	753	42
15. Woodway	8500	4.2	UM	W	2024	409	270

LM = lower middle; M = middle; UM = upper middle; W = predominately white; 50 50 = white/minority; N.A. = not available

PAY AND BENEFIT CONSIDERATIONS

Pay and benefit scales may reflect on a city's ability to attract

and retain personnel. Turnover may cause overall expertise and experience levels to be at a lower level.

Table 7.--Pay and Benefit Considerations

City	Monthly Starting Pay	Monthly Incentive Available	Allowances	Adjusted Monthly Starting Pay	Sick Days per Year	Demand for Manpower as a % of Total Demand from Available Labor Pool	Percent of County Manpower Compensated at a Higher Rate
1. Waco	\$1826	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$1826	15	66.91%	0%
2. Woodway	1558	0	17	1575	12	5.95	26.91
3. Hewitt	1351	135	17	1503	12	5.58	72.86
4. Robinson	1400	0	0	1400	12	3.35	78.44
5. Bellmead	1300	0	17	1317	6	4.09	81.79
6. Riesel	1275	0	0	1275	0	.37	85.88
7. Lacy Lakeview	1253	0	17	1270	12	2.60	86.25
8. Beverly Hills	1200	50	17	1267	10	1.86	88.85
9. Lorena	1250	0	0	1250	6	1.12	90.71
10. West	1250	0	0	1250	0	1.49	90.71
11. McGregor	1127	0	0	1127	5	2.23	93.32
12. Mart	1000	0	0	1000	0	1.49	95.55
13. Northcrest	1000	0	0	1000	0	1.49	95.55
14. Moody	867	0	0	867	5	1.12	98.53
15. Bruceville-eddy	800	0	0	800	10	.37	99.63

DATA INTERPRETATION

Comparisons of listed statistics may provide cities with suggestions for improvement or areas of concern. The Tables reflect statistics that are influenced by, or dependent upon other statistics. For example, to lower the incidence of serious crime, it may necessitate an increased patrol staff, which would mean an increased police budget and an increased total budget, supported by a larger tax base. This, of course, is only one scenario.

The amount of any city's financial commitment to supply resources

should match the amount, and type, of resources necessary to achieve the goal set for the law enforcement function. A city must match ability to fund, to necessary service, based on the needs of the individual community. A review of where the city is, where it is in relation to its peers, what is possible, and what is necessary, are factors for consideration.

Statistics are interesting and provide generalized information. Many factors are important in considering the appropriate level of police response. The sheer volume of possible factors prevented the inclusion of many in this basic survey. It was the patrol function that was examined in greatest detail. No attempt was made to evaluate police management and supervisory methods. No attempt was made to evaluate the proficiency of individuals, their experience or their education levels. Many factors that reflect on police performance are difficult, if not impossible, to reduce to statistics.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Some limited conclusions might be drawn from the information obtained. Recommendations will be made for one department. Similar recommendations would apply in many instances with other cities included in this survey.

The City of Robinson competes for the lower 22% of the available labor pool, based on compensation, as shown in Table 7. The majority of officers have less than 4 years experience. Turnover is high per patrolman position; within one to three years. The UCR Index is very high both as an absolute and as a percentage, as shown in Table 2.

The number of available officers in virtually every category is the lowest in the county, as shown in Tables 4 and 5. The amount of financial resources committed to Robinson is extremely low, both as a percentage of the total budget and per capita, as shown in Table 3. No officers are available or assigned to crime reduction programs. Robinson has one officer per shift at least 87% of the time. When this officer is busy on any type of incident, the Police Department cannot perform even a reactive function. The size of the city alone, as shown in Table 6, ensures a frequent lack of rapid response with one officer, even if the officer is otherwise available.

The City of Robinson needs to set clearly defined goals to determine the appropriate commitment. If the department's goal is full and rapid response to the law enforcement demand for services, then it would be appropriate to increase the amount of patrol personnel. An increase of 7 patrolmen would eliminate the 87% plus single coverage problem, providing enough officers for a minimum of two per shift including Holidays and vacation. The benefit would be enhanced availability of response, and more rapid and complete service to the community.

If the department's goal is reduction of crime, it might be advisable to provide for a position of Crime Prevention Officer whose duties would include the reactivation of the neighborhood watch program, education programs, and statistical analysis for directed patrol. A person in this position could also provide limited C.I.D. assistance for some property crimes investigation.

