Mackinac Center for Public Policy

Issues and Ideas Forum

“Foot Patrol Policing: Engaging Michigan Communities One Step at a Time”

Speakers:

Dr. Frank Straub,
Director of Strategic Studies,
Police Foundation

Jeff Hadley
Chief,
Kalamazoo Department of Public Safety

Introduction and Moderator:

Kahryn Riley,
Policy Analyst,
Mackinac Center for Public Policy

Location: Radisson Lansing Hotel at the Capitol, Lansing, Michigan

Time: 12:00 p.m. EST

Date: Wednesday, March 8, 2017

[Kahryn Riley] Thank you for coming everyone. Good afternoon. My name is Kahryn Riley. I'm with the Mackinac Center, and I direct the criminal justice policy initiative at the center. I just wanted to welcome you and do just a couple of quick housekeeping items before we get started.

First, I'd like to start by thanking Auto-Owners Insurance for sponsoring today's event.

You'll find on your table copies of these Votespotter cards. Votespotter is an app that the Mackinac Center for Public Policy has produced that enables you to keep up with pending legislations. You can keep track of what your legislators are doing here in Lansing. That's available at the App Store and Google Play.

Today's topic is Foot Patrol Policing: Engaging Michigan Communities One Step at a Time.

As police departments seek to reduce crime, restore trust in law enforcement, and improve the strained relationship between officers and civilians, many have begun shifting to a more community-oriented operation.

A study produced by the Police Foundation considers how foot patrols may help agencies engage with the communities they serve in a positive, productive way. The paper studies five police departments in Cambridge, Massachusetts; Newhaven, Connecticut; Kalamazoo, Michigan; Evanston, Illinois; and Portland, Oregon that have adopted foot patrol and offers detailed description of how this strategy has been implemented.

Although foot patrol is manpower intensive, the study finds that this approach allows police departments to build relationships in the community that enhance the departments' problem-solving abilities. Both police officers and community members benefit psychologically from these improved relationships as well.

Our speakers today are Frank Straub, the Police Foundation's Director of Strategic Studies. He will discuss the study's findings and one of its featured police departments, the Kalamazoo Department of Public Safety.

Dr. Straub is a 30-year law-enforcement veteran, last serving as the chief of the Spokane Washington Police Department. In that role, he received national recognition for achieving significant crime reduction by implementing major reforms including community policing programs. Currently, he works on critical incident reviews including the San Bernardino terrorist attack and the Orlando Pulse nightclub shooting.

Chief Jeff Hadley, currently leads 225 sworn police and fire officers as the chief of the Kalamazoo Department of Public Safety and has worked with the Police Foundation since 2008.

In Kalamazoo, he refocused the department and strengthened trust and relationships between the community and officers. He initiated a racial-profiling study that resulted in improved culture, policy, and training throughout the city.

We'll be hearing from Dr. Straub first, and then Chief Hadley; and then, again, as you may think of questions, please be writing those down, and then we'll take questions. Thank you.

[Frank Straub] Good afternoon. So, how many of you have heard of the Police Foundation? Thanks, Jim. [Audience laughter]. Jeff and I have learned that whenever we speak, we should always bring a plant. So Jeff's boss, the city manager from Kalamazoo is sitting in the back. So if nobody asks questions, Jim already has a list of questions to ask to at least make Jeff sound intelligent.

So, as Kahryn said, I spent 30 years in law enforcement. One of the first things you do when you retire is grow a beard, so I've actually been out of law enforcement as a practitioner for a year and now have my beard going, so I'm trying to get the academic look in place.

A little bit about the Police Foundation: we were started in the early 1970s, really in response to the turmoil that we saw nationally and in policing during the 1960s, the riots and so on and so forth. And so the Ford Foundation, back then thought that it would be necessary and appropriate to create a foundation, a not-for-profit, independent foundation to look at policing, the state of policing, and try to move it forward. But move it forward through science and through empirical researching and studies.

So starting in the 70s, we began conducting, really, academic-type studies and academic-type research. When you look at the history of policing, one of the first studies that we conducted—and it's considered one of the seminal works—was on the use of patrol; and in that case, motorized patrol, in terms of reductions in crime. And that was called the Kansas City Control Study.

So did it make sense to flood an area with police cars? And if it did, did it have a direct result on crime levels in specific neighborhoods.

We also conducted studies of foot patrol in cities like Newark, New Jersey, for example, to see what the impact was of officers walking foot beats and their interactions with the community and so on and so forth.

