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ABSTRACT

This research study presents results from an evaluation and cost effectiveness analysis of a regionalization of selected police services into a Law Enforcement Council approach, as practiced by the Metropolitan Law Enforcement Council (Metro-LEC). The Metro-LEC is a non-profit organization comprising forty three law enforcement agencies in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The results from wave two surveys administered to officers in the organization as well as a survey distributed to the Chief Executive Officers of the participating law enforcement agencies illustrate the overall effectiveness of the organization. Additionally, a cost effectiveness analysis presents data from the costs of operating regionalized police units as compared to operating those units in-house. The overall conclusion is that a law enforcement council approach to regionalization, as practiced by the Metro-LEC, provides services to area police agencies that are needed and utilized.
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CHAPTER I

LAW ENFORCEMENT COUNCILS

Introduction

This paper provides a cost effectiveness study along with an evaluation of the Metropolitan Law Enforcement Council (Metro-LEC). The Metro-LEC is a collaboration consisting of 43 law enforcement agencies that operate to the Southeast/west of Boston, MA. The organization was incorporated as a non-profit entity in 2002 with the goal of providing mutual aid programs and services to area law enforcement agencies. The impetus of such collaboration came from the realization that there are many incidents that exceed the resources or capabilities of any one single agency and that by sharing and expanding resources, law enforcement agencies would more efficiently and effectively handle such situations. An interesting fact about the Metro-LEC is that it was established by the chief executive officers of small to medium sized police departments. Thus, such a collaborative venture that brings together a series of independent law enforcement agencies under an umbrella organization for the purposes of sharing resources represents a dramatic departure from traditional police practice and warrants further inquiry.

This study examines the Metro-LEC organization and the police services that it has regionalized in an effort to evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of such an endeavor. A previous survey of the Metro-LEC was conducted in 2004 (See Schnobrich-Davis and Terrill, 2010) and served as an administrative and operational assessment of the organization in its initial stages. This study utilizes the same survey instrument that the
first study used (e.g. wave two survey) and was again administered to the personnel in the organization to ascertain changes over the last five years and to assess the viability and sustainability of such an organization. Additionally, a survey was administered to the chief executive officers of the participating law enforcement agencies to determine their satisfaction with the organization as well as providing supplemental data on less tangible outputs that are associated with the benefits of such an enterprise. Lastly, a cost effectiveness analysis was conducted to determine whether the regionalization of selected police services does indeed prove cost effective. Altogether, these data provide an accurate evaluation of the viability, affordability and sustainability of such an organization. The conclusions theorize on how this type of collaboration can be utilized to accomplish emergency management plans, interoperability requirements, and focus on the sharing of intelligence. The knowledge provided from this study can assist other communities and law enforcement agencies that are interested in finding ways to become more cost effective, efficient, and ready to handle damaging events that can occur in any city or town.

**Description of Law Enforcement Councils**

There are many different forms of collaborations among law enforcement agencies; most common are task forces, partnerships, and data sharing networks. These types of collaborations differ from a Law Enforcement Council (LEC) in various ways. The purpose of a Law Enforcement Council is to provide various mutual aid assistance, programs, and services to its member agencies by expanding member resources and capabilities by sharing equipment, knowledge, and personnel (Bylaws, 2007). Task
forces and partnerships both focus on a particular crime or quality of life problems to investigate, while data sharing networks focus on developing a mechanism to host and transfer data queries.

LEC provide a means for coordinating activities among multiple law enforcement agencies that can assist in an incident that exceeds the capabilities and resources of any one agency, thereby delivering a regional resource for area police departments. A LEC requires member agencies to devote a percentage of personnel and funds so as to form various operational units such as SWAT and Cyber Crime Investigators that are then activated when needed. Historically individual agencies would call upon state and/or federal resources for assistance in situations that went beyond their capabilities or they would need to call other area law enforcement agencies individually for mutual aid service. However, there were problems with these types of arrangements. For instance, when a police department called the state police for assistance the local police chief gave up control of the situation and the means necessary to handle the incident. This was problematic and proved to be an ongoing turf issue between the local police and the state police. When a police department called other police departments for aid, it was time consuming and unorganized. The LEC provides the opportunity for a police department to call one organization with specialized training to handle the incident and maintain local control over the incident. The LEC delivers additional police services on a regional basis as well as providing emergency aid.

Some chief executive officers of law enforcement and criminal justice agencies have acknowledged the potential for certain types of incidents to exceed the capabilities of any one single agency. Particularly more recently with the number of school related violence
incidents, the threat of terrorist attacks, and the ever present danger of natural disasters, law enforcement chief executive officers understand that disaster can strike and they need to be prepared with a coordinated effort. However, even more common criminal activity such as property crimes, drugs, and gangs are not confined to specific boundaries of municipal origin and thus a coordinated effort is important to curbing all public safety concerns (Brewer et al. 2007).

Many collaborative ventures are temporary in nature because they formed for a specific purpose or for a specific period of time (See Rosenbaum, 2002). Some collaborative ventures are less sustainable because turf issues pervade and are not able to be overcome by the involved members (See Giacomazzi and Smithey, 2001). The Metro-LEC formed an innovative collaboration by incorporating the organization as a private, non-profit establishment. The goal of creating this type of organization was to make it a sustainable approach to regionalizing some police services as well as providing emergency aid.

The LEC is a type of multijurisdictional collaboration supported by mutual aid agreements between the participating agencies. Mutual aid agreements allow agencies to enter other jurisdictions when called upon to assist another police department in its function. For purposes of this study, mutual aid refers to a formal standing agreement for cooperative emergency management on a continuing basis across jurisdictions and defines the legal and fiduciary responsibilities of the involved parties (Lynn, 2005).

Many emergency agencies have such agreements with neighboring towns. It is the most comprehensive type of inter-agency collaboration in terms of the ability of member organizations to fully cooperate and assist each other (Lynn, 2005). McIver and Wagner
(1978) report that nearly 90 percent of all agencies nation-wide give or receive emergency assistance, and about 50 percent that belong to formal mutual aid agreements (p. 307). The result of this type of collaboration is, in theory, a better use of manpower and technology as well as enhancing the kind and quality of services that can be offered to the community (Lynn, 2005).

In the Northeast, LECs are forming in response to the needs of local municipal police agencies and the citizens they protect. The collaborative effort of law enforcement and criminal justice agencies to cooperate on a regional basis is thought to be an efficient and effective way of coping with insufficient financial resources and personnel shortages (Peterson, 2005). The LECs allow for the development of comprehensive strategies and resource deployment on a regional basis. The LECs do not seek to duplicate services already available, but improve and augment the capabilities of the member agencies. The LECs act as an aid for localities for incidents that go beyond their capability in scope (meaning they may not have the specialized skill set locally) and/or duration (meaning the incident spans several days and they will not have the local resources to handle that effort). The map (Figure 1) shows the two most prominent LECs that are operating in Massachusetts.

Recent Research on Law Enforcement Councils

To date there has only been one study conducted on Law Enforcement Councils. Schnobrich-Davis and Terrill (2010) provide an operational and administrative assessment of the Metro-LEC in its early stages of operation. Additionally, they provide an evaluation of the Metro-LEC as an organizational strategy developed by member
police agencies for the purposes of handling critical incidents that go beyond their capability to effectively control. A summary of the findings are detailed below.

Figure 1: Commonwealth of Massachusetts
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Source: Map provided by Executive Director of the Metro-LEC (2008)

- **NEMLEC**
- **Metro-LEC**

Together NEMLEC and Metro-LEC represent one third of Massachusetts residents.

The assessment was utilized to determine whether the organization is meeting its own stated goals and functions. The principal mission of the Metro-LEC is to continually prepare and implement a comprehensive plan for mutual assistance to enhance law enforcement capability throughout the region (Interagency Mutual Aid/ Assistance
Agreement, 2005:1). A detailed description of the planning process, functions, and operations of the organization was completed through comprehensive interviews with personnel in various positions throughout the organization. A survey was administered to all personnel working in Metro-LEC. The survey was divided into six themes: role definition, preparedness, workload, communications, activation process, and morale in order to gain an accurate examination of the intricate workings of the organization.

The results show that the organization seemed to have encountered few impediments in its initial operations. The personnel have their roles well defined and reported receiving excellent or good training in all areas. The workload is not reported to be burdensome, and in fact almost 38 percent reported that the workload was less than it could be. Horizontal communications within divisions and within the organization did not pose any problems at this stage. Moreover, vertical communication with the executive board was satisfactory. There were no complaints about the activation process. The activation process/call-out procedure is the process where a member agency calls in the assistance of needed units from Metro-LEC. The morale in the organization was reported to be very high with 76 percent reporting excellent or good. The results showed that this was indeed a well designed planned change effort to provide small and medium sized police departments the opportunities usually seen only in large police agencies.

Examining the Metro-LEC as an organizational strategy, as defined by Kelling and Wycoff (2002), facilitated its evaluation using their criteria. Kelling and Wycoff’s (2002), concept of organizational strategy is fundamentally the same as Chandler’s (1962) definition of corporate strategy which states, “the pattern of major objectives, purposes, or goals and essential policies and plans for achieving those goals, stated in
such a way as to define what business the company is in or is to be in and the kind of company it is or is to be.” This definition includes the determination of long term goals and the adoption of courses of action as well as the allocation of resources to obtain them (Kelling, 1990: 2). Kelling and Wycoff (2002) then established eight criteria that can be utilized to evaluate the successfulness of the organizational strategy. The eight criteria are: “identifiability, internal coherence, determine the extent to which the organization exploits current opportunities, the organization’s consistency with its competence and resources, the consistency between it and the personal values of the key managers, effectiveness, whether it contributes to society all that it can, and whether it stimulates the organization to ongoing productivity and creativity” (Kelling, 1990: 9).

Using the criteria set by Kelling and Wycoff (2002), the Metro-LEC is a successful organizational strategy. Metro-LEC ranked highly in each of the eight criteria as evidenced by the study conducted by Schnobrich-Davis and Terrill (2010). Schnobrich-Davis and Terrill (2010) found the Metro-LEC to be easily identifiable as a distinct organization, the survey results indicated high levels of internal coherence, and the organization was found to maximize on current opportunities by forming partnerships with other agencies. Additionally, the organization has sufficient resources and personnel through the establishment of annual dues and ten percent personnel dedication from each of the member agencies. Moreover, the consistency between organization and values of the key managers exists due to the fact that the executive board consists of elected members from participating agencies. The sixth criterion is whether the Metro-LEC is effective. The anecdotal evidence and self assessment prepared by the organization shows that the organization is effective in achieving its goals. However, no
empirical investigation has been completed on the effectiveness of the organization. In terms of the seventh criterion of providing a maximum contribution to society, the organization not only provides its services to member agencies but also to other private and public agencies. Finally, with regards to stimulating ongoing productivity and creativity, the organization has grown in number of participating agencies as well as the number of operational units. Thus the Metro-LEC provides an approach that can be used by small and medium sized police departments for purposes of mutual aid and assistance as well as regionalizing selected police services. Overall, the Metro-LEC is functioning in a distinctive collaborative venture that is worthy of additional review.

Value of this Study

Collaborative ventures have been studied throughout the criminal justice literature (Rosenbaum, 2002; Giacomazzi and Smithey, 2001; Brewer et al., 2007; Jefferis et al., 1998). Task force studies and partnership evaluations were the most prevalent with information-sharing network examinations now becoming more pervasive. To date there has only been one study into the type of regional, mutual aid based, inter-agency collaboration that exists in the Northeast (See Schnobrich-Davis and Terrill, 2010). Lynn (2005) notes several examples of agencies operating with the use of mutual aid agreements for the purpose of emergency preparedness, however, none of these examples demonstrate the regionalization of police services that exist in the Metro-LEC. Indeed, funding for anti-terrorism efforts such as training, coordinated response/mobilizing, disaster preparedness, and information-sharing has not been coming from the federal government but is being borne by local budgets (Riley et al, 2005). Yet it is not known
what consequences this has for staffing, morale, and overall preparedness for traditional law enforcement functions (Riley et al, 2005). This study will investigate whether the Metro-LEC is a practical, viable and affordable organization and whether it is an approach that can be used in 21st century policing.

Unlike the federal law enforcement agencies like the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Central Intelligence Agency, and National Security Agency, local police agencies historically did not have a mandate to address threats against national security, despite their role as first responders (Jackson and Brown, 2007). Now according to the Department of Homeland Security every law enforcement agency has a role to play in being prepared to prevent future attacks and respond to critical incidents (IACP, 2002).

However, there have been no major terrorist attacks since 9/11 so there is a need to focus on emergency response for all types of damaging events (Jackson, 2008). One of the goals of the National Strategy as described by the Department of Homeland Security is for law enforcement agencies to adopt an Intelligence Led Policing (ILP) paradigm in order to facilitate a sharing of information. The cornerstone for a successful ILP paradigm relies on interagency cooperation (Jackson and Brown, 2007).

According to Jackson and Brown (2007), information sharing and interagency cooperation are recognized by the policing community as important components to effective crime prevention. However, the implementation of such a strategy has eluded law enforcement managers and leaders (Jackson and Brown, 2007: 116). Indeed, Desai (2005) argues that the major obstacle to interagency cooperation and information sharing is the agency culture. Other studies have found similar results in their efforts of multi-agency coordination (Giacomazzi and Smithey, 2001; Rosenbaum, 2001; Minor et al,
A key factor to any kind of successful multijurisdictional cooperation is to form an interagency culture rather than promote turfism (IACP, 2002; Lasker et al, 2001).

The Department of Homeland Security is promoting ILP, while many police departments are still in the midst of implementing Community Policing. There remains no agreement on how to connect the two models (Raymond et al, 2005). Thus police departments are left in a state of quandary on how to become efficient and effective when current research lacks a definitive approach on integrating the somewhat conflicting paradigms being touted. With the continual changes within the structure of the Department of Homeland Security and other new federal offices being added, replaced, or eliminated, along with the continual changes and updates to federal “doctrines” (NICS, NIMS, NRP, etc), local law enforcement agencies do not have the means to implement the latest changes (Raymond et al, 2005).

All localities despite their size need to develop strategies that can respond quickly and efficiently to a critical event (IACP, 2002). The Department of Homeland Security has viewed interoperability as a requisite for all police departments in their efforts to serve and protect. The Department of Homeland Security also declared that mobilization and mutual aid are critical in responding to a situation (Lynn, 2005). The International Association of Chiefs of Police Summit in 2002 provided numerous recommendations on expanding the Department of Homeland Security mandates to the law enforcement

---

1 See Krauss, Benjamin (2007) “SAFECOM defines interoperable communications as ‘…the ability of public safety agencies to talk across disciplines and jurisdictions via radio communications systems, exchanging voice and/or data with one another on demand, in real time, when needed, and as authorized.’” (p. 1).
Community and within that context was that smaller departments find ways to collaborate with each other or with larger police departments.

Public expectations of the roles and responsibilities of the police have evolved beyond traditional crime fighting and into community policing and problem solving and continue to evolve and play a role in national security (Raymond et al., 2005: 5). However, we know little about how these changes affect local police agencies. The myriad responsibilities thrust upon police departments may inhibit their ability to fight all types of crimes and respond to the publics’ needs adequately (Riley, 2006).

Moreover, police departments are facing a shortage in terms of recruits. Now, with the influx of duties placed on police officers, it is more and more challenging for departments to find qualified applicants. There are several suppositions as to why the pool of qualified applicants is diminishing (See Koper et al., 2002). Some studies have identified trends in the youth population that hamper law enforcement recruitment (Raymond et al., 2005). These trends include issues pertaining to health and fitness, criminal activity and drug use, and higher education (Raymond et al, 2005).

Furthermore, there is more demand from private security companies and government agencies for high caliber recruits. With the competition for law enforcement jobs high, there is also a problem with officer retention. Thus, there is considerable flux in both the demand for police services and supply of qualified personnel (Raymond et al., 2005: xii). Law enforcement leaders are looking for ways to retain their talented staff.

Small and medium sized police departments residing on the outskirts of Boston, MA and Providence, RI have pooled resources in order to become more efficient in their responsibilities to their communities. From the current research, the LECs seem to be
successful in meeting the needs of the member agencies and mobilizing to handle a critical incident. Additionally, the Metro-LEC claims that regionalizing some police services has associated benefits that facilitate job satisfaction and officer retention within the individual member agencies. The criminal justice literature presents cost analyses for drug courts, treatment interventions, and crime prevention, but not on collaborations. Thus a cost-effectiveness study of the Metro-LEC will add to the literature on collaborative ventures as well as providing a much needed examination of such an organization.

**Research Questions**

The current paucity of literature pertaining to law enforcement councils offers a clean slate in order to start examining this unique collaboration within a post 9/11 context. Schnobrich-Davis and Terrill (2010) provide a detailed description of the organization as well as an administrative and operational assessment of the Metro-LEC. That study provides an understanding of the operations of the organization, yet there is still much to investigate. Below are outlined the three main research questions that this study answers regarding the Metro-LEC umbrella organization.

1. Is the Metro-LEC organization a viable and sustainable approach to regionalizing selected police services?
2. How successful have the Units within Metro-LEC been in achieving their goals?
3. What are the costs and/or benefits associated with membership in the Metro-LEC?
These three questions serve as a starting point in understanding the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization. First, whether the organization is a viable approach to regionalizing some police services and responding to critical incidents is examined. Additionally, we need to know if the organization is sustainable and if the organization will continue to operate successfully in the midst of economic decline. Second, whether the operational units within the organization are successful is researched. Lastly, the Metro-LEC claims to be a cost effective approach to regionalizing selected police services as well as providing associated benefits to the participant agencies, so these claims will be examined.