If the department's goal is to provide the highest possible

quality response, it must attract and retain personnel from the upper portion of the available labor pool, eliminating turnover and retaining experience and expertise. The starting pay, currently at the bottom 22% among county departments, as shown in Table 7, should be increased in order to compete for the best candidates. Retention would depend on things like step raises and incentive pay to keep the most educated and experienced officers. Realigning the current rank structure to bring it in line with County Law Enforcement, and providing appropriate compensation will help retain current supervisors. Corporals are doing Sergeant's duties and sergeants are performing Lieutenant's duties with little or no pay differential from patrolmen.

Solutions are difficult to isolate and of necessity are general in nature. An examination of the Law Enforcement situation throughout the County shows that virtually every city, with the exception of very small communities, commits more to providing the law enforcement response. It would appear that based on the demand for services in Robinson, and the needs of the citizens, Robinson has too few officers.

APPENDIX 1

SUMMARY OF RAW DATA
FROM SURVEY FORMS

Table 8.

CITY	Type	Population	Square Miles	Tax Rate	Income Level	City Budget General Fund	Police Budget	Calls for Service	Citations	Department Personnel	Total Commissioned Patrol Officers	Starting Pay Per Month	Incentive Pay(Max.)	Sick Days (Year)	Vacation (Year)	Allowances
Bellmead	HR	8200	N/A	.2502	M	1,727,080	388,750	5913	2570	16	11 8	1300	-0-	6	2-10 5-12	C
Beverly Hills	GL	2089	11.0	N	LM	317,482	143,611	1530	--	6	5 4½	1200	50	10	1-10 5-15	C
Bruceville-Eddy	GL	1038	N/A	N	M	48,700	32,424	898	310	1	1 1	800	-0-	10	1-5 2-10	N
Hewitt	HR	9200	7.08	.3643	M	1,228,083	481,528	4942	2351	22	15 11	1351	135	12	1-5 2-10	C
Lacy Lakeview	GL	2752	2.58	.293	LM	1,236,635	344,018	924	1355	11½	7 5½	1253	-0-	12	1-5 3-10	C
Lorena	A	1500	2.5	.4520	M	212,890	43,250	907	853	3½	3 3	1250	-0-	6	12 1-5	N
Mart	GL	2400	N/A	.65	LM	451,300	78,800	598	382	4	4 4	1000	-0-	N	2-10 1-5	N
McGregor	HR	4513	N/A	.40	LM	545,230	255,346	3047	730	11	6 4	1127	-0-	5	3-10	N
Moody	GL	1385	N/A	.3484	M	140,000	83,100	N/A	--	4	3 3	867	-0-	5	10 1-5	N
Northcrest	A	2000	N/A	.2723	LM	72,000	Incl.	1254	--	5	4 4	1000	-0-	Need	3-10 1-5	N
Riesel	GL	900	N/A	N	M	30,000	Incl.	480	240	1	1 1	1275	-0-	N	2-10 1-5	N
Robinson	B	8662	36.26	N	LM	1,180,550	335,552	4474	2100	14	9 6½	1400	-0-	12	3-10	N
Waco	HR	106,000	85.0	1.8045	--	-----	-----	--	--	--	180 --	1826	-0-	15	1-2 2-4	N
West	A	2600	N/A	.398	M	480,593	Incl.	1959	108	8	4 4	1250	-0-	N	1-5 5-10	N
Woodway	HR	8500	4.2	.39688	UM	2,430,986	877,199	3476	2297	27	16 12	1558	-0-	12	1-10 5-15	C

APPENDIX 2

SUMMARY OF COMPARISONS DRAWN FROM RAW DATA

Table 9.