About five or six years ago, we took on another mission, and Kahryn alluded to that, and that's the conduct of critical incident reviews. I've been involved and have lead and continue to lead a bunch of them. We did a review of the San Bernardino terrorist attack. We were commissioned, in that case, by the COPS office, the Department Of Justice, the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services to take a look at the public-safety response to that terrorist attack. That's available online at Policefoundation.org.

We were then asked to take a look at the Pulse night club shooting in Orlando, and we're currently working there; again, looking at the public-safety response.

We've worked with Chief Hadley's department in the city of Kalamazoo to do a review of the mass shooting that occurred a few weeks more than a year ago. That study should be out probably within two weeks to a month.

And so the idea is to look at these incidents that are of significance and try to flush out what went right and what went wrong and advance the field of policing by sharing those lessons learned.

In this case, the Charles Cooke Foundation came to us and asked if we would be interested in looking at foot patrol contemporaneously. So we have looked at it in the 80s, as I said, in Newark. There had been some work done by Temple University in Philadelphia; and we were asked to take a look at foot patrol in five different cities across the country that Kahryn identified. One of those was Kalamazoo.

We are at, I think—and I think it's fairly obvious—a critical stage in American policing. We have in some of our urban areas—Chicago—and I don't mean to single them out—Chicago, Baltimore, Indianapolis—pretty horrific crime rates, pretty horrific violent crime rates. And we're struggling nationally to figure out what do we do to intervene. How do we stop the bloodshed in those cities, particularly in high-crime, high-poverty communities or neighborhoods within those cities?

We've had a series of very unfortunate incidents that have claimed the lives of community members and also police officers. And I don't have to go through the list of those, but Ferguson and Baltimore and Dallas, for example, jump out.

And those incidents have caused in many communities a fissure between the police department and the communities they serve. It has caused a national discussion that questions police practices and how we police the communities that we serve.

And then I think we have a third area that is emerging: And that is the area of immigration reform and immigration enforcement, and how do we deal with that issue.

I believe that foot patrol—and I think our study shows it—is an integral part of those three conversations, that the benefit of foot patrol is that it allows police departments and police officers to establish baseline relationships with the individuals that they serve.

By establishing those baseline, personal, one-on-one relationships, it gives police departments the ability to do their job much more effectively. It gives police departments the opportunity to build relationship of trust. And trust comes from personal knowledge. If we know somebody, we're more apt to do business with them.

If we feel we are receiving a high level of customer service, we tend to do business with them—particularly in a society now that is so highly competitive, where we want to get our questions answered quickly. We want to get our benefits quickly. We want to get services quickly. And we want them to be of high caliber.

Well, I think more and more, we're expecting that same level of satisfaction from the government; and so those personal relationships built on exchanges on city blocks, by officers going into barber shops, by officers going into the corner store. And you'll hear about Jeff's initiative in a little bit.

Those give incredible opportunities for officers and community members to get to know each other. And as officers are able to build trust at the individual level and at the department level, their actions are seen as more legitimate.

And so those interactions give officers and chiefs and departments the opportunity to engage in dialog, to engage in listening opportunities, to hear about what are they doing right, what are some of the challenges that they face, and then, to coproduce, if you will, public safety with neighborhood residents and neighborhood businesses.

So I'll give you two examples very quickly from Evanston, Illinois, in terms of how this works.

How many of you have heard of Stop, Question, and Frisk? Pretty controversial subject, right? So, I'm from New York if you can't tell from my accent. New York, really, in many ways, pioneered aggressive Stop, Question, and Frisk.

Rudolph Giuliani, Bill Bratton, and—I think—others, Ray Kelly would say that that technique has directly contributed to the reduction in violence and the reduction in crime and, particularly, the reduction in gun-related violence in New York City because it was very intentional.

People became concerned that if they were carrying a gun, they were going to be stopped by the police, that they were going to be questioned by the police. And if reasonable suspicion and probable cause developed, they would potentially be searched by the police, and that gun would be taken away from them.

So what we saw is that less and less people carried guns, and they tended to leave them home.

So those arguments that precipitated violence didn't precipitate violence because the means wasn't there. Somebody didn't have a gun. They had to go home to get their gun. And by the time they came back, the person they were going to shoot was long gone, or they had cooled down, or a whole bunch of other things had happened.