Conclusion

Throughout the country and perhaps even globally, municipal law enforcement agencies are facing tough economic times. Local budgets are crunching numbers and deciding what necessary services the Town/City absolutely requires and which are expendable. Within that context lies the policing budget and deciding what will be cut. This economic situation is not new and we can look into the 1970s when there was another deep recession that fueled our political leaders into looking more closely at cutting costs. Indeed, the idea of regionalizing and even consolidating police services was very prevalent. The next chapter will detail the literature on regionalization, consolidation, and restructuring of police departments. Then Chapter III will include descriptions on the costs and advantages of regionalization with an emphasis on economic analysis tools that are used in the criminal justice literature. Theoretical concepts relative to regionalizing and consolidating resources will be discussed in
Chapter IV. Next, Chapter V provides a description of the Metro-LEC organization. Then Chapter VI will discuss the methodology being used in this study along with the data being analyzed. Finally, the next three chapters discuss the findings. Chapter VII presents the results from the wave one and two surveys for comparison purposes as well as results from the Chiefs survey and data provided from the Metro-LEC that together examine the sustainability and viability of the umbrella organization. Chapter VIII again presents results from the frontline officer perspective, the chief executive officer perspective and data from the Metro-LEC that provide an examination of the successfulness of the organization. Chapter IX presents the results from the cost analysis of the Metro-LEC in determining the costs and benefits of operating the Metro-LEC. Lastly, Chapter X discusses the policy implication and makes recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER II

TRANSFORMATION OF POLICE SERVICES

Introduction

In few other occupations is rapid communication and access to information so crucial to success (Wickum, 1986). Yet, law enforcement is uniquely segmented into a multitude of federal, state, county and municipal organizations that are highly interdependent for information and assistance (Kuhn, 1981; Reiss, 1992). There has been much debate about the consolidation, unification, integration, merging, and regionalization of police services for small, rural and suburban police departments. In 2003, the Bureau of Justice Statistics reported that there are close to 10,000 agencies that have twenty five or fewer sworn officers. The discussions of consolidation date back to the 1950s when thousands of schools were successfully consolidated into larger district schools. However, the consolidation of police services was viewed as radical and unsettling by many (Tully, 2002). Skoler (1977), reports that from 1945 to 1974, over 70 percent of local government consolidations were defeated at the polls. This chapter will detail the different methods that have been used to transform police services whether it is from consolidation, regionalization or some other form and where the Metro-LEC approach fits.

Historical Perspective

It is important to examine the history of a reform before implementation of organizational structure change. As Skoler stated in 1977, “with a call for greater
measures of consolidation and coordination – a prescription bound to cause uncertainty in an era where the values of decentralization, local-decision-making, competition in public goods and smallness are being urged as an answer to the mediocrity and diseconomies of scale – there is bound to be much debate on this reform movement” (p. 3). This still holds true today in the 21st century. However, the question at the time was - what method works best and with what type of community?

A study conducted in California examined the issues that lead a community to disband their police department in favor of a different form of some integrated method of police protection (Wickum, 1986). In California, cities that “disband[ed] their police departments fell into one of three categories (1) most likely to contract are small cities (population up to 100,000) with heavy fiscal problems as the main motivator and additional elements include, high liability risks, inefficient force, citizens’ lack of support, and/or citizens’ apathy toward police department, (2) less likely to contract are those cities that have independent revenue sources and can stand alone without assistance from the federal or state governments, (3) least likely to contract are cities that have a population of 100,000 or more” (Wickum, 1986: 23).

Furthermore, the study also examined those “cities that would become providers and categorized them into three groups (1) most likely providers will be those departments that are presently serving a community of 100,000 population or more and have a full service police agency (2) less likely are those small full service departments serving a community of less than 40,000 population that border other well established cities, however, this group would consider sharing services. (3) least likely are large or small city departments that do not directly border a potential subscriber. These are cities that
are in rural or semi-remote areas” (Wickum, 1986: 23). This study provides a useful categorization of the types of communities that would disband their police department in favor of some other police protection and communities that would serve as providers of that police protection.

A feasibility study can be conducted to determine whether some form of integration would prove beneficial for merging potential police agencies. Norrgard (1975) conducted a feasibility study in Iowa to determine the potential benefit of some type of unified program among three municipal police agencies of various sizes and stature and the county sheriff department. The communities were already engaged in other cooperative ventures so a unified police force was considered a viable option. There were “two key factors to consider: ‘degree of autonomy’ lost to another agency and ‘degree of responsiveness’ to citizen concerns” (Norrgard, 1975: 23).

Norrgard (1975) recommended the development of an area-wide records and communications center, a joint investigative service, and a coordinated training effort because it was the least disruptive approach which still preserved the identity of individual police agencies and the basic police mission of prevention and patrol” (p.20). “The creation of a new police agency and a new police district would represent the greatest loss of local control” (Norrgard, 1975: 20). Very few governments or citizens are ready to relinquish their local autonomy to consolidation (Wickum, 1986). Therefore, other methods such as interlocal agreements and shared integration of services were looked upon more favorably (Wickum, 1986). Many feasibility studies had similar recommendations (See Ostrom et al, 1973, 1973a). Indeed there “has been far less
consolidation of police services than has occurred at all levels of public education, health, welfare, and emergency services” (Reiss, 1992:66).

The popularity of local control over municipal functions and services has its roots in the 1800s when, by necessity, American localities practiced independence and home rule (Margo, 1992). The “concept of home rule involves the attempt to thwart state government domination over municipal affairs” (Margo, 1992: 4). In the 19th and early 20th centuries cities competed over growth, jobs and influence and there was very little cooperation (Margo, 1992). Today the concept of home rule is still pervasive as evidenced by the number of local governments – 19,429 municipal governments, 16,504 townships, and 35,052 special districts (Census of Governments, 2002). However, critics of the home rule philosophy have argued that the large number of governments causes inefficiency by providing duplications of effort, fragmentation of authority and fiscal inequities (Margo, 1992).

The empirical studies showed mixed results in terms of the cost savings and increased level of service to the citizens. For instance, Ostrom et al (1973a) conducted a matched comparison study of the provision of police services between neighborhoods in a city that consolidated with the county and independent towns that operated their own police department. They found that the level of service delivery and citizen satisfaction was higher in the independent towns than their matched counterparts in the consolidated city. In conclusion they found that the independent police departments cost slightly more but provided better service. This conclusion was echoed in several other studies as well (Gyimah-Brempong, 1986, 1987; Wickum, 1986; ACIR, 1988; Ostrom and Smith, 1976).
In the Ostrom et al (1973a) study, the better service was attributed to greater informal communication between police and citizens. "More than half of the citizens in the independent communities knew a police officer and only 39 percent in the consolidated city neighborhoods responded that they did" (p.41). "In the consolidated city neighborhoods, the rate of patrol officers to residents was between 1 to 10,000 or 1 to 13,000. In comparison, the independent communities provided a patrol service ratio of 1 to 3000, or 1 to 4000" (p. 64). The city neighborhoods spent much more on specialized units than the smaller communities. In fact, based on their findings, Ostrom et al (1973) recommended that small jurisdictions be created within large cities to provide generalized patrol services while enhancing opportunities for community control (p. 430). However, they also stated that a larger police department would still be needed to provide technical services and specialization.

Kuhn (1981) also argues that the patrol function is best handled at the most local level, but there are other functions that fit with consolidation. In 1971, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) and the 1976 President’s Crime Commission made “explicit recommendations that state or metropolitan departments should help smaller communities with laboratory facilities, major investigations, area wide records, and communications needs” (Skoler, 1977:7). Indeed, the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals took that suggestion further and recommended that all police departments with ten or fewer sworn personnel consolidate with other law enforcement agencies (Skoler, 1977:6). According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (2003) there are 5757 police departments in the United States that operate with fewer than ten sworn personnel, which is 45 percent of all local police
organizations. As discussed earlier, there are several studies that indicate police department consolidation does not necessarily produce the cost savings or improvement of services that it was designed to accomplish (Ostrom et al, 1973, 1973a; Ostrom and Smith, 1976; Gyimah-Brempong, 1978). However, today, many states, counties, and cities do provide numerous police services to smaller communities through contract policing or through various sharing methods.

In a survey administered in 1985 to the city managers in California regarding the issue of police department disbandment, the most important concern was loss of local control (Wickum, 1986). Another concern relates to changing the status quo. Officers fear losing their employment and citizens fear that the new police force would not perform as well as their current officers. In fact, most small police departments are doing a pretty fair job of providing the services their community desires (Tully, 2002; Ostrom et al, 1973a), and the cost to maintain a small police department is relatively modest (Tully, 2002). The research shows that consolidation of police forces can actually cost the citizens more in taxes (Ostrom and Parks, 1973b). The start up costs for consolidating the Las Vegas Police Department and Clark County Sheriff’s Department in 1974 totaled about $3 million (Wickum, 1986).

The statements above lead to the question of why, or under what conditions, should small police departments pool resources. Many small police agencies already share some aspects of their business. For example, radio communications in some areas have been regionalized, the purchasing of items can be regionalized in order to obtain a better economies of scale, laboratories are expensive to operate and have been regionalized in
some areas, and there are task forces or other types of collaborations that work together to reduce crime or increase the quality of life in an area.

Theoretically, a larger police force offers opportunities for professional growth, better training programs, and more opportunities for promotions and participation in special units (Koepsell and Girard, 1979). Moreover, it affords communities better quality investigations, adequate manpower to handle most emergency situations, and better service in protecting the citizens (IACP, 2003). Tully (2002) argues that regionalization will raise the professional standards of all law enforcement agencies throughout the country because growth in organizations allows for innovation, specialization and increased productivity (p. 5). Regionalization “minimizes the problems intrinsic to the recruitment, training and retention of qualified police specialists” in small police agencies (Kuhn, 1981: 52). This approach, “leaves intact local jurisdictional autonomy and the presence of home rule while developing cooperative action over a much larger geographical area” (Kuhn, 1981:53). Additionally, it has been suggested that the regionalization of some police services would prove beneficial to the citizens by decreasing costs and increasing efficiency and total consolidation of police forces is unnecessary (Kuhn, 1981; ACIR, 1988; Koepsell and Girard, 1979).

**Methods for Integrating Police Services**

The terms consolidation and regionalization seem to be used interchangeably in the literature. However, there is a distinct difference between regionalization and consolidation. Regionalization is said to have functional advantages obtained through a planned, coordinated and cooperative approach (Kuhn, 1981). Kuhn (1981) identifies a
region as an “area where a number of smaller police agencies and jurisdictional
governments combine their police service efforts and is so clearly distinguishable as a
separate entity that it receives popular recognition because of its efforts and the nature of
police services provided” (p. 21). “The regionalization of police services is defined as an
expansion of services” (Kuhn, 1981: 49). Consolidation is defined as the abolishment of
one or more existing full or part time law enforcement agency(s) and the absorption of
the responsibilities of that agency(s) by another organization (Kuhn, 1981; Maguire and
King, 2004). The provider agency of the consolidated system may be an outgrowth of an
existing law enforcement organization or it may be a new agency established specifically
to provide police services to two or more local jurisdictions” (Koepsell and Girard,
1979). This section will provide a brief examination of the different methods that have
led to integration of police resources and can be used for comparison purposes among the
different approaches. The list is not an exhaustive list, since different terminology is used
for similar integration processes, but does describe a variety of methods.

*Extraterritorial powers* are those powers which a police department exercises outside
its ordinary territorial limits (Girard et al., 1976). Kuhn (1981) argues that officers
should have police powers throughout a defined region, and not just specific to their local
jurisdiction. The scope of use of extraterritorial powers varies among cities and states by
the types of power authorized. One problem that can arise from this form of extending
police powers is that it can cause friction if the outside agency does not carry out its
function in a highly professional manner. The International Association of Chief of
Police (2003) defines this type of regionalization as cross deputization, mutual
enforcement zones or overlapping jurisdictions. For instance in the State of Connecticut
the State Police have full jurisdiction in all parts of the state, but they do not exercise such authority unless requested to do so by local officials (Girard et al., 1976).

Mutual Aid agreements allow for extraterritorial powers through formal written agreements between two or more jurisdictions that specify the terms (i.e. scope and purpose) under which law enforcement personnel from outside agencies may operate within the other’s jurisdiction (Lynn, 2005). Law enforcement agencies are most familiar with the automatic mutual aid agreements which are interlocal agreements between neighboring towns that provide for emergency assistance (Lynn, 2005). However, mutual aid agreements operating on a regional basis are becoming more common. Traditionally, “mutual aid has been conceived primarily to respond to disasters and emergencies, but it is also well suited for intervention and prevention” (Lynn, 2005:4). “For the first time, the federal government directly supports the establishment of local mutual aid agreements … and has embarked on a National Mutual Aid and Resource Management Initiative” (Lynn, 2005:5).

Intergovernmental agreements can take two forms. In the first, agreements provide for the joint exercise of police powers. In the second, a contract for a business transaction provides for the sharing of services such as police patrols, training facilities, or purchasing (Kuhn, 1981: 81). According to the 1976 Law Enforcement Assistance Administration survey, nearly 40 percent of the states reported some planning and experimentation with small police department merger, primarily through contract service
arrangements (Skoler, 1977:6). Indeed some state that contract policing is the most feasible way of eliminating the one or few person force (Skoler, 1977; Girard et al., 1976; Wickum, 1986).

Voluntary Councils consists of public officials typically in a metropolitan area that formed to (1) seek a better understanding among the governments in the area, (2) develop consensus regarding metropolitan needs, and (3) promote coordinated action in solving their problems (Girard et al., 1976). The Greater Boston Police Council (GBPC) is an example of this method of sharing resources and is exclusively comprised of law enforcement officials. It was created in the 1970s with three main goals. It maintains the Boston Area Police Emergency Radio Network (BAPERN), it now provides training on the Incident Command System (ICS) and the National Incident Management System (NIMS), and lastly it administers cooperative purchasing for its members (www.gbpc.org). Voluntary councils also exist outside the law enforcement field. A non-law enforcement example of this type of council would be the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) which is a regional planning agency consisting of 101 cities and towns in the metropolitan Boston area. It serves as a non-profit agency where state and local public officials can discuss regional issues such as transportation and economic development (www.mapc.org).

Metropolitan Special Districts are defined as limited purpose or multipurpose districts involving independent units of government organized to perform one or a few functions in part or all of a metropolitan area (Girard et al., 1976). A special district can be created

---

2 According to Maguire and King (2004), “there have been no national studies of organizational births, deaths, and consolidations” (p. 28). Thus the most recent information we have on small police intergovernmental agreements is from the 1976 LEAA survey results.
for a variety of purposes (police service, fire protection service, school districts) (ACIR, 1988) and allows jurisdictional boundaries to be drawn where needed (Kuhn, 1981).

Nassau County, NY operates their policing functions through the use of a special district tax that funds the county police department (Koepsell and Girard, 1979).

*Consolidation* involves the forming of a new police department from the disbandment of two or more police departments (Kuhn, 1981). Some examples of police departments that have consolidated are Nashville-Davidson County in 1963, Indianapolis-Marion County consolidated in 1970, and Carson City-Ormsby County consolidated in 1969 (Girard et al., 1976). Additionally, Crank (1990) describes five types of public safety consolidations (i.e. merging of fire and police) (1) full consolidation, (2) partial consolidation, (3) functional consolidation, (4) selected area, and (5) nominal consolidation (p.277).³

*Annexation* is a method of consolidation. It entails the absorption of a whole territory by a city (Girard et al., 1976). It produces a larger unit of government but not one that is different. It is used to adjust jurisdictional boundaries and to absorb un-incorporated areas. This approach did not receive widespread support throughout the country (Kuhn, 1981). However, an example of this method occurred in Phoenix, AZ. Phoenix, AZ actively sought annexation as the most appropriate form of providing for orderly growth and city development. “From 1950 to 1966, the city grew from 16 square miles to 250 square miles with its population increasing five-fold” (Girard et al., 1976:16). Law enforcement service in those areas that were annexed were provided by the Sheriff on a

³ See Crank (1990) for a full description of five types of consolidation. Also see IACP (2003) for a description of seven types of consolidation.
request basis without any organized patrol area, the city now extends complete services immediately to the added areas with a corresponding increase in the size of the police department (Girard et al, 1976).

As noted above, there are several forms of integrating police resources in a specified region and these approaches can be combined as well. “As a rule, the more independent governmental jurisdictions in a region, the more difficult it becomes to adequately finance a high level of police service for the region as a whole” (Kuhn, 1981: 36). This was the belief that prompted policy makers into investigating the integration of police services. Consolidation of police services was advanced in the 1950s through 1970s to facilitate the coordination of diverse and typically small agencies and in which created larger, hierarchical organizations due to the belief that they could provide an economies of scale. However, each police department that seeks to integrate their police services can utilize more than one form described above or based upon their State laws creates a new form.

The Metro-LEC utilizes a somewhat different form, although still makes use of the mutual aid agreements that fall under the rubric of extraterritorial powers. The Metro-LEC is a private, non-profit, quasi-government organization. It is private because it can establish a mechanism to receive funds from private or public sources. It was incorporated as a non-profit organization. And it is quasi-government because the organization consists of law enforcement agencies and it is operated by an executive board that is elected from those agencies. The funding to operate the organization comes from the annual dues from the member law enforcement agencies (i.e. taxes). Thus, in essence it can be defined as a hybrid organization, “…entities that have some legal
relation or association, however tenuous, … to the terrain that putatively exists between government and private sectors” (Moe, 2003: 2).

**Restructuring the Police**

Many police departments have disbanded since at least the 1950s (IACP, 2003; Maguire and King, 2004) and possibly even as early as 1911 (Crank, 1990). King (1999) reported that 105 Ohio police agencies disbanded between 1970 and 1999 (in Maguire and King, 2004). Maguire and King (2004) report that in most instances a “preexisting agency assumes policing duties for the disbanded agency’s community, or multiple agencies disband and consolidate into a new agency, or one agency disbands and consolidates within an existing agency” (p.27). The authors forecast that the “future landscape of American policing might someday look very different, much like the face of corporate America changed after years and years of mergers and acquisitions” (p. 28). This is certainly a trend that may snowball more rapidly since the establishment of the Department of Homeland Security and the mandate to share intelligence, which requires some sort of collaborative nature to accomplish (Davies and Plotkin, 2005). These different types of collaborations may indeed change the very “landscape of policing in the United States” (Maguire and King, 2004:28).

Bayley and Shearing (2001) argue that the public police are being restructured and transformed. This is due to the development of different methods of providing security, often referred to as privatization. Private policing functions now rival that of public police in that they “guard, patrol, investigate, respond to emergencies, monitor, collect intelligence, work undercover, constrain, ameliorate crime-producing conditions, advise
about crime prevention and control disorder” (Bayley and Shearing, 2001: 17). Bayley and Shearing (2001), termed this restructuring as multilateralization – separating the authorization of security and the activity of policing from what is recognized as formal government.

The Metro-LEC with its non-profit status falls into the realm of what Bayley and Shearing (2001) are describing as a restructuring of police services. The Metro-LEC has selected some aspects of public policing that would benefit from a regional perspective and integrated those services among 43 law enforcement agencies. The Metro-LEC operates as a separate private non-profit agency that supplies selected police services to the member agencies at no additional cost as well as outsourcing their services to other towns, businesses, and LECs.