	UCR Crime Index	UCR as a % of Total Calls	UCR Index per Officer	UCR Index per Patrol Officer	Population Density (Square Mile)	# Officers per 1000 Population	# Patrol Officers per 1000 Population	# Officers per Square Mile	Patrol Officers per Square Mile	Calls for Service per Officer	Calls for Service per Patrol Officer	Calls for Service per 1000 Population	Citations per Officer	Citations per Patrol Officer	Citations per 1000 Population	% of total Officers as Patrol Officers	Police budget as % of City budget	Police budget per Resident	Manpower demand as % of total demand	% Manpower compensated higher
Bellmead	336	.47	30.5	42	---	1.34	.98	---	---	537	739	721	234	321	313	72.7	22.5	47.41	4.09	81.79
Beverly Hills	100	.14	20	22	190	2.39	2.15	.45	.41	306	340	732	---	---	---	90.0	45.2	68.75	1.86	88.85
Bruceville-Eddy	N/A	---	---	---	---	.96	.96	---	---	898	898	865	310	310	299	100	66.6	31.24	.37	99.63
Hewitt	102	.19	6.8	9	1299	1.63	1.2	2.12	1.55	329	449	537	157	214	256	73.3	39.2	52.34	5.58	72.86
Lacy Lakeview	158	---	22.6	29	1067	2.54	2.0	2.71	2.13	---	---	---	194	246	492	78.6	27.8	125.01	2.6	86.25
Lorena	37	.06	12	12	600	2.0	2.0	1.2	1.2	302	302	605	284	284	569	100	20.3	28.83	1.12	90.71
Mart	40	.16	10	10	---	1.67	1.67	---	---	150	150	249	96	96	159	100	17.5	32.83	1.49	95.55
McGregor	76	.11	12.7	19	---	1.33	.89	---	---	508	762	675	122	183	162	66.7	46.8	56.58	2.23	93.32
Moody	N/A	---	---	---	---	2.17	2.17	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	100	59.4	60.00	1.12	98.53
Northcrest	8	.01	2	2	---	2.0	2.0	---	---	314	314	627	---	---	---	100	---	---	1.49	95.55
Riesel	N/A	---	---	---	---	1.11	1.11	---	---	480	480	533	240	240	267	100	---	---	.37	85.88
Robinson	141	.27	15.7	22	239	1.04	.75	.25	.18	497	688	517	233	323	242	72.2	28.4	38.74	3.35	78.43
Waco	6809	---	37.8	---	1247	1.7	---	2.12	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	66.91	-0-
West	26	.03	7	7	---	1.54	1.54	---	---	490	490	753	27	27	42	100	---	---	1.49	90.71
Woodway	83	.2	5.2	7	2024	1.88	1.41	3.81	2.86	217	290	409	144	191	270	75.0	36.1	103.20	5.95	66.91

APPENDIX 3
SURVEY FORMS

SOURCES CONSULTED

Arensman, Mark Chief of Police, Mart, Texas
Interview by author, 12 February 1990

Barker, Margie City Secretary, Woodway, Texas
Interview by author, 13 February 1990

Becker, Maggie Police Lieutenant, Woodway, Texas
Interview by author, 13 February 1990

Bibb, Carolyn Court Clerk, Bellmead, Texas
Interview by author, 12 February 1990

Bruce, Debbi City Secretary, Beverly Hills, Texas
Interview by author, 8 February 1990

Cook, Mike Chief of Police, McGregor, Texas
Interview by author, 13 February 1990

DePriest, Roberta Records Supervisor, Hewitt, Texas
Interview by author, 8 February 1990

Dowell, Charlene City Clerk, Moody, Texas
Interview by author, 13 February 1990

Dulock, Thomas Chief of Police, West, Texas
Interview by author, 13 February 1990

Frost, Tom Chief of Police, Lorena, Texas
Interview by author, 12 February 1990

Kieh, Doug Chief of Police, Bruceville-Eddy, Texas
Interview by author, 8 February 1990

Kinder, Glen Chief of Police, Beverly Hills, Texas
Interview by author, 8 February 1990

Kubala, Kenneth City Secretary, West, Texas
Interview by author, 13 February 1990

Lavender, Sharon City Secretary, Lorena, Texas
Interview by author, 12 February 1990

Lopez, Patricia City Secretary, Northcrest, Texas
Interview by author, 13 February 1990

Maler, Bill Chief of Police, Bellmead, Texas
Interview by author, 12 February 1990

Massey, Kim City Secretary, Bellmead, Texas
Interview by author, 12 February 1990

Moehlig, Mary Court Clerk, Woodway, Texas
Interview by author, 13 February 1990

Otter, Christine City Secretary, McGregor, Texas
Interview by author, 13 February 1990

Orton, Betty City Secretary, Hewitt, Texas
Interview by author, 8 February 1990

Perkins, Jean City Secretary, Lacy Lakeview, Texas
Interview by author, 12 February 1990

Schraeder, Doris City Secretary, Riesel, Texas
Interview by author, 13 February 1990

Steinkamp, Nelva City Clerk, Crawford, Texas
Interview by author, 12 February 1990

Swittle, Gary Chief of Police, Riesel, Texas
Interview by author, 13 February 1990

Vranich, Linda City Secretary, Robinson, Texas
Interview by author, 1 February 1990

Werner, Esther City Secretary, Mart. Texas

Interview by author, 12 February 1990

Wiggins, Royce Ann City Secretary, Bruceville-Eddy, Texas

Interview by author, 8 February 1990