But what we also saw with Stop, Question, and Frisk is that the New York City Police Department became a victim of its own success. In its very efforts to save violence-challenged neighborhoods, people that weren't engaged in gang activity or drug activity or violent activity were being stopped, questioned, and frisked by the police on a very regular basis. And the fault, in many ways, of the New York City PD story is that nobody ever stopped to take the pulse, to see whether there were unintended consequences emerging from a strategy that was highly successful on one level.

So we get to Evanston, Illinois, and we're there probably all of about 15 minutes, and the chief says, "You know, we have a very aggressive stop-and-question policy here."

I'm like, "Really?"

He's, "Oh yeah. No, we're very proud of that."

I'm like, "Do you read the paper? This is kind of an issue here." But I'm like, "OK, let's see how this goes."

And we go out, and we're doing a walk along with foot patrol officers, and they're talking about Stop and Question, and how aggressively they use it in Evanston's 5th Ward, which is their high-crime, high-poverty neighborhood.

So the next day we go to a meeting with the ward representative on the council, an older 75-year old woman, a person of color; and she says, "One of the things we're proud of in our community in the 5th Ward is Stop and Question."

I've got to ask the question: "How are you all touting this very controversial strategy and tactic?"

And she said, "You know, in all the years that we've been using it, we've only targeted one wrong person."

And notice the language: *We* only targeted one wrong person.

And she said, "As soon as that happened, the police very quickly apologized and explained what happened."

The community, the neighborhood, the residents, and businesses of the 5th Ward, because of their relationship with the foot patrol officers, were identifying the very people who were carrying guns and drugs and wreaking havoc in their neighborhood. And so they were coproducing neighborhood safety with those foot patrol officers because they had so much trust in these foot patrol officers that they knew that they would get it right, and if they screwed up, they would quickly admit that they screwed up and apologize.

And so because of that relationship, the Evanston, Illinois Police Department was able to use a very aggressive, controversial policy to reduce crime, and reduce violence, and reduce drug activity in Evanston's 5th Ward.

Similarly, they had an issue where they had a high influx of gang activity in one of the city parks. And the neighborhood residents approached the officers and said, you know, we're having a problem down here, particularly in the midnight hours.

And the officers worked with the community, worked with other government agencies, worked with the energy provider for the City of Evanston. And they trimmed the bushes, and they put up new lights, and they increased their presence in the park. And what happened? The gang activity disappeared.

So the value of those relationships, the value of trust, the value of convening legitimacy to police departments are what we found as probably the most critical outcome of foot patrols.

In New Haven, every single recruit police officer goes for a year to foot patrol. The idea being that, what is the best way for those officers to get to know the community and the people they're going to serve but by engaging them on a daily basis? By getting to know them. By getting to understand the chal-

lenges and issues that they confront. Extremely successful. Not only in those individual officers' careers, but in improving the relationship between police officers and the communities they serve.

In Cambridge, in Portland, what we found is that those cities, in their downtown areas, their central business districts, if you will, had very high levels of homeless individuals, had very high levels of persons who were in the area who were challenged by mental health issues. And what they used the foot patrol officers to do was not to arrest and incarcerate these individuals, but to connect them to services.

So they used the system to break that cycle of incarceration, and rather connect these individuals to treatment. So different models and different ways to use foot patrol.

When I was in Spokane, Washington, we had a very large population of homeless individuals. We had a very large population of individuals challenged by mental health issues. We were really the county seat. Spokane is the biggest city—if you go across the northern border of the United States from Seattle to Minneapolis—so about 210,000 or 220,000 people. And we were high dessert, so it was a beautiful climate and a beautiful place to live. So we had people that came through the city.

And what we found is that our foot patrol officers downtown accomplished two things:

One, worked very closely with that population and our community mental health providers to connect these individuals to services, which reduced quality-of-life crime rates downtown; but it also created business opportunities.

I would go down occasionally and do foot patrol with them, or bike control, and I remember a conversation with a group of young women, and I was like, "Why do you come here?"

And they're like, "Well, obviously, you're the biggest city and town. But we come here because we feel safe because of the presence of police officers and the amount of police officers. We feel very safe in this environment."

And I had heard the same thing several years before that when I was the police commissioner in White Plains, New York, and we had this burgeoning downtown, and we infused foot patrol and bike patrol into the area. And we saw a real rebirth of our bar and restaurant and entertainment businesses because people felt safe to be in the area.