The Metro-LEC is a private organization with public police powers through the use of mutual aid agreements stipulating the arrangement. This method allows for privatizing police but with public funds and therefore responsible to the public, in essence a hybrid model. Bayley and Shearing (2001), state that policing should remain a public good whose distribution cannot be distorted by commodification. The police should act as a central point for interagency cooperation designed to strengthen communities (Bayley and Shearing, 2001). In other words, the government should share policing, but it should not share the responsibility for it. Providers of police services should be supervised and coordinated by the public police. There are many instruments for mixing and matching forms of policing as evidenced from the literature above, but we need to know more about the cost and benefits of these mechanisms (Bayley and Shearing, 2001).
Maguire and King (2004) reported that recent surveys showed that police departments across the country are making dramatic changes that resulted from the September 11th attacks and are likely to have a profound influence on policing. Some examples include the increase in attention to disaster planning, willingness to cooperate and collaborate jointly with other law enforcement agencies, revamping their intelligence collection efforts and a host of other changes that are impacting the tasks of police officers (Maguire and King, 2004). In order to prepare for emergency/disaster planning, mobilization efforts, and intelligence sharing to name just a few, police departments will require aid from multiple other agencies (i.e. law enforcement, federal and state emergency agencies) (Lynn, 2005). Lynn (2005) notes that “mutual aid agreements may one day be a requirement for funding because the National Incident Management System cites such agreements as ‘an indispensable tool for the swift and coordinated response to disasters of all kinds’” (p.5).

The Metro-LEC established an innovative collaboration between multiple law enforcement agencies throughout a region that provides a variety of police services and functions to member agencies. It is in essence a hybrid, non-profit organization delivering police services within a specific region. The Metro-LEC is not a consolidation of law enforcement agencies, but a pooling of tangible and intangible resources for the betterment of the communities involved. The LECs operational in the northeast are in a very unique situation where the Boston Police department is in the center surrounded by the Northeastern Massachusetts Law Enforcement Council to the north, Metro-LEC to the east and south, and Southeastern Massachusetts Law Enforcement Council to the
south, which in effect provides a very different landscape of regional policing throughout a very large metropolitan and suburban area.

**Conclusion**

From the early attempts of the federal government in the 1960s and 1970s to promote service integration between federal, state, and local providers, the question of how to improve the delivery of human services and reduce fragmentation and duplication of services has concerned scholars and policy makers (Sowa, 2008). Police functions and services have been consolidated, regionalized, integrated, outsourced and privatized over the last century. In fact, the notion of joining forces with other law enforcement agencies has regained popularity.

In 2004, the Senate in the State of Vermont approved a bill that would allow towns to share police services, which had been prohibited prior to this (Associated Press, 2004). The IACP (2003) reported that Pennsylvania had established twenty eight regional police departments. In his 2002 inaugural address, the Governor of Maine made a plea for greater regionalization and by 2009 signed into law a statewide mutual aid agreement among first responder agencies (www.maine.gov, June 8, 2009). In 2004, two boroughs in North Jersey signed an interlocal police agreement that they believe is the first step toward a larger regionalization of the police force (Yellin, 2004). New Jersey historically has a strong tradition of home rule and consolidations have not been very successful (Girard et al, 1976). The fact that communities all across the country are engaging in some sort of regionalization now points to the importance of the economies of scale.
There are many contemporary examples of police departments and local governments looking for ways to become more efficient and effective. Kuhn (1981) argues that “citizens can no longer accept the existence of separate, uncoordinated and often ineffective governmental functions that are duplicative and discordant because it fails to provide a suitable level of performance to society at a cost which it can afford” (p. 11). Collaborations can take various forms. However, there has been very little attention given to the empirical evaluation of such efforts (Margo, 1992; Hatry, 1983). The next chapter will provide insight into prevailing literature regarding the costs and benefits of regionalizing police functions and services.
CHAPTER III
COSTS AND ADVANTAGES OF REGIONALIZATION

Introduction

A considerable amount of research has been undertaken to determine what works and what does not work in the field of criminal justice (Swaray et al., 2005; Sherman et al., 1997; USDOJ & OJP, 2007). However, less attention has been given to the costs and benefits of criminal justice programs, even though economic analysis tools have been widely used in other disciplines the techniques are just beginning to enter the criminal justice policy arena (Cohen, 2001:46). Using economic tools in determining the costs associated with different strategies allows supervisors, policy makers, and funding organizations to make informed decisions about how to allocate sparse resources.

“Economic analysis is a tool used that allows choices to be made between alternative uses of resources or alternative distributions of services” (Welsh and Farrington, 2001:4). “The criterion most commonly utilized is efficiency which is essentially defined as achieving maximum outcomes from minimum inputs” (Welsh and Farrington, 2001:4).

The resources available for public safety compete with other possible uses (e.g. education) within local budgets (Swaray et al., 2005). Thus, using economic analysis tools that can inform decision makers about the alternative uses of resources allows for an examination of viable options (Swaray et al., 2005). This study proposes a cost effectiveness analysis of the Units within the Metro-LEC organization with the costs of establishing those Units separately in each police department. As stated earlier, it is assumed that regionalizing some police services is a cost effective means of providing
necessary police functions, thus this study tests that assumption. Although, it should be noted that the main purpose of the LEC was never to be a cost effective means of providing these selected police functions – the purpose has been and remains “to provide for the preparation and implementation of a comprehensive, coordinated mutual assistance plan for the police departments in the Council, which will enhance the law enforcement capability of the region” (Interagency Mutual Aid/Assistance Agreement, 2005:1). Thus, showing a positive cost effective result would be ancillary to the overall goals of the organization. Moreover, confirming or refuting the perception of benefits derived from a regionalized police force is also ancillary to the main goals of the Metro-LEC. However, the findings do have important implications for future policies and add to the sparse literature on multijurisdictional police collaborations.

**Economic Analysis**

“Studies that provide an economic analysis can help us understand whether an implemented policy worked better than other policies in achieving the same desired result or whether the effectiveness of the policy was great enough in quantitative terms to justify the resources required to produce the results” (Moore, 2002:38). Most program evaluations show whether a particular intervention did or did not produce a particular result, however, few go a step further by answering cost effectiveness questions. “From the point of view of policy analysis, program evaluations are useful because they examine the effectiveness of past actions and provide reasonable estimates of what would happen if we tried that intervention again” (Moore, 2002: 35). However, an important question
to ask is – how valuable is the intended result? This is an essential inquiry in comparing results with the costs of producing that effect.

A cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA) will be used in this study to determine whether membership in the Metro-LEC (i.e. regionalization) is cost effective in comparison to the alternative of establishing the special operations units within each police department. This technique estimates the monetary value of the resources (costs only) against the cost of alternative options (Welsh and Farrington, 2001). “However, benefits still need to be expressed as some common denominator” (Cohen, 2000: 265). Cost effectiveness analysis cannot show that the total effect was worth the cost of the program (Welsh and Farrington, 2001).

A cost benefit analysis (CBA) is an economic tool that can demonstrate the total effect of a program by estimating the monetary value of the program costs and program outcomes and comparing them (Welsh and Farrington, 2001). A CBA is most useful “when there is one goal (increase efficiency) with one criterion (maximize net benefits) so that … the choice among alternatives is trivial (simply select the policy with the largest net benefits)” (Boardman et al., 2001:44). This study utilizes the cost effectiveness analysis because it will examine the benefits, in non-monetary values, that are derived from the available alternatives. Thus increasing efficiency is not the only goal of the Metro-LEC.

There is one important assumption that is being made with respect to this study. It assumes that the level of service from the Metro-LEC is equal to the level of service of operating special operations units within small to medium sized police departments. There are no evaluation studies that have researched these options for comparison. This
study consists of an evaluation of the Metro-LEC, but does not include an evaluation of individual special operations units within other police departments. Thus for purposes of this study, the assumption that the units operate equally is being made.

Studies involving cost-effectiveness analysis and cost-benefit analysis relationships can provide valuable insights into how a program operates and how its operations could be improved to serve more people better for less. These economic tools also show funders that program managers are aware of the importance of accountability - accountability for how funds are used and what they are used to achieve. Marsh et al (2008) found that utilizing economic tools in addition to evaluation efforts to determine the net benefit of an intervention significantly added to the information on the efficiency of the intervention. Economic tools can be very helpful if implemented conscientiously, but still must be considered with caution. “When economic analysis techniques are used improperly, they can become nothing but rhetorical ammunition in an ideological debate” (Cohen, 2000:266).

**Agency level issues that may lead to Regionalization**

This section describes some of the current trends in policing that effect the police agency and impact regionalization of law enforcement organizations. Koepsell and Girard (1979), report that many determinations to merge police departments were precipitated by local difficulties in hiring, retaining and/or financing law enforcement personnel (p.12). Throughout the past decade, reports in cities and towns across the United States have reported recruiting and retention problems (Taylor et al., 2006). For instance, “a drop from 36,211 to 5,263 applicants in Chicago from 1991 to 2000, a 154
percent increase in resignations in New Orleans from 1999 to 2002, cancellation of the police academy in Los Angeles in 2001, and reports of lowered morale in smaller departments” (Taylor et al, 2006:2). These examples demonstrate a growing trend towards problems of recruiting and retaining police officers.

It is possible that the strong economy of recent prior years has aggravated recruitment and retention problems by luring some potential and new recruits away from law enforcement and into better paying jobs with flexible hours in the private sector (Koper et al, 2002; Taylor et al, 2006). Increasing college requirements for law enforcement officers (Reaves and Goldberg, 1999, p. v) and current criticism of police over matters such as racial profiling and excessive use of force as well as the recent hiring binge in law enforcement fueled by the COPS program, may have significantly drained the pool of potential applicants, thereby increasing competition between agencies for good officers (Koper et al, 2002).

Furthermore, this problem could become worse as larger numbers of baby boom officers enter their retirement years (Koper et al, 2002; Taylor et al, 2006). This raises the danger that some agencies may feel pressure to lower their standards in order to fill positions, a move which has had demonstrably negative consequences in some places (Koper et al, 2002). “Hence, strengthening methods for recruiting and retaining qualified officers could be emerging as one of the major contemporary challenges facing law enforcement administrators” (Koper et al, 2002:4).

In fact, Koper et al (2002), in a telephone survey to police departments on hiring and retention issues (H&R Survey), found a lack of qualified applicants was the primary difficulty faced by agencies trying to hire officers. Over half of small agencies (those
with a population under 50,000) reported that a lack of qualified applicants caused some
or much difficulty in finding officers (Koper et al, 2002). And over 40 percent of small
agencies indicated that unanticipated vacancies caused at least some difficulty in filling
positions.

The causes of the vacancies in small agencies (population under 50,000) were due to
a marginal number of officers leaving for retirement, medical reasons, or dismissal
(Koper et al, 2002). However, it was reported that the majority (59%) of departing
officers left due to other circumstances which might have included transfers to other law
enforcement agencies or a move out of the policing profession (Koper et al, 2002).
Respondents from small agencies estimated that about 45 percent of their departing
officers went on to work for other law enforcement agencies (Koper et al, 2002). Two
thirds of the officers leaving small agencies had five or fewer years of service, in
comparison with large agencies which reported only one third of officers leaving with
fewer than five years of service with the department (Koper et al, 2002). Thus, officers
working in large departments seem more likely to serve full careers in their agencies than
do their counterparts in small departments.

Indeed, smaller agencies have expressed concern over recruits using them as
“stepping stones” to larger agencies (Taylor et al, 2006:3). For example, in one small
department in Maine, officers averaged three years of service, while four other small
police agencies with low turnover rates attribute their successful retention to good
salaries and benefits, officer job satisfaction, and good tax bases and stable local
economies“(Taylor et al, 2006:3).
“Agency level variables may play an important role in agencies’ ability to recruit, select, hire, and retain highly qualified law enforcement personnel” (Taylor et al, 2006:4). Some law enforcement experts “suggest that to make entry-level positions desirable, departments need to emphasize the variety of tasks available at the officer level, such as SWAT and community-oriented roles. The working conditions may contribute to an agency’s ability to retain officers. “For instance, among Memphis PD officers, lack of promotional opportunity was the most frequently cited reason for dissatisfaction” (Taylor et al, 2006:8).

There are several issues that can influence the establishment of a regional collaboration in expectation of improvement. Small and medium size police departments are less successful than larger police departments in recruiting and retaining officers (Koper et al., 2002). Some reasons for this include the lack of promotional opportunity and issues related to job satisfaction. These are not the only reasons for regionalization. Previous chapters detailed other factors such as cost effectiveness, maintaining local control over incidents and the ability to handle major critical incidents that influence the inception of a regionalized police force.

**Benefits of Regionalization**

The Metro-LEC states that regionalizing selected police services has resulted in several benefits to their individual member police departments. Specifically, regionalization is believed to (1) provide regional problem solving, (2) provide more efficient and effective services, (3) provide job satisfaction for officers, (4) provide greater opportunities for sworn and civilian personnel, and (5) provide the ability to retain
talented personnel. However, we know little about the impact regionalization of police departments has on the benefits it is purported to influence.

There has been little research into the benefits the police departments receive from regionalizing selected police functions. The reason for this is partly due to the fact that the selected police functions that have been consolidated are functions such as records management and dispatch, which are consolidated for a purely monetary savings standpoint (Ernst, 1994). An important aspect of this study examines whether any indirect benefits are actualized from membership in a regionalized policing organization. Additionally, the findings report on the importance of these benefits regarding the decisions of chief executive officers of law enforcement agencies to participate as members in the Metro-LEC.

One approach for police agencies to attract qualified personnel and retain talented staff is to provide an environment conducive to job stimulation. A way for small police departments to offer some of the services larger police departments engage in is to form multijurisdictional/ interagency operations. Shernock (2004) stated that “Multijurisdictional Task Forces (MJTFs) not only provide services that small police agencies cannot provide for themselves, or provide effectively, they provide these services in a highly efficacious manner” (p. 71). “The MJTF is seen as an effective form of coordination that provides communities with improved specialized services they previously did not have while also not threatening citizens’ close contact with and control over their police” (Shernock, 2004:81). In their study of drug task forces, Jefferis et al (1998) found that increased communication and cooperation among local law
enforcement and other agencies was related to the perceived effectiveness of these MJTFs.

MJTFs are perceived as a non-threatening form of consolidation and tend to be seen and accepted as a positive type of coordination that can also contribute to community policing, because it is seen as breaking down organizational barriers between different police agencies (Shernock, 2004). Additionally, such a “special unit is seen as compatible with community policing when the specialized expertise of that unit enhances rather than diminishes police officer roles by providing training and improving officers’ skills as first responders in dealing with the problems in which the special unit focuses.” (Shernock, 2004:83).

Thus, theoretically forming some sort of interagency collaboration to fill the void of services small police departments cannot accomplish alone allows for better services being provided to the public as well as offering job stimulation to officers. The Metro-LEC has formed an innovative collaboration among small and mid-sized police agencies for accomplishing a multitude of functions. “Because of the enormous cost of equipping and maintaining a fully staffed SWAT team, particularly for small and mid-sized police departments, the future is likely to see more mutual aid SWAT teams in which small and mid-sized police departments band together to form a SWAT team made up of members from all of the police departments (Snow, 1996:290). Some law enforcement experts also expect the formation of many more regional SWAT teams to be implemented across the country (Snow, 1996:290). Indeed, several regional SWAT teams that train together may prove beneficial in times of crisis. “No matter what the reason for interagency cooperation among police SWAT teams, be it the type of crime, its location, or its
seriousness, police departments across the country have found that they can accomplish much more by working together and pooling their expertise and resources than they can by working alone” (Snow, 1996:248).

**Conclusion**

Police morale is a prime concern of police administrators because job satisfaction influences performance (Sherman, 1980). Job satisfaction may also be linked to officer retention in small police departments. With police agencies and researchers touting a cop crunch crisis in the current law enforcement field of recruitment (Taylor et al, 2006), other research has focused on collaborations as a means of diversifying the tasks available for police officers to engage in. Multijurisdictional task forces and interagency collaborations are offering officers in small and mid-sized police departments job stimulation, by providing an outlet for talented personnel to become involved in a variety of specialized functions. This research adds to the literature on whether the associated benefits (i.e. officer recruitment, job satisfaction, officer retention) of engaging in interagency collaborations actually occur and if interagency collaboration offers a cost savings to the communities involved. The next chapter details the methodology that was used to offer an examination of associated benefits and cost savings of interagency collaboration by focusing on the Metro-LEC organization.
CHAPTER IV
THEORETICAL CONCEPTS

Introduction

Policing in America is highly fragmented with over 17,000 different law enforcement agencies across the country (Reaves, 2003). There have been efforts at consolidation, mergers and regionalization of police services in order for law enforcement officers to cooperate on a multi-jurisdictional level. Police agencies often do cooperate with each other. However, at other times their interests prevent cooperation/coordination of efforts. This chapter will discuss some of the ongoing theoretical concepts related to the fragmentation of law enforcement agencies in the United States.

Literature Review

There is much debate about the fragmentation of law enforcement agencies throughout the country. The debate centers on whether fragmentation of law enforcement agencies is effective and efficient in terms of the quality of services and the economies of scale. There is also much discussion on how best to coordinate services with bordering law enforcement agencies (Francis, 1994). “Policing networks are highly partial and fragmented: information flows are easily disrupted and turf wars remain a constant reality for multi-agency policing” (Gill, 2002: 531). Research has not confirmed that fragmentation has resulted in less efficiency, less duplication or less fiscal equity.

Much of the research done on the topic of fragmentation of public goods and services has focused on the Tiebout theory (Margo, 1992; Dowding et al., 1994; Park,
The Tiebout theory can be summarized as follows: “The consumer-voter may be viewed as picking that community which best satisfies his preference pattern for public goods. At the central level the preferences of the consumer-voter are given, and the government tries to adjust to the pattern of those preferences, whereas at the local level various governments have their revenue and expenditure more or less fixed. Given these revenue and expenditure patterns, the consumer-voter moves to that community whose local government best satisfies his set of preferences” (Tiebout, 1956, p. 418). Simply put, it is hypothesized that 'voting with one's feet' will reveal citizens' preferences for local public services and lead to the efficient allocation of local public goods (Dowding et al., 1994:1). This relates to policing as a public service and if people are unhappy with the service provided in their community, they can move to another.

One of the important assumptions about the Tiebout theory is that each community develops its own public goods without intercommunity spillover (Margo, 1992). Thus people who are unhappy with the services in their community such as the schools or police service can move to another community. The result would be a number of different communities within a metropolitan area, each characterized by homogeneous residents with respect to preference for and ability to pay for the public good (Margo, 1992). This produces a competition among jurisdictions to provide the best services.

Politically, local jurisdictions prefer home rule, and do not want to be dominated by other local governments (Margo, 1992; Park, 1997). “Local jurisdictions want to avoid monopolization of local power by a single sizable government, whether it is a central city or county. This idea of preventing political power monopolization in the local
government system goes back to Madison’s famous statement that the federal system should be organized in such a way that ambition counteracts ambition” (Park, 1997; 730). Thus, there is competition among jurisdictions to provide quality services at less cost for the residents in their jurisdiction so as not lose the tax base.