So overall, as Kahryn said, we concluded that foot patrol was highly effective in building relationships. I think that as we look at those critical areas that we face in policing now, foot patrol provides an important strategy to help move police departments, and more importantly to move the communities they serve through some of those critical issues that are present and continue to emerge in policing.

With that, I'll turn the podium over to Jeff and let him tell you about the outstanding work that they've done in Kalamazoo, which, as Kahryn noted, was really the prime feature of our report because of the outstanding work that Jeff and his team have been doing in Kalamazoo. Thank you.

[Jeff Hadley] Well, thanks to Dr. Straub and the Police Foundation, number one, for allowing us to participate in the foot patrol study. I want to give a shout out to my boss here to support me and the city of Kalamazoo as we speak with you today.

Let me back up a little bit to give you a context in which we embarked upon our foot patrol initiative, if you will.

In 2012, the city of Kalamazoo and the Kalamazoo Department of Public Safety undertook a traffic-stop data analysis or a racial profiling study, which is commonly referred to. And that study came back with some significant disparate impact in our city.

We had to acknowledge that and recognize that. It really challenged us to really look at what we thought was right and what we thought we were doing in the city and to really double down on our efforts around engaging in our community because we knew no matter however we were going to go forward, it had to be with the foundation of trust. And you only get that through positive human interaction.

So how could we create a significant more number of opportunities to engage our community, our residents, in a non-traditional way, in a non-enforcement type way? And you only get that by engaging your patrol officers.

And where I think law enforcement has failed historically is even when our intentions were right, and we were looking for—we created programs, or we created a community policing unit to engage our community, we left our patrol force harmless in that exercise.

They were the ones who were the call takers. They're going to go out and engage. They're going to go out and do the enforcement-type actions. And we left it up to some others to build the relationship.

And even from a mathematical perspective, that was an error because there are more patrol officers than anything in any police department, by and large. And they have the most opportunity to move the needle with the relationship with the community.

So we had the idea of, and the goal and the ambition, to knock on every residential door in our city in a span of about 12 months. And we got there in about 15 months. We weren't able to do it in 12. But that really began us on a path on two fronts: One, more opportunities to engage the community. And then, two, the officers themselves, the benefit that it had for them, not only from a job satisfaction standpoint, how they viewed the community, but also their ability to solve problems in the very neighborhoods that they were tasked with policing.

I'll share a couple of anecdotal stories to kind of drive home my point and much of what Dr. Straub said.

So one of our sergeants was out, probably in the first few months of the initiative, and he's been out for about two hours knocking on doors, engaging folks; and he's walking across the street across the other side of the block. And a gentleman walks up and shakes his hand and says, "Thank you. Really appreciate your being out here."

"Oh, you're welcome." Blah, blah, blah.

Well, as he walks away, there's a note in that sergeant's hand, and it's information on a shooting that occurred in that neighborhood a few days before, and it had a suspect information which happened to be *the* suspect in that shooting; and we were able to solve that crime.

Now think of the value in both ways. Not only from the community member's perspective, that they trusted that officer enough to go up, shake his hand, give him information; and then from the officer's perspective that, hey, this really works. I got information. I solved a problem, and I made my neighborhood safer.

And that was really—and what he told me—a light bulb went off for him. Because, I'm not going to lie to you, there are some officers who are like, "This is bogus! I don't want to be doing this! I'm a crime fighter. I'm a cop. This doesn't work!"

But, by and large, I'm telling you, those officers within several months of doing this, and the more opportunities they had to engage their community turned around and said, "You know what? There's a lot of good people out here. And they kind of support us. And they like us. And I like them."

And that is where it really started changing, to me, the internal piece for the officers. Because we often would talk about, well, we need to engage the community so the community sees us differently, right? So they get to know us. But we need to get to know them.

We have an arranged marriage with our community, right? It's arranged. We can't get divorced. Dr. Phil is not coming in and solving all our problems within an hour, right? So whether or not we're married day one or married for 50 years, you've got to work on that relationship, right? All the time. Every day. Consistently. And that's really what this initiative has allowed us to do.

And what I want out of it, aside from the trustful relationship, is that this becomes second nature for our officers, that's it's part of their toolbox. When they get in their squad car every day, and they turn on their computer, and they have to answer calls for service, or they do traffic enforcement, whatever the case may be, that they also think naturally, "I've got to get out of my car. I've got to go engage the community."