A key question concerning the Tiebout model is whether its assumption that no intercommunity spillovers occur among urban communities is accurate. Margo (1992) argued that all public goods, even those described as pure public goods (e.g. police and fire), rely on outside communities for assistance in emergency situations. Therefore, he argued that all public goods produce intercommunity spillovers to a greater or lesser extent. If external benefits result from all types of public service, it can be theorized that cooperative provision of public services would be advantageous to all.

Park (1997) studied the effects of intergovernmental policy interactions between central city, county, and suburban city governments, testing the competition hypothesis based on Tiebout’s theory and the cooperation hypothesis based on functional arrangements. The competition hypothesis states that local governments will spend the same amount as other local governments, in essence matching their spending. The cooperation hypothesis expects local governments to spend more in one area when other governments spend less and vice versa. This hypothesis presumes that local governments provide additional services not provided by their neighbors and cuts services that their neighbors already provide.
The findings from the analysis showed, horizontal interactions between cities in the area of public safety⁴ are mostly competitive (Park, 1997:744). The vertical interactions between counties and suburban cities are cooperative in the area of public safety. These findings were statistically significant. “In the area of public safety, the results support the supplementation/substitution hypothesis instead of the competition hypothesis” (Park, 1997: 743). Thus, Tiebout’s competition theory does not apply to public safety. This finding suggests that public safety expenditures and policies, in general, ebbs and flows with the vertical and horizontal interactions of the neighboring local governments. This finding impacts the debates on consolidation and regionalization because the policies in one government jurisdiction have an impact on what other local governments do at both the horizontal and vertical levels (Park, 1997:744). Thus, if cities are in competition with their counties for resources there may be a need for a different resource allocation structure to distribute funds in an equitable manner.

A study conducted by Carruthers and Ulfarsson (2002), studied growth and change in metropolitan areas utilizing fragmentation and urban sprawl theories. “Political fragmentation refers to the dispersed allocation of decision-making authority among multiple jurisdictions, under which the inter-jurisdictional relations more often appear as isolation, competition, or conflict, rather than exchange, coordination, or cooperation” (Zhang, 2008: 3). Urban sprawl theory is “defined as the unplanned, uncontrolled, and uncoordinated single use development that does not provide for a functional mix of uses and/or is not functionally related to surrounding land uses” (Carruthers and Ulfarsson, 2002).

⁴ Public safety expenditures included police, corrections, courts, and fire protection.
The authors state that over the last 15 years, state and regional governments have steadily expanded their involvement in local land use planning practices and according to the National Association of Regional Councils (NARC), nearly ninety percent of the nation’s 39,000 local general purpose governments (counties, cities, townships, towns, villages, and boroughs) were served by a regional planning organization (Carruthers & Ulfarsson, 2002: 312). The study does not focus on public safety specifically, but instead examines a trend in metropolitan areas of using planning councils for multiple purposes. The study and findings are analogous to the Law Enforcement Councils that also seek to improve coordination and planning efforts among law enforcement agencies and there has been a trend in Massachusetts towards the implementation of LECs.

The crux of Carruthers and Ulfarsson (2002) research was examining the shift in the power structure from the home rule mentality to planning organizations and the effectiveness of such a strategy. The authors found that centralized regional planning organizations can have a significant positive impact on reducing the effect political fragmentation has on urban sprawl (Carruthers & Ulfarsson, 2002: 335). In other words, regional planning organizations utilize passive forms of growth management based on voluntary cooperation among local jurisdictions, including consensus building, revenue sharing programs and other initiatives that help to bring about the intended result. This research did not include any references to policing but parallels can be used to see how a regional law enforcement council uses many of the same approaches to achieve more coordination of effort among the local jurisdictions, yet not disturbing the home rule mentality. “The concepts of smart growth, regionalism, and regional visioning continue
to gain currency in many metropolitan areas” (Carruthers & Ulfarsson, 2002: 335). The authors concluded that further research is needed in order to evaluate whether or not efforts at reducing fragmentation produces the intended effects (Carruthers & Ulfarsson, 2002: 337).

Wheaton (2006) investigated the effect of law enforcement fragmentation across 236 metropolitan statistical areas (MSA) in the United States. A typical metropolitan area has approximately 1.5 million residents and about 150 law enforcement agencies (Wheaton, 2006:13). The author developed several statistical models to examine the impact of numerous law enforcement agencies in a metropolitan area and found the number of law enforcement agencies had a consistent and significant negative impact on crime (Wheaton, 2006:11). The result is explained by a greater number of smaller jurisdictions significantly shifting the criminal supply downwards. In essence, Wheaton (2006) concluded that an increase in the number of smaller police agencies is more effective in controlling the amount of crime in a metropolitan area. Thus, greater fragmentation of law enforcement agencies is encouraged instead of consolidating them into one large agency.

The studies continue to demonstrate the ongoing debate regarding the fragmentation of law enforcement agencies. The assumption made by Margo (1992) that
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intercommunity spillover does occur is consistent with the findings from Park (1997). The results from the study conducted by Park (1997) offered support that public safety policies and expenditures impact neighboring jurisdictions. Carruthers and Ulfarsson (2002) also present findings that demonstrate regionalization can prove to have a positive impact on bringing together different independent localities for a common purpose. While this study was not specific to law enforcement, the objectives of regionalization are the same as for Law Enforcement councils. Lastly, Wheaton (2006) provided evidence that many small police departments in a metropolitan area are more efficient in reducing crime than a larger police force. In other words, perhaps regionalization and not consolidation would work for a reduction in crime rates.

**Conclusion**

A few studies have looked into the impact of fragmented police agencies on the quality of services, the duplication of efforts, economies of scale, and efficiency. Theoretically it was believed that fragmentation of public safety agencies produced inefficiency and ineffectiveness. However, research has not supported that argument. In fact, there is research to support the idea that fragmentation leads to a greater reduction in crime (See Wheaton, 2006). This project will add to the literature on regionalization of police agencies by providing an evaluation and cost effectiveness analysis of such an endeavor in the greater Boston area. The next section provides a description of the Metro-LEC organization.
CHAPTER V

METROPOLITAN LAW ENFORCEMENT COUNCIL

Introduction

This chapter will provide a brief description of the Metro-LEC. The idea for the organization was conceived prior to the attacks of September 11th. However, the horrific nature of that event initiated further interest in establishing the collaboration as a non-profit organization. The Metro-LEC became incorporated in 2002 with thirty nine law enforcement agencies as members. It has currently expanded to include forty three law enforcement agencies and has grown in terms of the services it provides.

Description of the Metropolitan Law Enforcement Council

In Massachusetts, the strategy of involving multiple law enforcement agencies under an umbrella organization for the benefit of regional problem solving, sharing of resources, and mutual aid became paramount after teamster strikes that occurred in 1996, in which the State Police could not respond. The events of September 11th also gave credence to the goals of the organization as well as allowing small and medium sized police agencies to get a handle on being able to serve their community in times of a crisis. The organization was then incorporated as a non-profit organization in 2002 as a means of delivering services to local police departments.

The organization consists of 42 law enforcement agencies, two of which are County Sheriff Departments. The Metro-LEC services an area spanning approximately 655 square miles across five different counties that are situated in the suburbs of Boston, MA.
and Providence, RI. Geographically, the Metro-LEC communities represent an equal mix of bedroom communities, industrial communities, and communities that reside on the immediate outskirts of two urban centers (Boston and Providence) (Executive Summary, 2007). Four interstate highways pass through the region (I90, I95, I93, and I495) as well as major State freeways (Routes 128, 24 and 3). The communities range in total number of index crimes varying between 61 and 1,016 for the 2006 year (Crime in the US data, 2006).

Currently, the Metro-LEC is comprised of approximately 166 specially trained personnel from the member communities and serves a population of nearly 1 million people, which represents 12 percent of the Commonwealth’s total population. Twelve of the participating communities host resident populations that exceed 25,000. There are twelve communities that host a resident population of below 10,000. The member police departments are small to medium sized agencies, ranging from fifteen to one hundred one sworn law enforcement personnel\(^6\). The majority of police departments, 71 percent, have fewer than fifty sworn officers.

The purpose of the Metro-LEC can be found in its By-Laws, “... to provide various mutual aid assistance programs and services to its member agencies. The need for said aid may be related to, but not limited to, terrorist or enemy threats or actions, natural or man-made disasters, fires, floods, storms, earthquakes, landslides, aircraft accidents (or other mass casualty incidents), search or rescue operations, school or workplace violence, riots, mob action, civil disturbances, various types of specialized investigative services,

technological assistance, or other situations which may be beyond the resources or capabilities of the member agency” (Article II, 2007).

In order to accomplish its goals the Metro-LEC has created five separate divisions within its organization, each with specific units assigned to accomplish specialized tasks. The organization is governed by the 43 member agencies with an Executive Board whom are elected from the chief executive officers of the participating agencies. The selected regionalized police services are described below. Figure 2 depicts the organizational chart for the Metro-LEC.

The first division that Metro-LEC operates is referred to as Metro-STAR (Special Tactics And Response). This is the largest and most frequently called out division. It consists of a Special Weapons and Tactical unit (SWAT) that deals with high threat incidents. Additionally, a Regional Response Team (RRT) is trained for search and rescue operations, crowd control, and various security operations. The Crisis Negotiations Team (CNT) is trained to work in critical incidents with trained forensic psychological and psychiatric specialists. The Tactical Emergency Medical Services team (TEMS) is comprised of specially trained EMTS and paramedics who can operate during a critical incident. The Tactical Canine team (K9) consists of canine officers specially trained to operate during a critical incident. And lastly, is the Administrative and Logistical Support team (ALS) which consists of sworn and non-sworn professionals that have been trained to operate an incident command post and to provide additional logistical support to the other operational components of Metro-STAR. These specialized units also train together to provide a regional tactical police force.
The second division is the Cyber Crime Investigations Division (also referred to as the CCU for Cyber Crime Unit). It consists of three operational Units. The first one is referred to as the Investigative Unit and includes sworn and non-sworn law enforcement personnel who have been trained and equipped to possess a level of expertise to investigate a wide range of computer related crimes (i.e. cyber threats, computer related larcenies, frauds and scams, cyber stalking, identity theft, etc.). The Forensics Unit is responsible for conducting forensic exams of all types of digital media, preserving, recovering and testifying about evidence. The Education Unit develops training materials and conducts presentations to schools for students and parents as well as in the communities affiliated with the Metro-LEC. This division has become a fulltime operation due to the pervasiveness of computer related crimes.7

The third division of the Metro-LEC is the Metro Regional Traffic Safety Division. This division is comprised of a Motorcycle Unit that is staffed by law enforcement personnel with an expertise in crowd control and traffic control, traffic safety initiatives, and providing escorts for major events occurring in and among the area (Executive Summary, 2007).

The fourth division of the Metro-LEC is the Metro Criminal Investigations Division. This division is comprised of the Investigative Support Unit, a Public Information Unit and the Child Abduction Response Team (CART). It also operates a website (www.massmostwanted.org) that features unknown criminal suspects in hopes of

7 In 2009 alone, the CCU assisted in 6 homicides/attempted homicides, 8 rape/sexual assaults, 5 robberies, 3 assaults, 17 breaking & entering, 3 bomb threats, 2 gun cases, 8 drug cases, 20+ child pornography/enticement, as well as arson, missing persons, embezzlement, hacking, fraud, larceny, and more. (Annual report, 2009).
obtaining tips that will enable their capture. The Investigative Support Unit is staffed exclusively by detectives with special training in conducting criminal investigations, interrogations, and interview processes. It offers services for a range of activations and works in tandem with Metro-STAR units when in activation (Interviews, 2008). Metro-CART was established in 2006 and has forty four detectives. It includes specially trained personnel to investigate, search and rescue for missing children on a large scale capacity. All Investigative Support Unit Detectives must also be in CART. The Public Information Unit is essential at the scene for dealing with the press. They set up an area for the press and address the press if the Chief in Control so desires. They will also write up responses for the Chief that he can then use or disregard at his discretion (Interviews, 2008).

The last division of the Metro-LEC is the Metro Regional Communications Division. This division serves a direct supportive role to the other operational components of the Metro-LEC and is in place to enhance the overall communications capabilities among member agencies. This division provides proactive planning and implementation services to aid the radio communications infrastructure across member agencies. It expands the inter-operational abilities among member agencies and provides for tactical communication operations for a large scale incident.

**Conclusion**

The Metro-LEC is not unique in Massachusetts, but innovative in terms of multi-jurisdictional collaborations. There are several law enforcement councils that operate in

---

8 The website has posted over four thousand suspects that has resulted in the capture of over one thousand individuals in the approximately five years it has been operational (Correspondence, 2010).
the New England region. However, the Metro-LEC has developed a distinctive reputation that is worthy of further investigation. The next chapter will detail the method and data used to evaluate this organization.
CHAPTER VI

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter details the methodology and data used to determine the sustainability, viability, and affordability of the umbrella organization of the Metro-LEC. This study provides an analysis of changes in the organization over time, replicating and building on the results of the survey-based study completed by Schnobrich-Davis and Terrill (2010). Additionally, a survey sent to each of the chief executive officers of the member agencies measures their satisfaction with the organization as well as benefits and/or hardships derived from participation. Lastly, this study provides a cost effectiveness analysis of the organization. The information gathered through this study will enable policy makers, and chief executive officers to make informed decisions regarding the pros and cons of integrating selected police services.

Methodology

This study will utilize a multi-method approach to determine the answers to the three main research questions listed below. All methods and data sources were approved through the Institutional Review Board before beginning the study.

(1) Is the Metro-LEC organization a viable and sustainable approach to regionalizing selected police services?

9 See Schnobrich-Davis & Terrill (2010) for a detailed description of the study and results.
(2) How successful have the Units within Metro-LEC been in achieving their goals?

(3) What are the costs and/or benefits associated with membership in the Metro-LEC?

The data for these analyses were gathered from three sources. First, a second wave survey of the officers involved in Metro-LEC Units examines the sustainability of such an organization by examining changes over time from a frontline officer perspective. Second, chief executive officers of each law enforcement agency are surveyed on issues pertaining to satisfaction with the Metro-LEC and issues affecting their home agencies. Lastly, data collected by the Metro-LEC organization are used in examining the success of the operational units, information on the viability of the organization, and records on the costs and budgets of the Divisions. The cost effectiveness analysis of the Metro-LEC utilizes data from all three sources to discern whether the organization is an efficient means of regionalizing selected police services. The cost effectiveness will examine the costs of membership in the Metro-LEC versus the cost of developing such a specialized team within a police department.

Data Sources

Frontline Officer Survey

In order to learn whether the Metro-LEC is a viable and sustainable approach to regionalizing certain police services, we must first determine if the organization does what it says it does. Multi-wave surveys of establishments allow for the analysis of organizational change over time (Maguire, 2002). The wave-two survey provides data on the changes the Metro-LEC has undergone in the last five years. The initial survey was administered in 2004 and the second wave was completed in 2010. This survey was
distributed to the officers who are members of the Metro-LEC across all divisions. The total number of officers is one hundred sixty six, compared with the ninety four officers who participated in Metro-LEC in 2004. The purpose of this wave two survey is to “calculate descriptive measures of change” (Maguire, 2002:53). As in 2004, the 2010 survey allows for a front-line officer’s perspective on the administrative and operational aspects of the organization.

The survey examined six themes to assess the organization’s administrative and operational effectiveness. The first theme related to the officers’ understanding of their role in the organization and how clearly it was defined. This theme is essential when bringing together so many officers from different law enforcement agencies. The second theme involves preparedness for their task. This construct determines whether the officers received adequate training and equipment to effectively handle their respective missions. Workload is another theme and examines whether officers find working for the Metro-LEC and their home law enforcement agency burdensome. The fourth topic involves satisfaction with horizontal and vertical communications within the organization as well as with outside agencies. The next theme involves the officers’ satisfaction with the activation process. This is the process where officers in a unit are called for activation in response to some critical incident. Lastly, the morale of the divisions is examined in order to discern how well the officers from different law enforcement agencies get along. In order to gauge whether the organization has staying power, the
wave-two survey will illustrate any significant change to the organization over the last five years.\textsuperscript{10}

The surveys were provided to the Control Chief of each Division with instructions on how to administer the surveys. All surveys were accompanied by a letter stating that participation was voluntary and a self-addressed stamped envelope was attached so that each member could mail their survey directly to the researcher. This is the same method of distribution that was utilized in the wave one survey in 2004.\textsuperscript{11}

The overall response rate for all the officer surveys across all Divisions was 40 percent (66/166) for the wave two questionnaires. The wave one survey that was distributed in 2004 had a 75 percent response rate (71/94).\textsuperscript{12} In 2004, there were only three operational divisions within the organization with fewer agencies and fewer officers involved when compared in 2010. There are now four operational divisions with several Units within each Division and there are now more law enforcement agencies participating as members in 2010.\textsuperscript{13} There are no results for the Criminal Investigative Division (CID) for 2004 because that Division was established in 2005 with the MassMostWanted website and the Investigative Support Unit. The Child Abduction Response Team (CART) and the Public Information Unit came along later in 2006.

The demographical information of the respondents to the officer survey is displayed in Table 1. There were three females and sixty three males that completed the survey. The number of years each respondent has been a sworn officer varied. There were

\textsuperscript{10} See Schnobrich-Davis & Terrill (2010) for the results from the original survey.
\textsuperscript{11} Several emails were also sent in an attempt to increase the response rate.
\textsuperscript{12} The wave one survey was administered by Northeastern University, Boston, MA.
\textsuperscript{13} Response rates for 2004 surveys: STAR = 72%; Regional Traffic = 85%; Cyber Crime = 100%. There was no Criminal Investigations Division in 2004.
eighteen respondents that have been an officer for between zero and eleven years. There are thirty three respondents that have been officers for between twelve and twenty three years. Lastly, there are thirteen respondents that have been officers for more than twenty four years. In terms of the educational level of the respondents, ninety seven percent of the officers had at least some college education. Additionally, about seventy percent of the officers have either a Bachelors Degree or higher.

Some limitations with this data involve the fact that there are no identifiers on the original survey so there is no way of knowing if the same people have completed both surveys. Moreover, the Metro-LEC has expanded in the number of participating agencies and officers involved, and the number of operational units, therefore the number of people completing the survey differs from the original. Thus, descriptive statistics are used for comparison purposes.

Table 1: Demographics from the officer survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Years as an Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24+</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school/ GED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no Bachelors Degree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors Degree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Graduate work</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chief Executive Officer Survey

A survey was administered to the chief executive officers of the participating law enforcement agencies. There are forty three chief executive officers including the two sheriff offices. The survey serves two main purposes and is divided into three themes. First, the survey is used to assess the satisfaction of the chief executive officers of the member agencies with the services and administration of the Metro-LEC. Since the Metro-LEC is a non-profit organization requiring annual dues and a percentage of the members’ personnel as a means of operating, then it is critical to assess the satisfaction of those participating as members to determine if the organization is meeting their needs and stated objectives. The second purpose of the survey is to assess issues related to how membership affects the individual law enforcement agency. It is important to understand the benefits and/or hardships that result from participation in a regionalization of selected police services.