They're going to look for those opportunities as they drive down the street. Or they're going to get out intentionally and knock on five doors tonight. "Tonight I'm going to knock on five doors, and I'm going to see what's going on in my community. And I'm going to see if I can help solve some problems."

And when that becomes more organic, where I don't have to tell them to do it, or their sergeant doesn't say, "Ok, tonight you're doing this on this block," when that starts happening, and it *has* started happening, that's where I think culture changes, and that's where you're really moving the needle between a relationship with the community and your law enforcement agencies, so when problems happen—and they will happen—you can get through them in a constructive positive way: sit down like human beings, discuss the issues, be transparent, and that keeps your community whole.

If you don't have those relationships, what happens? You're on CNN, and we're all talking about what's going on in Kalamazoo or whatever other community that doesn't have a good relationship.

No different than your personal relationships, right? If you aren't talking to your wife or your husband, and you aren't having that dialog for months and months and months—and I always say, when I don't do the dishes, and I'm getting yelled at because I didn't do the dishes, it ain't because I didn't do the dishes, is it? It isn't, is it? It's the hundred other things I didn't do over the last few months, or you don't listen to me and I've been telling you. Or I got my hair done differently, and you didn't even notice. And you didn't remember a Valentine's card. Whatever it is that I've been yelled at a hundred times about.

But that's no different than communities. When you see something flair up across the country in a community, it quickly moves from the one incident to the hundred other things that the community now says about their police department. So let's avoid that. Let's stay together. And that's what brings about better police-community relationships.

And foot patrol, positive human contact between officers and community consistently, repetitiously will sustain your organization through times of trouble.

And that's why I believe in foot patrols.

So with that said, I'm sure Frank and I would love to answer questions from the audience and go from there.

[KR] Thank you both very much for sharing your thoughts with us.

I do have a question about the problem-solving orientation of community policing as contrasted to, maybe, an older theory of broken-windows policing that really focused on aggressive enforcement. I'm wondering how that contrast has been playing out in academia, the trend away from that and towards more problem-solving functions and how that's been playing out on the streets as well with the actual departments. We'll start with Dr. Straub, if you want to start.

[FS] Sure. So my dear friend George Kelling who came up with Broken Windows has been much maligned. Unfortunately, the maligning is not placed where it should be.

Broken-windows policing was really, at the end of the day, problem-solving policing. It was really foot patrol policing.

The idea that Kelling had with Broken Windows was that if you had officers in neighborhoods who knew the community, knew the residents, knew the businesses who then identified issues for them, that if they solved and worked with the community to fix broken windows, very small things, that that would then act as a deterrent for further crime because if you had a sense of order, people would be less prone to engage in criminal activity.

And it goes all the way back to a sociologist by the name of Jane Jacobs who talked about urban streets and encouraging people to be present on sidewalks and to be present in neighborhoods as not only a sign of neighborhood vitality but also as a deterrent to crime.

Unfortunately, the broken-windows theory of addressing quality-of-life issues morphed into a zero-tolerance policy that then caused the problems it had; but at the end of the day, Kelling's idea with Broken Windows is police officers engaging with the community to solve small quality-of-life issues to bring neighborhood safety and stability to reality.

[JH] I think what Frank referenced earlier being a co-producer of public safety with your community really is at the heart of it. I think that law enforcement, at times, hasn't known when to take the foot off the gas, if you will. But when the community, if you're constantly taking that community pulse or engaging them, and they're giving you the cue, yeah, we want you to go arrest those folks because they're wreaking havoc in my neighborhood.

And that's what people care about. Not that they don't care about crime generically or what's going on throughout the rest of the city. But any one of us, what we really care about is, what do we see when we get up in the morning and leave our house? When we come home, what do we see? Next door, across the street, will there be noise, trash, whatever the case may be? That's what we care about.

So, by and large, that's what people in those most challenged neighborhoods are really affected by. And so the when engagement happens with the officers, they give them the cue to take care of that problem, and the officers go ahead and do that, that's where that connectivity comes in; and we have to constantly stay connected to those folks in those neighborhoods so we know what they want from us instead of telling them what we're going to do for them. You know, chasing the drug cartel in Mexico, even though we have a drug unit in Kalamazoo, and we're not really worried about what's going on in the neighborhood, but we're chasing something else that the community may not necessarily want.

[KR] A couple of practical questions. In cities where foot patrols are implemented, do you see an increase in the amount of calls that citizens make to police to report crime? And what happens in winter in Kalamazoo when it's snowy and cold?