In particular the themes presented in the survey involve the contributions the agency makes, the satisfaction the agency has with the services provided by Metro-LEC, and agency specific questions related to effects of membership. The questions pertaining to contributions will help assess the level of participation each agency has with Metro-LEC. The questions pertaining to satisfaction will examine the success of the Metro-LEC organization in meeting the needs of its member agencies. The questions related to the specific agency will cover issues on officer job satisfaction, recruitment, retention, and regional problem solving. The results supply information on the potential benefits and/or hardships expressed by member agencies. This survey provides a means of assessing the viability and successfulness of such the organization.
The survey was mailed to each individual chief executive officer with an attached letter explaining the objectives of the survey,\textsuperscript{14} instructions for completing the survey, and notification that participation was completely voluntary. The President of the Metro-LEC also provided a letter of endorsement for the project. A self-addressed, stamped envelope was provided for participants to mail the completed survey directly back to the researcher. The chief executive officers were given a deadline to return the survey. A follow up email to the chief executive officers was sent a week before the deadline and one week after the deadline by a member of the executive board. The overall response rate for the survey was 67 percent.

\textit{Metro-LEC Data}

Data was gathered from Metro-LEC in order to assess the organization’s sustainability and viability, the success of the operational units, and whether it is a cost effective means of regionalizing selected police services. The Metro-LEC provided information on the number of agencies that withdrew from membership, the number of agencies that have joined, and the number of chief executive turnovers that have occurred in participating agencies. Data was also gathered on the number of activations and the types of activations that have occurred over time from member agency requests and requests from outside sources. Lastly, data was assembled from budgets from each division in the Metro-LEC as well as the overall organizational finances, and from individual agency budgets in order to determine the cost effectiveness of the organization.

\textsuperscript{14} The survey was pre-tested by the Executive Director of the Metro-LEC, the President of the Metro-LEC, and a Chief of Police in Massachusetts for review and comment. These individuals have knowledge of the policing field and of the Metro-LEC organization so their input served to improve the content of the survey.
Cost-Effectiveness

There are no studies that analyze the costs or savings of Law Enforcement Councils, so this is the first attempt at such an endeavor. The Metro-LEC was incorporated as a non-profit organization by several law enforcement agencies that wanted to pool their resources and integrate certain police services that would benefit from a regional perspective. The purpose of establishing this concept as an Amalgamation lends itself to becoming a permanent fixture in the way police conduct their business. Task forces and partnerships are seen as more temporary collaborations, where the Metro-LEC has actually formed a private, non-profit entity with the expectation that it will provide sustainability.

This part of the evaluation will help determine the costs and/or savings realized from participating law enforcement agencies. The main objective of the Metro-LEC is to provide mutual aid assistance (e.g. ability to function with police powers in member jurisdictions when requested to do so) and services that lend themselves to regionalization by sharing and expanding equipment and knowledge in a successful manner. Kuhn (1981) posits that there will be reduced cost or the same cost through utilization of police services of a larger, more powerful and capable force. Kuhn (1981) asserts that the administrator should compute the economy of scale results for the proposed region on a cost per unit basis (Kuhn, 1981: 44).

Part of a cost effectiveness analysis is to analyze the costs of the various alternatives available to determine the most effective approach. It should be noted here that the law

---

enforcement agencies in this study have four options available for responding to critical incidents. Here the options are (1) to join the Metro-LEC, (2) to establish a special unit within the home agency, (3) to call surrounding law enforcement agencies for assistance whenever the need arises or, (4) to call the State Police. These options are not all equal.

One of the primary reasons for establishing the Metro-LEC was for local chief executive officers to maintain control of the situation or critical incident in their jurisdiction rather than to surrender control to the State Police (Schnobrich-Davis & Terrill, 2010). Furthermore, the State Police do not possess the authority to respond to all incidents that require aid (i.e. labor strikes). The option of calling individual police agencies for aid whenever a need arose was time consuming and inefficient because the officers were not trained to work together and problems arose. Another option includes establishing a special unit within the home agency which is an ideal situation if money, personnel and resources are available. The final option involves membership in the Metro-LEC.

This study provides a cost effectiveness analysis between the two most similar options with respect to the ability to respond to all calls for aid with a special operations unit. The two options being compared in this study are the option of joining the Metro-LEC or the option of establishing a unit within the individual agency. The State Police do not possess the authority to respond to all incidents that require aid. Due to this

16 State Police in MA cannot assist a local police agency during a labor strike (Correspondence, 2010). However, this situation depletes the local police resources thus they require assistance through mutual aid from other local police agencies. Contract for services is not an option in MA (Correspondence, 2010). In some areas of the country police departments can contract out to the Sheriff Office or State Police for services.
differentiation in the ability to fully aid a police department in their time of need, this option is not being considered in the comparison of costs or benefits. A future study including the State police may be warranted at some point in time. Similarly, the costs of maintaining status quo (i.e. calling other police departments for aid) does not allow for comparison because there is no functional unit to compare. Thus, this alternative is not being considered in this study.

The data for the costs associated with establishing a special operations unit within individual police agencies is extrapolated from the costs of operations that the Metro-LEC has incurred. The police departments involved in this study are small to medium sized agencies thus it is not conceivable that they would have numerous special operations units within their agencies for comparison purposes.

The main question that has yet to be answered is whether this pooling of resources delivers a cost savings to the individual member agencies. Intuitively, it is believed to maximize on economies of scale and scope in terms of its accomplishments. However, in the 1960s it was also assumed that consolidation of police departments was effective, efficient and produced a cost savings, and there is now some literature to show that it was not always the case. Thus, this cost effectiveness study will enlighten us to the costs and/or savings of establishing a Law Enforcement Council.

The costs associated with establishing and operating a specialized unit within an individual law enforcement agency is determined and compared to the costs of annual dues for membership in the Metro-LEC. The data are gathered from records and discussions with the participating agencies on the costs of operating each team/unit. The time the chief executive officers contribute to the operations of the organization are all
considered donated time and do not figure into the ten percent personnel equation. The costs reflect the most recent costs of operating a unit for a one year period.

The data for comparing the benefits that are perceived to exist when regionalization of law enforcement agencies occur will be gathered from the survey administered to the chief executive officers of the participating law enforcement agencies. There are several questions that pertain to the benefits that purportedly exist for law enforcement agencies that regionalize activities. This information is used to understand the associated hardships and/or benefits that exist for the individual agency that participates in a multi-jurisdictional collaboration.

Conclusion

Together these sources of data will help determine the viability, sustainability and successfulness of the Metro-LEC organization. Much of the literature on collaborations has analyzed and identified critical elements that make a successful collaboration. However, this is the first attempt to provide an empirical evaluation of the associated benefits derived from participating in a collaboration. Additionally, this is the first attempt to produce a cost effectiveness study of a Law Enforcement Council as well as an evaluation of the successfulness of the organization. Moreover, the findings will provide useful information for comparing different law enforcement councils or other regionalization efforts for future research endeavors.
CHAPTER VII
FINDINGS FOR SUSTAINABILITY AND VIABILITY

Introduction

One of the three main questions this research seeks to answer is whether the Law Enforcement Council approach as practiced by the Metro-LEC is a sustainable and viable approach to regionalizing selected police services. In order to answer this question, data were gathered from a variety of sources. First, officer survey responses were compared for their consistency in answers between wave one and wave two. This offers a measure of sustainability. In 2004, the Metro-LEC was found to have few problems with minimal need for change (Schnobrich-Davis & Terrill, 2010). However, the organization has grown since then and this measure provides an examination of the sustainability of the organization over six years.

Second, data provided by the Metro-LEC organization regarding the ratio of agencies that have joined the organization to the number of agencies that have withdrawn were examined. Additionally, the turnover rate of chief executive officers in member agencies is examined along with its impact on involvement in the organization. This data also provides a measure of sustainability. In other words, it examines whether turnover of membership and leadership is at a low enough level to permit survival and growth.

Lastly, the responses from the chief executive officer surveys that pertain to their agencies’ levels of involvement present data on the sustainability and viability of the LEC approach. This measure allows for a chief executive officer perception of the organization and provides an examination of the sustainability and viability of the
organization by looking at the involvement and perceptions of its members. This chapter will compare and summarize the results in order to evaluate the sustainability and viability of the Metro-LEC.

Frontline officers’ perspectives

This section serves to evaluate the sustainability and viability of the organization by comparing the percentages of the respondents from the wave one and wave two questionnaires. As noted earlier, the questionnaires were divided into six themes and the results are presented along those themes. These themes are: (1) role definition, (2) preparedness, (3) workload, (4) communications, (5) satisfaction with the activation process and (6) morale.

Role Definition

The first measure related to the officers’ understanding of their role in the organization and how clearly that role was defined. Role definition is essential when bringing together so many officers from different law enforcement agencies across various counties. Table 2 shows the results to the question about how well the officers felt his/her role was defined from the wave one and wave two surveys. Overall, the responses were similar in both years. However, the Cyber Crime Division and the Regional Traffic Division both showed some increases in the percentage of respondents who reported their role as very well defined.
Table 2: Officers’ perceptions on how well their role is defined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STAR % (N)</th>
<th>Cyber Crime % (N)</th>
<th>Regional Traffic % (N)</th>
<th>CID % (N)</th>
<th>TOTAL % (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well defined</td>
<td>87   (47)</td>
<td>86.5 (32)</td>
<td>50   (3)</td>
<td>100 (6)</td>
<td>63.6 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat defined</td>
<td>13   (7)</td>
<td>13.5 (5)</td>
<td>50   (3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36.4 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not well defined</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100 (54)</td>
<td>100 (37)</td>
<td>100 (6)</td>
<td>100 (6)</td>
<td>100 (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preparedness**

The second theme is Preparedness which incorporates measures related to training and equipment for the members in the organization. The members’ feeling of preparedness for their role in the organization is crucial to meeting the needs of the member agencies. The different units each have had different training related to their function. It is assumed that the ratings of how helpful the training was and whether respondents reported that they received adequate training for their unit will demonstrate a feeling of being prepared. The respondents in the wave two surveys were asked about the number of hours spent training per month. Including all the Divisions, 45.5 percent of the officers reported training between 1 - 8 hours per month, 36.4 percent of the officers

---

17 Metro-STAR units train in compliance with professional standards for each of the Units. For instance, Metro-SWAT members are required to train for 16 hours per month according to the National Tactical Officers Association. Cyber Crime members also engage in frequent training to keep up with technical advances. The motorcycle unit trains every month for a minimum of 4 hours. The Criminal Investigator Division is comprised exclusively of veteran detectives that have received specialized training (i.e. interview and interrogation techniques) through their departments and continue to receive on the job training.

18 This question was added to the wave 2 survey, thus there is no comparison to the wave 1 survey. It was added because the wave one survey only allowed for respondents to report on 3 training exercises and now that the organization has been in operation for 8 years, this question was not adequate in order to get an understanding of the amount of training that had been received.
reported training between 9 - 16 hours per month, and 13.7 percent of the officers reported training more than seventeen hours per month.\textsuperscript{19}

Table 3 shows the results from the wave one and wave two surveys displaying whether respondents felt they had received adequate training. The Cyber Crime and Regional Traffic Divisions showed an increase in the percentage of respondents who felt they received adequate training. The reason for the increase for cyber crime members was due to the increase in training as well as the increase in equipment that was received over the last several years (Correspondence, 2010). Additionally, the respondents in both wave one and wave two surveys were asked about the helpfulness of the training sessions. Approximately 98 percent of respondents in wave one and 99 percent of respondents in the wave two survey reported that the training had been excellent or good.

Table 3: Officers’ perceptions on whether they received adequate training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STAR % (N)</th>
<th>Cyber Crime % (N)</th>
<th>Regional Traffic % (N)</th>
<th>CID % (N)</th>
<th>TOTAL % (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92.5 (49)</td>
<td>97.1 (34)</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>73 (8)</td>
<td>100 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7.5 (4)</td>
<td>2.9 (1)</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>27 (3)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100 (53)</td>
<td>99.9 (35)</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>100 (11)</td>
<td>100 (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, preparedness involves having adequate equipment to meet the members’ needs. As Table 5 shows, approximately 50 percent of respondents in wave one reported having adequate equipment as compared to wave two survey respondents

\textsuperscript{19} There were two respondents (4.5%) that indicated that the question was not applicable to them. They were leaders and did not participate in the trainings.
where approximately 66 percent responded they had received adequate equipment.

Some of the equipment that was asked for included better communications equipment, transport vehicles, and several types of gear.

Table 4: Officers’ perceptions on whether they received adequate equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STAR % (N)</th>
<th>Cyber Crime % (N)</th>
<th>Regional Traffic % (N)</th>
<th>CID % (N)</th>
<th>TOTAL % (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60.4 (32)</td>
<td>66.7 (24)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100 (6)</td>
<td>22.2 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>39.6 (21)</td>
<td>33.3 (12)</td>
<td>100 (5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77.8 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100 (53)</td>
<td>100 (36)</td>
<td>100 (5)</td>
<td>100 (6)</td>
<td>100 (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workload

The third theme is Workload. It is important to understand the workload of the members and if the amount is overly burdensome in addition to their regular jobs/positions. The Metro-L EC does operate as a part time organization, so members may feel overly taxed in relation to performing both their home law enforcement duties and Metro-L EC responsibilities. The workload measure provides for an examination of the amount of time members spend on issues related to the Metro-L EC and how that amount affects the members.\(^\text{20}\) Table 5 shows that in 2004, approximately 75 percent of respondents reported being called out to projects between one and four times per month. In 2010, approximately 60 percent of respondents reported being called out to projects

\(^{20}\text{The respondents to the wave 2 survey were asked how long they have been members of Metro-L EC and 36 responded that they have been members for more than 6 years, thus they have also completed the wave 1 survey. Although, because of the low response rate in the wave 2 survey, there is no way to determine the turnover rate of officers for the different divisions.}\n
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between one and four times per month, and another 20 percent reported being called out more than four times per month. Thus, there has been an increase in the number of call outs being reported by the respondents.

Table 5: Officers’ perceptions on their workload by number of activations per month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less than 1</strong></td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 to 4</strong></td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>More than 4</strong></td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># varies per</strong></td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>month</strong></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(65)</td>
<td>(58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, Table 6 shows that in 2004, approximately 60 percent reported spending four to twelve hours per month on Metro-LEC projects, while another 30 percent reported spending more than twelve hours per month. In 2010, approximately 47 percent reported spending four to twelve hours per month on Metro-LEC projects, while another 44 percent reported spending more than twelve hours per month on Metro-LEC projects. It appears that the workload has increased slightly since 2004.
Table 6: Officers’ perceptions on their workload by number of hours per month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Metro-STAR % (N)</th>
<th>Cyber Crime % (N)</th>
<th>MOP % (N)</th>
<th>CID % (N)</th>
<th>TOTAL % (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 4 hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than it could be</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overly burdensome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just right</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 12 hours</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varies per month</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 shows how respondents feel about the amount of time spent on Metro-LEC duties in both 2004 and 2010. As one can see, there are slightly fewer respondents reporting that the workload is less than it could be and fewer respondents reporting that the workload is overly burdensome. It appears that the majority of the members working for the organization feel the workload is just right. The cyber crime members show the biggest change over time and that is due to becoming a 24/7 operation due to the increase in demand from member agencies.

Table 7: Officers’ perceptions on their workload activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STAR % (N)</th>
<th>Cyber Crime % (N)</th>
<th>Regional Traffic % (N)</th>
<th>CID % (N)</th>
<th>TOTAL % (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than it could be</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just right</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overly burdensome</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communication

The fourth theme is communication. This measure examines the satisfaction of members with different types of communication. The first variable deals with communications within the unit. The communication among members within the same unit/division is important to understanding how well members are getting along. Each unit/division incorporates officers from different police departments. This variable helps discern how well members are communicating within their unit/division by asking respondents about their satisfaction with the amount and type of communication. As can be seen from Table 8, the percent of respondents reporting that they are very satisfied increased from 2004 to 2010.

Respondents were also asked about their satisfaction with the amount and types of communications with members of other Metro-LEC Divisions. In many organizations, it is said that the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing. It is important to know how well the units communicate. This variable provides a sense of how well the operational units communicate with each other across divisions. As can be seen from Table 8, the percentage of respondents that are very satisfied with communications across the different divisions of the organization has increased from 2004 to 2010.

Respondents were also asked about their satisfaction with communications with the Executive Board. The Metro-LEC is a non-profit organization consisting of law enforcement agencies, which we know to be quasi-military in structure and management style. Thus it is important to understand the vertical communication between the members of the Executive Board and the units. These questions assess the communication among the members of the Metro-LEC and the Executive Board to
determine if the member agencies are satisfied with the communication process. As can be seen from Table 8, the percentage of respondents that are very satisfied has increased from 2004 to 2010.

Table 8: Officers’ satisfaction with the amount and type of communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Within Division % (N)</th>
<th>Across Divisions % (N)</th>
<th>Executive Board % (N)</th>
<th>Outside Agencies % (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unsatisfied</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsatisfied</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>(66)</td>
<td>(66)</td>
<td>(58)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lastly, respondents were asked about their satisfaction with the amount and type of communication with other outside agencies. When mobilizing to a scene, it is important to understand that other agencies may also be called in as well. Indeed, the Metro-LEC has developed partnerships with many other agencies to assist in critical incidents. And it is vitally important to study the communication between the different agencies.

Historically, the Massachusetts State Police has been called in to handle critical incidents that exceeded the capacity of a local police department. This question provides a sense of how well the units communicate with outside agencies. As can be seen from Table 8, the percentage of respondents that are very satisfied has increased from 2004 to 2010.

However, the number of respondents that are somewhat satisfied decreased over time.
The accumulation of both the very satisfied and somewhat satisfied respondents still results in an increase from 2004 to 2010.

Activation Process

The fifth measure examines the Activation Process. The reason the Metro-LEC was formed was to be able to respond to critical incidents. Thus it is important to find out how the call-out/activation process works and if the member agencies are satisfied with its implementation. The call-out procedure is the process where one member agency calls for a needed unit(s) of the Metro-LEC for assistance in handling a critical incident. These questions allow for a determination of satisfaction from the member agencies with the call-out process. As can be seen from the percentages in Table 9, there is an increase in the total number of respondents who were very satisfied in the activation process from 2004 to 2010. However, the regional traffic division showed a decrease in satisfaction which was reportedly due to problems with the cell phone paging system and a belief that the motorcycle unit is underutilized.

Table 9: Officers’ satisfaction with the activation process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STAR % (N)</th>
<th>Cyber Crime % (N)</th>
<th>Regional Traffic % (N)</th>
<th>CID % (N)</th>
<th>TOTAL % (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>61.5 (32)</td>
<td>82.9 (29)</td>
<td>20 (1)</td>
<td>66.7 (4)</td>
<td>72.7 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>34.6 (18)</td>
<td>17.1 (6)</td>
<td>40 (2)</td>
<td>33.3 (2)</td>
<td>27.3 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unsatisfied</td>
<td>3.8 (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40 (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>99.9 (52)</td>
<td>100 (35)</td>
<td>100 (5)</td>
<td>100 (11)</td>
<td>100 (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Morale

The sixth measure examines the Morale of the members in the organization. The morale of the unit is important to its overall mission. When morale is high, people work together better and the mission is accomplished with fewer problems (Sherman, 1980). These officers are all coming from different police departments and it is important to understand how well they get along. As seen in Table 10, each division showed an increase in the number of respondents from 2004 to 2010 that answered positively regarding their morale. Overall, there was a percentage increase across divisions from 2004 to 2010 in the respondents that reported their morale as excellent.

Table 10: Officers’ morale rating for their Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STAR % (N)</th>
<th>Cyber Crime % (N)</th>
<th>Regional Traffic % (N)</th>
<th>CID % (N)</th>
<th>TOTAL % (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>43.1 (22)</td>
<td>64.9 (24)</td>
<td>25 (1)</td>
<td>50 (3)</td>
<td>60 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>39.2 (20)</td>
<td>24.3 (9)</td>
<td>25 (1)</td>
<td>50 (3)</td>
<td>40 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>15.7 (8)</td>
<td>10.8 (4)</td>
<td>25 (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25 (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100 (51)</td>
<td>100 (37)</td>
<td>100 (4)</td>
<td>100 (6)</td>
<td>100 (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of officer survey results

The results presented in this section show that this is a well designed and planned effort to provide small and medium sized police departments an opportunity to become something much bigger. As evidenced from the survey results, the organization over time has encountered few impediments. The personnel have their roles well defined, and
report receiving excellent or good training in all areas. The workload is not reported to be burdensome. Horizontal communications within divisions and within the organization do not pose any problems at this stage. Moreover, vertical communication with the executive board is satisfactory. There were no complaints about the activation process. The morale in the organization is very high. The division displaying the greatest change over time is the cyber crime unit with a general increase in satisfaction for the six themes. The division was so new in 2004 that it had not yet developed the training equipment needed to properly execute its mission. Overall, the Metro-LEC is functioning as a distinctive collaborative venture, though the small number of respondents does not provide for a majority perspective for the wave two surveys.

Results from Metro-LEC data

The data provided here are from the records that are kept by the Metro-LEC and are the most current information available. The information will help evaluate the sustainability and viability of the organization. The Metro-LEC provided information on the number of agencies that withdrew from membership, the number of agencies that have joined, and the number of chief executive turnovers that have occurred in participating agencies. Data was also gathered on the number of activations and the types of activations that have occurred over time from member agency requests and requests from outside sources.

The Metro-LEC was incorporated in 2002 with thirty nine agencies (Metro-LEC, 2002). Three member agencies have withdrawn from the Metro-LEC since their incorporation. However, the organization has added seven new member agencies since
2002. Thus, over time the organization continues to grow. The Metro-LEC currently has a total of forty three member agencies.

Many small police departments have a high rate of turnover at the chief of police level and since the Metro-LEC is comprised of small to medium sized law enforcement agencies, it is important to discern the number of chief executive officers who left their agency and whether that agency continues to participate in Metro-LEC under new management. The data indicates that twenty four agencies have hired or promoted new chief executive officers since the agency originally decided to participate in Metro-LEC. Thus, all of those agencies with new chiefs of police continue to be members of Metro-LEC. There have not been any changes in the Sheriff’s office, which is an elected position and thus far, the Sheriffs who participate in Metro-LEC have been re-elected.

The Metro-LEC appears to be able to maintain support from the member agencies even when the chiefs of police have left the police department the agency continues to participate and be involved in the organization under the new chief of police. Additionally, more agencies have joined the organization than the number that has left showing continuity and growth.

Chief executive officer’s perspectives

The surveys from the Chief Executive Officers of the participating law enforcement agencies were designed to investigate a number of different issues. This questionnaire elicited perceptions from the chief executive officers of the participating agencies regarding several themes. This is the first time a survey was administered to the chief executive officers, thus there is no comparison to the earlier years of the organization’s
development. This section will summarize the results from the survey questions that are relative to answering the main question of the research. The questions that pertain to the individual agency’s level of involvement will be examined here in order to understand the sustainability and viability of the Metro-LEC. The surveys were sent to all chief executive officers (police Chiefs and Sheriffs) via mail with a return deadline. The response rate is 67 percent.

Table 11 shows that most (85.7 percent) of the agencies that responded to the survey have been involved in the Metro-LEC for more than six years. Thus, approximately 86 percent of agencies were also members in 2004 when the first study was initiated. Table 12 shows that about 83 percent of the respondents reported that they are moderately or very involved in Metro-LEC decisions, activities and events. Moreover Table 13 shows approximately 35 percent of the respondents reported they would like to be more involved and none reported that they wanted less involvement.

Additionally, cross tabulations were run, showing the agencies that have been members for more than six years were also the agencies that are very involved or moderately involved in Metro-LEC. The cross tabulation results for the agencies that have been a member of Metro-LEC for more than one year and less than six years showed that three agencies are moderately involved and one is not involved in Metro-LEC decisions, events, or activities.
Table 1: Length of membership for the agency in Metro-LEC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1 year and less than 6 years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 years</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Agency level of involvement in Metro-LEC decisions, events, and activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very involved</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately involved</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not involved</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Level of involvement agency would like in Metro-LEC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More involved</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less involved</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay the same</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is also important to understand the reasons that influenced the chief executive officers to become members of the Metro-LEC. A question was asked about the factors that influenced their decision to become a member of the Metro-LEC. The response to choose from included: (1) cost effectiveness, (2) maintain local control, (3) peace of mind knowing your community can handle a critical incident, (4) associated benefits to your department (officer satisfaction and retention), (5), all of the above, and (6) other (please explain).

Interestingly, 65.5 percent of the respondents reported that all of the above included the factors that influenced their decision to become a member. Additionally, other
respondents choose other options that most reflected their decision to become a member of the Metro-LEC. Many of the respondents used the other category and listed which of the responses most reflected the factors that influenced their decision to join Metro-LEC.

The cost effectiveness, maintain local control and peace of mind knowing the agency is able to handle a critical incident was reported by 17.2 percent of the respondents as for the reason for joining. Table 14 presents the options available for the respondents and their respective results as well as the categories that respondents created in the other category. The reasons for becoming a member of the Metro-LEC provide some information as to what the members’ expectations are for the organization.

Table 14: Factors that influenced agencies’ decision to join Metro-LEC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost effectiveness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain local control</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace of mind for critical incidents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated benefits to agency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the above</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pd involved thru prior admin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost, Control, Peace of mind</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost, Peace of mind, Assoc benefits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control, Peace of mind, Assoc benefits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace of mind, Assoc benefits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chief executive officers were also asked about their satisfaction with communication among member agencies in the Metro-LEC. Communication across numerous independent law enforcement agencies is critical for operating the organization. Table 15 shows the results from the responses. As can be seen, all respondents are either very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with the communications among member agencies.
Table 15: Chief executive officers satisfaction with communication among member agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unsatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chief executive officers were asked about whether they received sufficient support from their community regarding their involvement in the Metro-LEC. In order for the agencies to remain a member of the organization it is important to understand whether their decision is supported by the community. This helps measure whether the Metro-LEC will be sustained. Table 16 shows that approximately 48 percent of the respondents reported receiving support from the citizens and political leaders in their community. Another 24 percent reported that they received moderate support from the citizens and leaders of their community, while another 24 percent reported receiving support from the political leaders and the citizens are unaware of the agency’s involvement in Metro-LEC. Lastly, approximately three percent reported that they did not receive support from their community.

Table 16: Chief executive officers’ reception of support from their community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reception Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes from citizens &amp; leaders</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders supportive, citizens unaware</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another variable used to help determine the viability of the organization is whether the services the Metro-LEC provide are valued by its members and if they meet the members’ needs. Table 17, presents the respondents responses to how they rate the value of the services provided by the Metro-LEC. As can be seen some services are valued more highly than others, but few are of no value to the participating members.\(^{21}\)

Table 17: Chief executive officers’ ratings of the value of services provided by Metro-LEC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Communicate across jurisdictions % (N)</th>
<th>Respond to large scale events % (N)</th>
<th>Respond to critical incidents % (N)</th>
<th>Training % (N)</th>
<th>Maintain Local control % (N)</th>
<th>Mass Most Wanted Website % (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Value</td>
<td>65.5 (19)</td>
<td>86.2 (25)</td>
<td>93.1 (27)</td>
<td>51.7 (15)</td>
<td>82.8 (24)</td>
<td>46.4 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Value</td>
<td>31 (9)</td>
<td>13.8 (4)</td>
<td>6.9 (2)</td>
<td>37.9 (11)</td>
<td>13.8 (4)</td>
<td>42.9 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Value</td>
<td>3.4 (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.3 (3)</td>
<td>3.4 (1)</td>
<td>10.7 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>99.9 (29)</td>
<td>100 (29)</td>
<td>100 (29)</td>
<td>99.9 (29)</td>
<td>100 (29)</td>
<td>100 (28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Networking for officers % (N)</th>
<th>Regional problem solving % (N)</th>
<th>Mentoring for leaders % (N)</th>
<th>School threat assessments % (N)</th>
<th>Intranet for members % (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Value</td>
<td>41.4 (12)</td>
<td>24.1 (7)</td>
<td>27.6 (8)</td>
<td>55.2 (16)</td>
<td>14.8 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Value</td>
<td>48.3 (14)</td>
<td>44.8 (13)</td>
<td>34.5 (10)</td>
<td>24.1 (7)</td>
<td>48.1 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Value</td>
<td>10.3 (3)</td>
<td>31 (9)</td>
<td>37.9 (11)</td>
<td>20.7 (6)</td>
<td>29.6 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.4 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100 (29)</td>
<td>99.9 (29)</td>
<td>100 (29)</td>
<td>100 (29)</td>
<td>99.9 (27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{21}\) This question did not allow for elaboration, thus it is not known why some services are seen as more valuable than others.
In order for the Metro-LEC organization to be sustainable and viable in the current environment it needs to be able to meet the changing needs of law enforcement officials as well as providing services that are not readily available elsewhere. The purpose of the Metro-LEC is not to duplicate efforts but to build on the talents that area available through the member agencies. Thus, one question that was asked to the chief executives pertains to how the organization can have a role in meeting Homeland Security objectives. Table 18 shows the results from the respondents. The most frequently reported response (35%) was that the organization can provide interoperability, intelligence sharing, and mobilization. This question was aimed at determining whether the organization has viability for the future and meeting the changing needs of law enforcement.

Table 18: Chief executive officers’ perceptions on Metro-LEC meeting Homeland Security objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gives members resources/ tools</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency mobilization</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interoperability, intelligence sharing, &amp; mobilization</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional information</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, one reason for establishing regionalized services is to decrease the duplication of efforts/services available in the area. Table 19 presents the results from the survey which asked chief executive officers what affect the Metro-LEC had on duplication of efforts in the area. More than half of the respondents reported that the
effects were unknown,\textsuperscript{22} while approximately 28 percent reported that there was a decrease in the duplication of efforts. Another 17 percent of respondents reported that some duplication had increased while other duplication of services decreased and no one reported that duplication of services had increased.

Table 19: Chief executive officers’ perceptions on the effect Metro-LEC has on duplication of efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase some/ decrease some</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

In conclusion, the Metro-LEC appears to be a sustainable and viable approach to regionalizing selected police services. The comparison between the wave one and wave two officer surveys showed very little difference in the satisfaction of the frontline officers in all six themes. The officers that work for the Metro-LEC have their roles well defined, they are prepared with adequate training and equipment, the amount of their workload is considered to be just right, the officers are satisfied with the amount and types of communications, they are satisfied with the activation process that is in place, and they report that their morale is high. Overall, it appears that the officers participating in Metro-LEC are satisfied with the operations of the organization. Satisfaction among the frontline officers is essential to the sustainability of the organization.

\textsuperscript{22} The question did not allow for elaboration, thus it is not known why 50 percent of the respondents choose the Unknown category.
Additionally, the Metro-LEC has grown in numbers and in operational units and divisions, thus it remains viable and able to meet the changing needs of its members. The fact that 60 percent of the chiefs of police have left their police department and that new chief decides to continue as a member of the Metro-LEC demonstrates the sustainability of the organization.

Lastly, the chief executive officers responses to the questionnaire showed their level of involvement as mostly moderate and that they would like to maintain that level of involvement or increase it, demonstrates commitment and sustainability of the organization. Indeed, the reasons the chief executive officers became members was to be cost effective, maintain local control over a critical incident, have the ability to handle a critical incident, and partake of the associated benefits that come from regionalizing selected police services. Thus, it is not surprising that all respondents reported they are very or somewhat satisfied with communications among member agencies. Moreover, almost half of the respondents reported that they receive sufficient support from the political leaders and citizens in their community towards their involvement in the Metro-LEC. The organization shows viability by trying to reduce the duplication of services in the area and provide the services that are most needed by small to medium sized agencies. The next chapter will present the findings from the officer survey, chief executive officer survey and data provided by the Metro-LEC in order to evaluate the success of the organization.
CHAPTER VIII

FINDINGS FOR SUCCESS OF METRO-LEC

Introduction

The second main research question this study seeks to answer regarding the Metro-LEC, is whether the organization is successful in accomplishing its purpose. The last chapter answered the question of whether the Metro-LEC organization is a viable and sustainable approach to regionalizing selected police efforts, while this chapter focuses on the second research question of whether the Metro-LEC is successful.

The primary mission of the Metro-LEC as stated in their bylaws is to, “provide various mutual aid assistance, programs and services to its member agencies. The needs for said aid may be related to, but not limited to, terrorist or enemy threats or actions, natural or man-made disasters, fires, floods, storms, earthquakes, landslides, aircraft accidents (or other mass casualty incidents), search or rescue operations, school or workplace violence, riots, mob action, civil disturbances, various types of specialized investigative services, technological assistance, or other situations which may be beyond the resources or capability of the member agency” (Metro-LEC Bylaws, 2007:1). In order to evaluate whether the organization is meeting the needs of its members, an assessment of satisfaction by the chief executive officers of the members agencies, data from the organization, and questions relating to the Divisions’ success are examined. This section will presents results from these data sources to evaluate the Metro-LEC organization.
Front line officer perspective

As described in Chapter VI, data were gathered from surveys administered to the frontline officers involved in the activities of the Metro-LEC organization. Respondents in the wave one and wave two surveys were asked the same question regarding their opinion on how successful his/her division/unit is in accomplishing its mission. In examining the percentages for each division and the organization as a whole, there is not much difference between the years 2004 and 2010. As can be seen in Table 20, 100 percent of the members in 2010 believe they are either somewhat or very successful as compared to 98.5 percent in 2004.

Table 20: Officers’ perceptions of success in your unit for accomplishing its mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STAR % (N)</th>
<th>Cyber Crime % (N)</th>
<th>Regional Traffic % (N)</th>
<th>CID % (N)</th>
<th>TOTAL % (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very successful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat successful</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unsuccessful</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsuccessful</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results from Metro-LEC data

The Metro-LEC provided statistics on the number of activations that each Division has been requested to assist a member agency as well as non-member agencies. Non-member agencies include police departments as well as private organizations (e.g. Universities and Colleges). In 2002, the Metro-LEC responded two activations from member agencies and one activation from non-member agencies. In 2009, those numbers
increased to two hundred nineteen activations for member agencies and fourteen to non-member agencies. Table 21 shows the number of activations throughout the years from 2002 through 2009.

Table 21: Frequency of activations from Metro-LEC data for the years 2002 to 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member agencies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non member agencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>1048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Provided by the Metro-LEC organization.

As can be seen in Table 22, the kinds of activations the Metro-LEC has been requested include search and rescue operations, high risk warrants, suicidal persons, hostage and barricaded subjects, crowd control, and various computer crimes. Thus, the increase in activations demonstrates that the requesting agencies are confident in the abilities of the officers in Metro-LEC. This is a measure of success for the organization as whole.

Table 22: Description of activations from Metro-LEC data for the years 2002 to 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro-LEC Calls for Service</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Search &amp; Rescue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barricaded Subject</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk Warrant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowd Control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugitive/Weapon Search</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Metro-STAR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake/Funeral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Crime</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>1,048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Provided by the Metro-LEC organization.
Chief executive officer’s perspectives

The chief executive officers of the member agencies were asked a number of questions on the survey pertaining to their satisfaction with the Metro-LEC. The member agencies pay dues and devote a percentage of their personnel to the organization, thus they are the producers and consumers of the services and it is important to know their perspective on how well the organization is achieving their mission.

The chief executive officers were asked about their satisfaction with how a unit from Metro-LEC handled an incident in their jurisdiction. Only respondents who have utilized the particular unit were asked to respond. Table 23 presents the results from the STAR (Special Tactics And Response) division and each unit it operates. As can be seen from the results, there was only one unsatisfied respondent, and that respondent elaborated on the survey that he/she was not satisfied because the K9 unit was unavailable to respond on more than one occasion.

Table 23: Chief executive officers’ satisfaction with Units utilized within Metro-STAR division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SWAT % (N)</th>
<th>RRT % (N)</th>
<th>CNT % (N)</th>
<th>TEMS % (N)</th>
<th>K9 % (N)</th>
<th>ALS % (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>94.1 (16)</td>
<td>94.4 (17)</td>
<td>87.5 (7)</td>
<td>100 (9)</td>
<td>91.7 (11)</td>
<td>90 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>5.9 (1)</td>
<td>5.6 (1)</td>
<td>12.5 (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.3 (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100 (17)</td>
<td>100 (18)</td>
<td>100 (8)</td>
<td>100 (9)</td>
<td>100 (12)</td>
<td>100 (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 This question did not allow for the possibility for a respondent to rate that he/she was not satisfied with a Unit at one time and satisfied at another time. Thus there is no measure of change.
Table 24 shows the results from the Cyber Crime Division. As can been seen, all respondents (100%) who have utilized the different operational units have been satisfied with how the incident was handled.

**Table 24: Chief executive officers’ satisfaction with Units utilized within Cyber Crime division**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Forensics % (N)</th>
<th>Investigative % (N)</th>
<th>Educational % (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>100 (18)</td>
<td>100 (12)</td>
<td>100 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100 (18)</td>
<td>100 (12)</td>
<td>100 (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25 shows the results from the Regional Traffic Division. As can be seen, all respondents (100%) who have utilized the motorcycle unit have been satisfied with how the incident was handled.