[JH] Good question! I think that, yes, we're getting more calls. And that's OK. That's what we want. When we don't hear anything, we can't mistake silence for everything's OK. You know, if they trust us enough to pick up the phone and call us and give us information or request our assistance, there's a certain measure of trust that can be gauged relative to that.

In reference to the weather question, we've had a pretty good winter this far, but we do have that identified through our coding system. We still go out and do foot patrols. We're not trying to knock on every single door. But it does occur; and it happens without the direction of management, if you will, and that's the big take-away for me. When it's happening because officers actually do it because it's part of their tool box, that's when you know it's taken root in your organization.

[KR] A couple of questions about expanding the program: When it comes to biracial citizens, it looks like this foot patrol seems to be a viable solution in many ways. Also with respect to the Dallas shooting and small businesses, again referencing the foot patrol community policing as potentially a really good solution to some of the problems people are facing right now, how can we expand community policing programs, and how can people get involved?

[FS] I think one of the things you have to recognize, and the study talks about it, Kahryn alluded to it, is that foot patrol is labor intensive, right? And so you have to do it in some of the ways that it's done. The way that Jeff handles it is really a community satisfaction, knock on every door in the community on a regular basis type situation.

In other cities that we talked about in the study, it's a dedicated unit assigned to a specific area or a series of areas. That's where the labor intensiveness comes from. And what you find, and we saw this in Evanston, which is about the size of Kalamazoo PD, that some officers become very critical. And they say that you're not taking calls for service. You two guys or you two ladies or you lady and male officer are walking the streets. And you're just schmoozing and hanging out with people having a good time. So how bad is your life?

Meanwhile, I look at my computer in the car, and I've got calls backed up waiting for me to respond to them, so maybe you should stop walking, and you should take some of the call volume.

I always looked at it from the perspective as a chief that I was never going to have enough police officers. It's impossible. We can't afford it. So what do I have to do? I have to figure out ways to decrease call volume. And when you do studies—and we were talking earlier, Kahryn, about the Council for Safe Governments, for example—they did a lot of work around mental health issues. And what you find is that there are people in every community there are high users of the system.

We had an individual in Spokane who generated over a thousand calls for service himself every year. He was a very large man. He had both physical and mental health issues. And so every time he needed to go to the doctor, or if he fell, it generated an EMS call, a fire call, and a police call. So a thousand calls for service. One person.

Well, we started to look at that and say, well, what could we do to help this individual? And we were able, over time, to connect him to a series of services. He went through from a thousand calls for services to ten calls for service. So look at the call volume reduction there and look how much time I'm freeing up for police officers, fire fighters, and EMS to do other work.

The problem comes—and Jeff, I think, can relate to this—is community members and government officials want pretty quick results. So if Jeff goes on TV tonight and says, "Listen, I know crime is going up. But we're going to take the next six months to a year to use foot patrol and our knock-and-talk policy to build relationships. And at the end, we're going to see crime go down." The vast majority of people are going to say, "Look, we're paying you to reduce crime. I don't want to get hurt or shot." Or, "I don't want my family to be victimized. I want you to do something now."

And so there's this tension that always exists between can we go slow and methodical and build base-line relationships that at the end of the day have an economic benefit and have a practical benefit; or do we do surges in police presence, and do what we know how to do: knock 'em down and drag 'em out and off to jail. And we see this, what I think is a very prophylactic solution. Crime goes down because of intensive police pressure. As soon as you remove the intensive police pressure, crime starts to go back up.

But when you look at foot patrol and you look at the work that Jeff is doing in terms of building those relationships, I believe that you're going to see a sustained reduction in crime and increased levels of customer satisfaction.

[JH] I think that how the community can help is, one, engage. Number one. Care about what's going on in your community around public safety and around your police department and what they're doing.

It takes an enormous amount of capacity to engage the community. Again, if you have an understaffed law enforcement agency that they're running from call to call to call, they're not going to have time to get out of their car and engage you in the manner in which they should. And you can ride that pony for a little bit, but at some point there's going to be no relationship because they're just out humping calls and not building the relationships that they need with their communities.

So get involved in the budget process. Understand what's going on with your law enforcement agency, and realize that short gains today by eliminating x-amount of officers may not prove fruitful one year, two years, three years, four years, five years down the road.

With that said, if you're going to come in and support your agency and advocate against budget reductions or a number of officer reductions, then dang sure expect your agency to have some type of strategic plan to engage your community in a manner that will built trust and legitimacy for them.

So don't let them off the hook by saying, "Hey, I'm going to support you. We don't want budget reductions," then allow them to do nothing with that capacity that they're keeping because of your support.

[KR] On that same thread, what is the legislature's relationship to various community policing programs at different agencies, and how can either legislative staffers or private people be cooperating with the legislature?

[JH] You're talking about state legislature?

[KR] Yes.

[JH] Well, I think I could get into the lack of revenue sharing from the state of Michigan to local municipalities.

So I have my own opinions about that because I think that—I'm just going to speak frankly. I started Kalamazoo in 2008. I had 249 sworn officers allocated to my budget. Because of all kinds of budget

constraints, I had to cut down 210. We've been able to crawl back up to a level of 225. But think of that: forty officers. That's almost a hundred thousand hours of work that's not getting done.

So those are the real-life implications that we've had to deal with in the city of Kalamazoo. So just from a legislative perspective to look at the financial models here in Michigan and how the state supports local municipalities in the revenue sharing.

[KR] We had a brief reference a moment ago to race. I noticed in the study, I think it was in Evanston where they documented a distinction in the perception of law enforcement based on the citizen's race, and they were able to close that gap when they engaged in community policing. Dr. Straub, can you talk a little bit about how race might play into some of this, and how progress has been made in that respect?

[FS] When we come right down to it, and we look at policing issues across the country, in many ways, it really does come down to a race issue. I would boil it down even further and say it comes to a human-interaction issue. And so it's interesting, and again I'll use the word *prophylactic*. We are now about training police officers on implicit bias and so on and so forth.

Where I see the value, though, in a program like New Haven's, where you get young police officers, and for the first year of their life in policing, they're forced to have human interactions with people who look like them but also with people that don't look like them. People that speak their language and people that don't speak their language. People that don't speak. People that don't hear. And they really get to form those human contacts, which I think are essential to effective policing, which are really, at the end of the day, effective to race relations.

It's building—it's not seeing police officers as uniforms, and it's not seeing somebody who looks different from me for their differences, but being able to see those people and engage those people, police officers or community members, as people. And so what we find when we look at foot patrol is that we develop sound human interactions and the ability to listen to each other and communicate with each other regarding very difficult subjects sometimes.

So I alluded to it. You know, the new administration's emphasis on immigration enforcement. Having worked in cities with very high immigrant communities—White Plains isn't officially a community of immigrants. Unofficially, when you look at school records, we're over 50 percent—I can tell you that that community right now is very fearful of what's going to happen. And that's where the police officer who's going door to door or the police officer who's having personal interactions with individuals has the opportunity to listen to those community concerns and also has the opportunity to be an ambassador for the department, to be an ambassador for the city, to translate in an effective manner what the policy looks like and how it's going to be implemented in that given community.

And so, I think that it's easy to go to a class. It's easy to sit there for whatever period of time and then say, well, I've got this now. It's much harder to have human interactions.

And the last thing I'll say, which I guess is one of my biggest concerns, is we live in a generation that has lost the art of interpersonal communication.

I have two older children. I have a 30-year-old and a 25-year-old. If I want to have substantive communication with them, I send them a text message. Unless they need money, and then I have a shot at getting a telephone call. But that's the reality, right? We live in this virtual world. And, really, we don't have to talk to each other anymore.

My dad died two weeks ago, and I'm trying to figure out the finances. The most frustrating part is I can't find a human being to talk to. Every insurance company or every brokerage house or every bank, I have to go through the computer and hope that if I hit zero, it's going to get me to an actual person who can then explain to me how to go back to the computer and use it to do what I need to do.

But we have a generation now of police officers who don't really know how to talk to each other. What's the essence of what we do in policing? We engage people and we talk to people. And the most effective police officers are those that know how to talk to people. They know how to listen to people. They don't have to use force. They don't have to use force at the rate that other officers do.

And so, I think, that's the value when we talk about race issues is it's a human interaction issue.

[KR] Chief Hadley, Western Michigan, do they have their own police force?

[JH] They do.

[KR] Have you had any interactions, whether positive or negative, with police agencies that may not be practicing community policing where you had to operate together with another agency and maybe have different approaches?

[JH] Well, with Western Michigan, it's interestingly enough their newer chief retired from Kalamazoo Department of Public Safety, and he was one of our community policing lieutenants, so it was obviously a great working relationship with WMU.