**Table 25: Chief executive officers’ satisfaction with Units utilized within Regional Traffic division**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Motorcycle Unit % (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>100 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Satisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100 (13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26, shows the results the Criminal Investigative division. As can be seen, the respondents who have utilized the operational units have all been satisfied with how the
incident was handled. The Child Abduction Response team (CART) is a new unit and was started in 2006. It is available for any member agency that has a child abducted in their jurisdiction. Fortunately, the unit has not been activated yet.

Table 26: Chief executive officers’ satisfaction with Units utilized within Criminal Investigative division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigative Support</th>
<th>Public Information</th>
<th>Child Abduction Response Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% (N)</td>
<td>% (N)</td>
<td>% (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>100 (8)</td>
<td>100 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100 (8)</td>
<td>100 (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chief executive officers were also asked about whether they felt better prepared to handle critical incidents (e.g. terrorist activity, natural or man-made disasters, etc) since their involvement in the Metro-LEC. And as can be seen in Table 27, 100 percent of the respondents reported that they do feel more prepared to handle critical incidents.

Table 27: Chief executive officers’ perceptions of preparedness to handle critical incidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparedness</th>
<th>% (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 (29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The chief executive officers were also asked about their overall satisfaction with membership in the Metro-LEC. Table 28 shows the results from the survey responses. As can be seen, all respondents are either very satisfied or somewhat satisfied.

Table 28: Chief executive officers’ satisfaction with membership in the Metro-LEC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership satisfaction</th>
<th>% (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>86.2  (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>13.8  (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unsatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100   (29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chief executive officers were asked whether there were any circumstances where they would continue to use the State Police. The responses in Table 29 show that seventeen (58.6 %) respondents would still use the State Police. Then the chief executive officers were also asked about the kinds of circumstances in which they would use the State police. Table 29 also shows that the majority of respondents reported that they would call the State police for an operational unit that the Metro-LEC does not operate (e.g. bomb squad, helicopter, etc.).

Table 29: Circumstances in which chief executive officers would use the Massachusetts State Police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Metro-LEC Units are not available</th>
<th>Metro-LEC does not have the Unit</th>
<th>Major investigations</th>
<th>Various calls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Two respondents answered yes but did not provide information about circumstances.
The chief executive officers were also asked if they operated their own special units or were involved in other special operations units. According to Table 30, twelve (57%) respondents reported that they do operate or are part of other special units not associated with Metro-LEC. The chief executive officers were asked to list the units they operate or participate in that may be separate from Metro-LEC. The most common unit that is operated by individual agencies (33%) is the K9 unit.

The Metro-LEC uses the individual agencies’ K9 units and makes them available to other member agencies, thus these can also be considered Metro-LEC units. Additionally, the motorcycle units in the individual agencies are also involved in the Metro-LEC Regional Traffic Division. Another two agencies (17%) operate a marine/boat unit, while another two agencies (17%) report that they are also members of another law enforcement council. Lastly, three respondents (25%) report operating a special response team. Individual agencies may operate their own special unit if that specialty is not incorporated into the Metro-LEC organization. For instance, shoreline agencies may operate a marine/boat unit or participate in another law enforcement council that does operate a marine/boat unit.

Table 30: Metro-LEC member agencies that operate or participate in other special units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Marine</th>
<th>K-9</th>
<th>Motorcycle</th>
<th>Member of other LEC</th>
<th>Special Response team</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey provided an area for chief executive officers to list services or programs that they would like to see incorporated into the Metro-LEC. The response rate for this
question was quite low with only six responses. The respondents reported would like Metro-LEC to provide an accident reconstruction team, an Incident Management Team, to provide more training, an investigative unit for new detectives and two respondents reported that they would like an internal affairs unit.

The last question pertaining to the success of the organization is whether the chief executive officers believe their involvement in the Metro-LEC is a worthwhile venture. A full one hundred percent agreed that participation in the Metro-LEC is a worthwhile venture for them.

**Conclusion**

The Metro-LEC appears to be quite successful in accomplishing its missions. The Frontline officers believe themselves to be successful. This perception had changed little between the wave one and wave two surveys. In fact, the data from the Metro-LEC shows that there has been an increase in the number of requests for operational units from the member agencies as well as from non-member agencies. The increase demonstrates the confidence in the operational units to effectively handle critical incidents. Moreover, the chief executive officers also reported their satisfaction with the Units that they have utilized, which again displays the success of the organization. Chief executive officers reported that they feel better prepared to handle critical incidents and that they are satisfied with membership in the Metro-LEC.

Additionally, members also reported that they would continue to utilize the Massachusetts State Police Units when Metro-LEC units were unavailable or if Metro-LEC did not provide the needed services. Some members also acknowledged that they
operate their own special units, some of which are used by Metro-LEC, and some members also acknowledged that they belong to other law enforcement councils in addition to being a member of Metro-LEC. The Metro-LEC provides many of the needed services to its members and does not duplicate services or efforts that can be found elsewhere. One of the stated missions of the Metro-LEC is to provide various services, programs, and mutual aid assistance to its member agencies and the organization does accomplish that mission. In summary, the Metro-LEC can still grow and provide more services to its member agencies, but all respondents to the survey reported being satisfied.
CHAPTER IX

FINDINGS FOR THE COST EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS

Introduction

One of the main objectives of this research is to find out whether the law enforcement council approach to regionalizing selected police services provided an economy of scale savings for the member agencies participating in the Metropolitan Law Enforcement Council. The idea of pooling resources is believed to maximize on economies of scale and scope in terms of delivering a cost savings. However, in the 1960s it was also assumed that consolidation of police departments was effective, efficient, and produced a cost savings, however, there is now literature to show that it was not always the case (See Ostrom et al., 1988; Ostrom et al., 1973 for review of this literature). Thus, this cost effectiveness study will enlighten us to the costs and/or savings of establishing a law enforcement council. This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section will present the findings of the costs for operating Units in the Metro-LEC and compare to the costs of operating Units within an individual agency. The second section will present findings from comparing the benefits of membership in the Metro-LEC to operating Units within the home agency. The last section will conclude this chapter with a summary of the findings from the previous sections.

Cost Analysis

The costs associated with establishing and operating a specialized unit within an individual law enforcement agency is compared to the costs of annual dues and personnel
dedication for membership in the Metro-LEC. The data were gathered from records and discussions with the participating agencies on the costs of operating each team/unit. An attempt is made to break down the costs into categories of Labor, Equipment, and Training for most of the Units. The time the chief executive officers contribute to the operations of the organization is all considered donated time and does not figure into the ten percent personnel equation. Thus, the executive board or committees that chief executive officers serve on are not considered part of the ten percent personnel dedication. The costs reflect the most recent costs of operating a unit for a one year period (fiscal year 2010). The member agencies are all required to dedicate 10 percent of their personnel to Metro-LEC responsibilities. The ten percent figure can be calculated by multiplying ten percent of the agency’s total number of sworn personnel by eight hours on a monthly basis. For example, the law enforcement agency has thirty sworn officers (30 x .10 = 3.0 then 3.0 x 8 = 24) thus, the agency would be expected to contribute about twenty four hours of staff hours per month to Metro-LEC activities.25

Special Weapons And Tactics (SWAT) Unit

The SWAT Unit requires a minimum of 10 officers to function effectively as recommended by the National Tactical Officers Association (Correspondence, 2010). There is a need for one unit commander, one unit sub-commander and safety officer, four

24 All costs are approximations for all Divisions and are based on records from the Treasurer of the Metro-LEC.
25 The number 30 was used because it is the median number of officers. The size of the sworn personnel from the member police departments ranges from 14 to 101. The mean size equals 36 officers and the mode equals 28 sworn personnel. All examples will use the median number of 30 for comparison purposes.
personnel for securing the inner perimeter and four personnel for the entry team. Additionally, the NTOA also recommends a minimum of 16 hours of training each month (see http://site.ntoa.org for more information). The Metro-LEC adheres to the minimum requirement for training of its officers. Much of the training is done in-house with training exercises that do not cost additional monies from the Metro-LEC organization. However, every other year the SWAT brings in the Law Enforcement Advanced Development (L.E.A. D.) consultants for training (see www.leadconsultants.org for more information). The instructors are mostly members of the Los Angeles SWAT team, known internationally for their SWAT units. The cost of this training is estimated at about $25,000. The Metro-LEC in its most recent years has split the cost of the LEAD consultants with other area SWAT teams in order to reduce the cost to one organization.

Operating a SWAT requires specialized equipment and training. The initial start-up cost can vary depending on the ability of the agency to acquire grants funds or receive donations or use available resources from member agencies. At a minimum the officers will need specialized gear to wear and weapons at a cost of $3,500. per officer. In order for the officers to be proficient in their jobs they will require a minimum of sixteen hours of training per month. If this training is provided at an overtime cost or if the department is required to backfill the position at an overtime cost for each officer that amount can vary. Using the overtime figure from one of the member agencies gives an amount of $48. per hour.

At a minimum the SWAT unit will require a transport vehicle at approximately $100,000. The administrative and logistical unit is comprised of three individuals responsible for operating the command post. The mobile command post costs $600,000.
and over the last several years the Metro-LEC has added over $75,000. worth of equipment, servers, and communication devices. There are also yearly costs for maintaining the communication services ($4500.). The initial training was provided by the manufacturer of the mobile command post and the equipment. From there the individuals have trained others and received on the job training.

Equipment $100,000. + $600,000. + $75,000. + $4,500. + ($3,500. X 10) = $814,500.

Training $12,000.

Labor (16 hours X 12 Months = 192), (10 activations X 5 hours=50)

(242 hours X $48.) X 10 = $116,160.

The first year start up cost can approximate $942,660. at a minimum. The operational cost for one year would eliminate the initial equipment cost necessary at the inception, thus approximating $132,660. per year. Table 31 summarizes the costs of operating a SWAT unit.

Table 31: Costs of operating a SWAT unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Labor</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start-up costs</td>
<td>$100,000. Transport vehicle $600,000. Command Post $3,500. Special gear $75,000. Various equipment $4,500. Licenses and Maintenance costs</td>
<td>$12,000. LEAD trainers</td>
<td>$116,160. 10 sworn officers at the overtime rate of $48. per hour. 16 hours of training per month 10 activations per year at 5 hours per activation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One year operational costs</td>
<td>$4,500.</td>
<td>$12,000.</td>
<td>$116,160.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: records from Metro-LEC
Membership in the Metro-LEC allows for one to utilize the SWAT unit when needed without incurring additional costs. Each member agency pays its annual dues of $2,500 and its ten percent personnel dedication. Thus, for an agency with thirty officers (30 x .10=3.0 then 3.0 x 8 hours per month = 24) the agency is expected to contribute twenty four hours of staff time per month to Metro-LEC activities. So again if we use the $48 per hour overtime figure, we can approximate that $48 x 24 = $1,152. x 12 months = $13,824. + $2500 dues = $16,324.

In summary, the cost to establish a SWAT unit would approximate $942,660. and operational costs on a yearly basis would approximate $132,660. (without adding in costs for personnel turnover or new equipment). The cost for a Metro-LEC member agency with thirty officers would approximate $16,324. on a yearly basis.

*Crisis Negotiation Team (CNT)*

The Metro-LEC Crisis Negotiation team is comprised of five officers and one psychologist and one psychiatrist. The two professionals are in private practice and contribute to the CNT training and attend activations on a pro-bono basis. There are trainings and conferences that the personnel attend. The equipment necessary for a CNT Unit is a *Throw Phone* which costs $12,000. and a *Throw Camera*, which costs $27,000. The initial training and annual trainings that are attended cost $3,400. per five members each time. The psychologist and psychiatrist also provided in-house trainings at no cost.

---

26 A Throw Phone is a piece of equipment used by a tactical team to communicate with the hostage taker or barricaded subject. It is typically thrown within the barricade and it cannot be tapped into by outside sources.

27 A Throw Camera is also a piece of equipment used by tactical units. It allows them to throw a camera into an area for viewing advantages of a critical situation.
The CNT unit also utilizes the command post and personnel associated with the administrative and logistical unit. This unit comprises three individuals responsible for operating the command post. The mobile command post costs $600,000, and over the last several years the Metro-LEC has added over $75,000 worth of equipment, servers, and communication devices. There are also yearly costs for maintaining the communication services ($4,500). The initial training was provided by the manufacturer of the mobile command post and the equipment. From there the individuals have trained others and received on the job training. Table 32 summarizes the costs associated with operating a crisis negotiation team.

Table 32: Costs of operating a Crisis Negotiations Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Labor</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start-up costs</td>
<td>$12,000.</td>
<td>$6,800.</td>
<td>$3,840.</td>
<td>$22,640.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throw Phone</td>
<td>$27,000.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throw Camera</td>
<td>$600,000.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command Post</td>
<td>$75,000.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various equipment</td>
<td>$4,500.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenses and</td>
<td>$4,500.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$729,140.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One year</td>
<td>$4,500.</td>
<td>$6,800.</td>
<td>$3,840.</td>
<td>$15,140.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operational costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: records from Metro-LEC

An individual agency establishing a CNT would require two sworn personnel, training, and equipment. The trainings are off-site and cost $3,400 \times 2 = $6,800. This cost includes registration fees and travel expenses, but does not include overtime costs for backfilling. The initial training is about forty hours long, thus backfilling for two people
would cost ($48 \times 40) \times 2 = $3,840. This figure does not include additional trainings or seminars that occur throughout the year, thus it is only an approximation. The equipment needed is the Throw Phone at $12,000, a Throw Camera at $27,000, and much of the same equipment included in the command post, which costs $679,500. In sum, establishing a CNT in-house would cost about $729,140. On-going costs per year would approximately $15,140. The average cost for membership in the Metro-LEC with access to the CNT is $16,324.

*K9 Unit*

The K9 Unit is not a unit that trains under the umbrella organization of Metro-LEC. Each individual police department that has a K9 Unit has the option to offer that service to other members in Metro-LEC. Thus, if a member agency has a canine that is trained for a specific purpose (e.g. bomb detection, crowd control, narcotics, search and rescue, etc.), it will allow its unit to assist other departments in need of that specialization. A member agency in need can contact the Metro-LEC and ask for a K9 Unit with a particular specialty and that police department and handler will be asked to assist the member agency in need. This is a true sharing of resources with a minimal cost (e.g. dispatch) to Metro-LEC but provides services to members. It also gives the K9 Units additional practice in the field.

Some necessary equipment for starting a K-9 unit includes a dedicated car with a kennel insert in the back seat, leashes, tracking leads, bite sleeves and other training equipment, an outdoor kennel at the handler’s home, veterinary bills, and food (Hamilton, 2003). The start-up cost is estimated at about $27,000. the first year and $7,000. each year after (Hamilton, 2003). The total cost can range from $20,000. to
$29,000 to start a K-9 unit, according to figures given by K-9 officers (Basich, 2003). The average cost for membership in the Metro-LEC with access to the K9 is $16,324.

*Tactical Emergency Medical Team (TEMS)*

The emergency medical team comprises medics and EMTs provided through the Fallon Ambulance Service, which is a private company that donates its time and expense to training with the Metro-LEC Units and attending all activations. They will assist in providing medical services for team members in critical incidents and under live fire whereas other untrained medical service agencies do not provide services in critical situations. The cost of this service is borne directly by the private ambulance company with no cost to Metro-LEC during their trainings or activations. If an individual agency wanted a service such as this, they would most likely need to find an agency to contract with or to negotiate a price. Many tactical units operate without a Tactical Emergency medical team.

*Cyber Crime Unit (CCU)*

The Cyber Crime Unit was already established in one of the member police agencies and the Unit has continued to expand under the Metro-LEC umbrella organization. The Unit now includes personnel from member agencies and is better equipped to handle a variety of activations. The forensic team receives the most extensive training. The education unit also receives specialized training to present to schools, parents, youths, and communities in regards to cyber crimes. The education unit presents to an average of twenty five schools annually (Correspondence, 2010).

28 More information can be found at [www.fallonambulance.com](http://www.fallonambulance.com).
The Cyber Crime Unit attends various trainings and conferences in order to keep up on the latest technology. They attend the annual Computer and Enterprise Investigations Conference (CEIC) on a regular basis. The cost of one week of training is about $3,500. They also pay for various software licensures and equipment. The annual licensure fees costs about $4,500. They amortize their equipment so that every year or other year they are able to obtain new equipment for the laboratory. Approximately $50,000 has been spent in the last several years for hardware, software, licenses, and training. Table 33 summarizes the costs of operating a cyber crime unit.

Table 33: Costs of operating a cyber crime unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Labor</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start-up costs</td>
<td>$50,000. Hardware and software</td>
<td>$3,500.</td>
<td>$3,840. Overtime</td>
<td>$61,840.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4,500. Licensure fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One year operational costs</td>
<td>$16,000. Hardware and software</td>
<td>$3,500.</td>
<td>$3,840. Overtime</td>
<td>$27,840.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4,500. Licensure fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: records from Metro-LEC

In order to establish a cyber crime unit, the members need extensive training and special equipment and software. The total start-up cost would approximate $61,840. and cost about $27,840. to operate on a yearly basis. The average cost for membership in the Metro-LEC with access to the Cyber Crime unit is $16, 324.

Motorcycle Unit

The motorcycle unit in Metro-LEC is comprised of officers from police departments that already have a motorcycle squad, thus there are no new start-up costs for the
organization. There is additional training in working with various police departments in a large scale event. The cost of a motorcycle is about $20,000, however, there is no minimum number of individuals needed for a Unit, it really depends on the agency and how the unit will be utilized. Most training occurs while on duty so it is not a significant cost for overtime. The Metro-LEC has spent about $9,000 on helmets for all unit members. There is no additional cost involved to the Metro-LEC organization, but gives members of a motorcycle squad in an individual agency more opportunities to learn greater skills. Again this is a sharing of resources that available to member agencies by other participating agencies that have this specialization.

The cost of establishing a motorcycle squad in an individual agency with four motorcycles would cost approximately $80,000 for the motorcycles. There is additional cost for trainings, gear, and maintenance which is typically written into the total maintenance budget for vehicles and is minimal. The average cost for membership in the Metro-LEC with access to the Motorcycle unit is $16,324.

_Criminal Investigative Division (CID)_

This unit comprises about twenty detectives from different departments. These detectives are typically veteran detectives who already meet on a regular basis through the regional drug task force. These officers have already had extensive training before entering into the Metro-LEC CID. They typically bring equipment or software (e.g. ability to track cell phones) with them when needed. The money provided through Metro-LEC is for additional training in new techniques. The Child Abduction Response Team (CART) requires a detective from each member agency be involved and it is mandatory to attend the initial forty hour training. This costs the home police department
about $1,500. per individual. Then there is an annual follow-up training per year that lasts two days. The Public information Unit attends a three day FBI training in the initial start up thus only requires money when there is a new member to the unit. This division is also responsible for maintaining the Mass Most Wanted website. There are three people trained in technical support and who often handle inquiries from the press as well as other law enforcement officials. The personnel typically work on the website during their on-duty hours and offer support to other State most wanted websites (i.e. CT, RI, ME, and NH).

The CID is typical of most detective units in police departments, thus a cost comparison is not appropriate. However, they did establish a CART unit that required specialized training and retraining every year. A CART unit requires a regional, organized and coordinated response to an abducted or missing child. CART units are being established all over the country, typically being spearheaded at the county level. Each individual member agency pays for its officer(s) to attend the training and the backfilling of that position if necessary. The training costs about $1,500. per individual. The public information unit attends a 3 day FBI training session at start-up, which equals 24 hours X $48. = $1,152. This Division is a minimal cost division to the organization and the member agencies. The detectives are already trained, and require only the CART training which the home agency pays. The Metro-LEC does pay for the training for the public information unit. The average cost for membership in the Metro-LEC with access to the Motorcycle unit is $16,324.
Summary of cost analysis

The comparison of costs per agency implementing a specific unit and the cost of a member agency in Metro-LEC is complicated by many items that are shared or donated. As mentioned before the chief executive officers devote quite a bit of their time to the administration of the organization. Grant funds are sought to help pay for items. The organization is no more successful at obtaining grant funds than individual police agencies. Moreover, other police departments have donated items (e.g. Cambridge PD donated a transport vehicle for SWAT). Individual agencies donate resources above and beyond their required dues.

Different law enforcement agencies hold different perceptions on what is needed for each unit. For example, some law enforcement officers may insist that ten members of a SWAT unit is not the minimum that is needed. Thus, there is much discretion on what the appropriate minimum numbers are and even the amount of training needed and equipment used. For purposes of this research, the least amount of personnel, training, and equipment were utilized in an effort to compare costs on the most basic level. Table 34 presents a summary of the costs from the literature above. As can be seen from Table 34, the Metro-LEC member law enforcement agency pays their annual dues and their ten percent personnel dedication and has access to a variety of services. For comparison purposes the median number of sworn personnel for the member agencies was used for the basis for comparing. The largest member agency in Metro-LEC has 101 sworn personnel. If we use that figure for the 10 percent personnel, we have (101 x .1 = 10.1 then 10.1 x 8 hours per month = 80.8). This agency is expected to contribute 81 hours of personnel time per month. If we use the $48. per hour overtime rate, we find that 81 x
$48. = $3,888. then $3,888. x 12 months = $46,656. plus the annual dues of $2,500. = $49,156. per year. Thus, even with the largest member agency in Metro-LEC, the agency is saving costs by being a member. The Metro-LEC has a set budget (i.e. the annual dues) and does not spend more than it has available. The organization actively seeks grants in order to supplement their budget. However, with the recent economic recession, grants have not been as forthcoming from State or Federal sources and many of the respondents in both the officer and chief executive officer surveys noted that difficulty that causes the organization. Table 34 provides a summary of the costs for special operation units for an individual police agency and a Metro-LEC member agency.

Table 34: Cost comparison for units between individual agency and Metro-LEC member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Police Agency</th>
<th>Metro-LEC member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWAT (based on a 10 officer unit)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start up cost</td>
<td>$942,660.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year operating cost</td>
<td>$132,660.</td>
<td>$16,324.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Negotiations Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start up cost</td>
<td>$622,640.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year operating cost</td>
<td>$10,640.</td>
<td>$16,324.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K9 Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start up cost</td>
<td>$27,000.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year operating cost</td>
<td>$7,000.</td>
<td>$16,324.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start up cost</td>
<td>$80,000.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year operating cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,324.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Abduction Response Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start up cost</td>
<td>$1,500.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year operating cost</td>
<td>$1,500.</td>
<td>$16,324.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start up</td>
<td>$1,152.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year operating cost</td>
<td>$0.</td>
<td>$16,324.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyber Crime Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start up</td>
<td>$90,000.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year operating cost</td>
<td>$22,000.</td>
<td>$16,324.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL 1 year operating costs</strong></td>
<td>$173,800.</td>
<td>$16,324.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: records from Metro-LEC*
Chief executive officer’s perspectives

Costs associated with membership

The survey completed by the chief executive officers also provides some information about their perceptions of the cost effectiveness of regionalizing selected police services. The survey had a few questions pertaining to the costs and benefits associated with regionalization. The response rate for the survey is 67 percent.

The first question asked respondents if they believed the Metro-LEC provided a cost effective means for regionalizing selected police services. Approximately 90 percent of the respondents reported yes, membership in Metro-LEC. Only three percent reported no, and seven percent reported that some services were cost effective. One respondent stated that the Rapid Response Team, Special Weapons and Tactics team, and the Motorcycle unit were the services that resulted in a cost savings.

Furthermore, the chief executive officers were asked about the percentage of their total police budget that they allocate for Metro-LEC activities as can be seen in Table 35. Approximately, 66 percent of respondents reported that less than 1% of their budget is allocated for Metro-LEC activities and another 35 percent reported that they allocate between 1% and 3% of their budget for Metro-LEC activities. There were no respondents who reported that they allocate more than between 1% and 3% of their budget to Metro-LEC activities.
Table 35: Percent of chief executive officers total police budget allocation for Metro-LEC activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 %</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1 and 3 %</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 3 and 5 %</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another question asked respondents how difficult it is for their agency to fulfill the monetary and personnel requirements for membership in the Metro-LEC. As can be seen from Table 36, a majority of respondents (62%) reported that it was somewhat difficult, while three percent reported it being very difficult to fulfill the membership requirements. The explanation of difficulties resulted in responses about overtime costs, budget limitations, and lack of available grant funds. Only about 28 percent of respondents reported that it was not difficult for their agency.

Table 36: Level of difficulty chief executive officers’ experience in fulfilling monetary and personnel requirements for Metro-LEC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not difficult</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat difficult</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very difficult</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary of the chief executive officers’ perspectives, the Metro-LEC appears to offer a cost effective means of providing a variety of services to member law enforcement agencies and their respective communities through a regionalization of selected police services. A majority of chief executive officers report believing the Metro-LEC to be cost effective, however, many agencies still report it being difficult to
fulfill the membership requirements to participate as a member of Metro-LEC. The next section will examine any benefits associated with such an endeavor.

Benefits associated with membership

The data for comparing the benefits that are perceived to exist when regionalization of law enforcement agencies occur were gathered from the survey administered to the chief executive officers of the participating law enforcement agencies. As described earlier in Chapter III, there are several associated benefits that the Metro-LEC describes as part of the regionalization of police services.

The regionalization of selected police services allows officers who participate in a regional unit to gain additional training, expertise, and also more responsibilities. It is believed that being a part of the regional elite unit offers job satisfaction to officers, particularly in small to medium sized law enforcement agencies. The survey administered to the chief executive officers asked whether their officers who participate in Metro-LEC activities have increased job satisfaction. The result was that 100 percent of the respondents reported yes: their officers have gained job satisfaction from participating in Metro-LEC activities. In addition, space was provided for chief executive officers to explain their answers. In Table 37, the reasons for officer job satisfaction are reported. The most frequent explanations included additional training (24 percent) and networking, training, and experience which was reported by another 24 percent of the respondents.
Table 37: Chief executive officers’ perceptions on increased officer job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for officer satisfaction</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional training</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation calls/ assignments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking, training, experience</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives more opportunities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism, self-worth, recognition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the benefits associated with regionalization is that it allows officers with special talents (e.g. computer expertise, sniper skills) to have a place to practice and make use of their talents even in a small or medium sized law enforcement agency. Chief executive officers were also asked whether participation in the Metro-LEC allowed them to retain talented employees. Approximately 35 percent of respondents reported yes in regards to officer retention. Another 28 percent responded no, while an additional 38 percent responded that they did not know whether participation in Metro-LEC helped to retain officers. Some of the reasons the chief executive officers believe Metro-LEC helps with officer retention include, officers staying happy and motivated in their job and that it gives talented officers a place. Some of the reasons why chief executive officers do not perceive officer retention include, officers that are involved in Metro-LEC units makes them more marketable to other agencies for transfers, and some chief executive officers report that they have too few officers involved to notice any change.

Another associated benefit that might result from regionalizing police services is the ability of individual agencies to attract or recruit more employees to their agency because they have more to offer. Chief executive officers were asked whether their membership in Metro-LEC has helped them to attract or recruit new employees. As can be seen from
Table 38, about 59 percent responded no, while 28 percent responded unknown and only fourteen percent responded yes. The reasons for the inability to recruit new officers include the fact that the agencies have not hired new employees in several years, other factors are more important, that new recruits are not aware of the agency’s involvement in Metro-LEC, and the agency is a civil service agency and hires recruits off the civil service list. The reason given for the ability to attract new officers was due to the agency’s membership in Metro-LEC.

Table 38: Chief executive officers’ perceptions on whether membership in Metro-LEC helped recruitment of employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer recruitment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another associated benefit believed to exist with regionalizing selected police services includes the idea that officers share the knowledge they have learned through trainings in Metro-LEC activities with officers in their home agency. Chief executive officers were asked whether Metro-LEC officers shared their knowledge with officers in their home agency. As can be seen from Table 39, approximately 79 percent of respondents reported that officers do share their knowledge with other officers in their home agency. Another ten percent of respondents reported that officers do not share their knowledge, while the remaining ten percent reported that the question was not applicable to their situation.
Table 39: Chief executive officers’ perceptions on whether Metro-LEC officers share
knowledge with officers in home agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the associated benefits that might result from membership in the Metro-LEC, it is also important to understand any hardships that result from agencies’ regionalization. Chief executive officers were asked whether having officers attend Metro-LEC activities had left their agency understaffed. Approximately 38 percent of respondents reported yes, while another 62 percent reported no, their agency had not been left understaffed. Additionally, chief executive officers were asked whether the additional duties imposed by Metro-LEC membership presented any difficulties to the member officers. Approximately 63 percent of respondents reported not at all, while another 37 percent reported somewhat. Some of the reasons that were given to the additional duties presenting somewhat of a difficulty to officers include other officers resenting the overtime that was given to the Metro-LEC officers and that only a few officers can participate so there is some friction between officers.

The last issue of importance regarding hardships or benefits associated with regionalizing selected police services involves the morale in the individual member agency. The chief executive officers were asked about positive and negative effects on supervisors and frontline officers in their respective agencies. Giving supervisors options and tools to handle situations was reported by 41 percent of respondents to have a positive effect on supervisor morale. Issues related to overtime was reported by seven
percent of respondents to have a negative effect on supervisor morale. Overall 55 percent of respondents reported that involvement in Metro-LEC had a positive effect on supervisor morale, while only fourteen percent responded that involvement had a negative effect on supervisor morale and 31 percent responded unknown.

The chief executive officers were also asked about positive and negative effects on frontline officers in their respective agencies. Overall 68 percent of respondents reported that involvement in Metro-LEC had a positive effect on frontline personnel morale, while only five percent reported that involvement had a negative effect on frontline personnel morale, and 27 percent responded unknown. Approximately 23 percent of respondents reported the reason for the positive effect on morale was due to wanting to be part of an elite group and another 23 percent reported a general positive effect on morale. The five percent that reported a negative effect on frontline personnel morale reported it was due to jealousy issues.

**Conclusion**

The Metro-LEC appears to be a cost effective means of regionalizing selected police services for small to medium sized law enforcement agencies. The costs of regionalizing the selected police services offers a cost savings to police agencies, even the largest agency which has to dedicate the most personnel to Metro-LEC activities sees a cost savings by regionalizing. The associated benefits are a bit more obscure. All respondents did report seeing officer job satisfaction, however, the agency’s ability to retain talented officers and to recruit new officers was less promising. Indeed, involvement in Metro-LEC activities made officers more attractive to other law
enforcement agencies that are hiring. However, chief executive officers did report that
Metro-LEC officers did come back to the home agency and shared knowledge or training
with other officers.

In terms of hardships for the home agency, there appears to be some mild hardships
that come with membership in Metro-LEC. A majority of the respondents reported that
they had some difficulty in meeting the annual dues and personnel dedication. However,
that is not surprising given our current fiscal recession. Although, only a few respondents
reported that their agency was left understaffed due to officers participating in Metro-
LEC activities. The majority of respondents reported that involvement in Metro-LEC has
had a positive effect on morale for frontline personnel and supervisors.
CHAPTER X
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The goal of this research project was to determine whether the law enforcement council approach, as practiced by the Metro-LEC, to regionalizing selected police services is viable, sustainable, successful and cost effective. In order to evaluate this endeavor, data were gathered from officer surveys, chief executive officer surveys, and records and statistics from the Metro-LEC organization. The overall conclusion is that a law enforcement council approach to regionalization, as practiced by the Metro-LEC, provides services to area police agencies that are needed and utilized.

Key Findings

The units within the Metro-LEC are successful as demonstrated by the reports from the chief executive officers that have used them, by the frontline officers themselves, and by the increase number of agencies utilizing them. The viability of the organization is demonstrated through its mission of continually addressing the needs of the member agencies. The organization has increased in the number of members, increased in the number of divisions and units, and increased in the number of officers participating in activities, events, and trainings. Lastly, the Metro-LEC provides a cost savings to member agencies by providing services and operational teams that an individual agency may not have the means to accomplish by itself. Moreover, the participation in the organization provides an insurance policy for the community, because the police
department will be able to activate specific units within Metro-LEC to assist with a critical incident that goes beyond the police department’s capability in terms of scope and/or duration.

Another key finding relates back to the theoretical concepts discussed in Chapter IV regarding fragmentation of law enforcement agencies and how it relates to efficient police services. Debates continue regarding consolidation of small police departments and whether small agencies will be able to provide the services needed to their community. The findings from this study show how regionalization can be used instead of consolidation, thus maintaining home rule (i.e. local control) and structure intercommunity spillovers that naturally occur into a more formalized entity.

**Policy Implications**

There is a need to be fiscally responsible, particularly in today’s economy yet there is still a need to provide myriad services to the public. Small to medium size police departments are not fiscally capable of providing a range of those services that might be needed in their community. They may indeed be able to house one or two of the special operations units, but could not establish all the services and programs that the Metro-LEC provides. Additionally, a smaller police department cannot rely on a larger police agency to assist all the time. Each local police department is responsible for public safety in their jurisdiction. Mutual aid is used frequently on an emergency basis, but is not meant to relieve the local police of their responsibility. In other words, it cannot be taken advantage of to cut costs to one jurisdiction and supplement or supplant by utilizing resources of another larger jurisdiction (Correspondence, 2010). Thus, a law
enforcement approach allows small to medium size agencies the resources to establish services and programs that they consider most important to their communities.

The other important aspect to the research findings is the emphasis on successful collaborations. The tasks and responsibilities of law enforcement officers are continually changing. As discussed in Chapter I, even small police agencies are responsible for preventing terrorist attacks and responding to critical incidents. The ability of small agencies to provide themselves with the means of responding to any damaging event that may occur in their community is important for public safety. The law enforcement council approach is successful in bringing together various independent agencies (both private and public), sworn and non-sworn personnel for purposes or mutual aid. The law enforcement council approach provides an immediate benefit in the form of an insurance policy while other collaborations such as task forces only provide benefits when successful outcome measures have been achieved.

Limitations

This research has some limitations that require further explanation. The limitations of the study center around the low response rate from the officer surveys and the generalizability of the results from this study. First, the low response rate from the officer wave two surveys may have resulted from the distribution method of the questionnaire. The wave one survey that was administered in 2004, utilized a similar distribution method and received a high response rate of 75 percent. However, the wave two surveys only had a response rate of 40 percent, thus a majority of frontline officers
perspectives regarding the Metro-LEC are not available, hindering our confidence in the results.

The second limitation needing further clarification involves the generalizability of the results of this study. The study only used data pertaining to the Metro-LEC, thus the results are not generalizable to other law enforcement councils. There are several LECs that operate in the Northeast and have their own missions and purposes, thus the information about the operations of the Metro-LEC are not applicable to all LECs.

**Recommendations for future research**

There is a need for more comprehensive studies that detail the kinds of collaborations, mergers, and regionalizations that are occurring in response to the 9/11 attacks. Small police departments also need to be prepared to respond to critical incidents and detailing efficient ways of sharing resources has become a must. Future research should focus on when and where forming a LEC would prove beneficial and efficient. In other words, under what conditions would this regionalization be feasible? There may be a reason as to why LECs are found in the Northeast, thus future research should explore whether LECs could be replicated in other parts of the country. Moreover, there are elements that make for a successful collaboration that should be explored more closely with the Metro-LEC since it does appear to operate in a cohesive manner with forty three independent agencies.

Another research focus should examine the factors that allow agencies to maximize the net social benefit that can be produced from regionalization. This study provided the first examination of the costs associated with regionalizing selected police services and
comparing those costs to establishing those services within an individual agency. Future research may also want to examine the cost effectiveness of such an approach compared to cities that are self sufficient (i.e. Boston, Cambridge, etc) in terms of having the operational units in-house as well as the benefits from regionalization versus in-house units.

Moreover, as discussed in Chapter II, the landscape of policing may very well be changing, thus it seems important to explore the effects on regionalization of smaller police departments to larger cities that are not part of the collaboration. In other words, are there any advantages or disadvantages to a large urban city to have the smaller police agencies that border their jurisdiction involved in their own regionalization of special units? At times, larger urban police agencies would come to the aid for smaller jurisdictions, so what impact does regionalization have on the larger department?

Future studies might want to individually evaluate the different Divisions in Metro-LEC to determine their successfulness and how it compares to State Police Units and other law enforcement agencies to determine overall benefits and hardships of collaborations. There is scant research on special operation units in the literature. A related research inquiry should focus on the types of officers assigned or that volunteer for special operations units and the effects of this on other officers in their department (i.e. cultural changes within departments) as well as success of units.

Lastly, the types of services that are regionalized may have an impact on the success of the LEC. The Metro-LEC focused its regionalization on operational units (e.g. SWAT, CNT, MOP) as well as specialized knowledge (e.g. cyber crime). Future research should focus on other LECs that have concentrated in other areas of
regionalization (e.g. providing regionalized training, entry examinations, etc.) in order to better understand the elements that make a sustainable, successful and cost effective collaboration.

**Conclusion**

This study of the Metro-LEC provides the first evaluation of a law enforcement council and incorporates a cost effectiveness component. This research should prompt additional studies into law enforcement councils in particular, but also into collaborations that regionalize programs and services and make use of the skills found in officers in smaller police agencies. Lastly, more economic analysis should be conducted on the programs and services provided by law enforcement agencies. Economic analysis tools can assist decision makers in making more rational, scientifically based judgments (Cohen, 2000:264).
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