You do, from time to time, run against other agencies that don't necessarily adopt the philosophy that you do. But I can't say it's really caused us any heartburn because we operate within our city limits and within our jurisdiction. And other than maybe the sheriff's office from time to time being in our city, we don't have to do enforcement actions or do any type of other law enforcement initiatives very often with other law enforcement agencies.

We've really just tried to be a good partner with all of our agencies and maybe lead the way in some aspects, take their direction in others because there are a whole lot of good ideas and good things that are going on in law enforcement throughout this country, small agencies, big agencies. We're not so proud to say, "Hey, that's a great idea. I'll plagiarize that and steal that because it benefits our community." And hopefully we set the stage in other areas of law enforcement, and we're more than willing to share our ideas and our resources if we can.

[KR] This may be a question for the both of you. What about problem officers? It seems like many nationally-publicized police incidents involve officers who have had issues with aggressiveness in the past that may not have been handled. I know that Dr. Straub has observed some of these incidents.

[FS] I think that we are at a critical point in American policing. I think that we have to be very careful because what I used to always say to my officers is you pay our salaries. You also give us the authority to do our jobs. You give us the authority to detain somebody, to incarcerate somebody, or take somebody to incarceration, and, ultimately, to take a human life if we believe it's necessary to protect the community or our own life.

There's nothing else in America, there's no profession in America that is ceded that much trust. Doctors aren't. Lawyer's aren't. Nobody is. Except the police.

And so, with that comes, I think, a very high expectation for professionalism and the way one conducts themselves in terms of their interactions between community members and officers.

Unfortunately, I think that wars on drugs and the terminology around wars on drugs, wars on crime, wars on terrorism have led to the creation of several generations of police officers that see themselves as Navy SEALs or Delta Force operators.

Interestingly the individuals that I hired who came back from real combat and were real SEALs or real operators didn't have that and didn't exhibit those traits at all. It was more a problem for people who didn't have that reality but maybe watched too much TV.

But we have in departments, fortunately, and I hope in most departments, small groups of individuals that believe we're the police, and we're the police; and you're going to conform because I told you to conform. From my perspective, that's a hundred percent wrong. The citizen has every right to say to that officer you're going to perform because I pay your salary, because I've given you the ability to carry a firearm and handcuffs and so on and so forth.

But there is a fissure in American policing right now as to what is colloquial in reference to the warrior mentality and the guardian mentality. And I think somewhere in the middle lies where we need to be in law enforcement.

But as somebody who was a chief and struggled with a department that I was asked to come in and reform and deal with that group of officers, they can be very powerful. They can be very insidious. And they can force out chiefs. And you see reform chiefs last two to three years.

Somebody asked the question earlier about what can the legislature do, what can the community do, what can professional public managers do, what can elected officials do? Support chiefs. If you hire a chief to reform your police department, understand that things are going to get ugly, and they're going to get difficult. But you've hired a woman or a man to come in and reform your police department, you need to stand by them, just like Jeff's marriage analogy, in good times and in bad.

I think that we have to be very careful that we continue reform, that we continue to hold police departments and police officers accountable for their actions, rewarding the good actions and taking steps to reduce and eventually eliminate the negative actions that have caused so much harm.

[KR] I'll give you the last word on this.

[JH] This one aspect, I think, is one of the more misunderstood components of officer discipline is labor—collective bargaining agreements, Public Act 312 here in Michigan. It's the officer's due process.

So oftentimes, historically, chiefs who have taken on rogue officers or officers that they felt should not be part of the profession and certainly part of their organization, finding the courage to terminate them. And I can tell you, I've fired officers, but I tell you, when you have to sit across the table from someone, and you're taking away their livelihood, that's not easy to do. Let me tell you.

You painfully go through an internal process to get to the point that you understand that this officer should no longer be part of your organization. With that said, they have due process rights, and they can file a grievance, and it's arbitrated whether or not that officer is returned to your organization or the discipline is upheld.

And I can tell you, sometimes it varies from state to state. But we often kind of joke amongst the chiefs that it takes an act of Congress to fire an officer. And that's not the fault of the police chief. It's law. It's ingrained.

We're sitting in Michigan, probably the birthplace of collective bargaining with GM and the associated industries, so you can imagine how hard it is to terminate an employee that you no longer wish to work for you. But those are things that can be legislated and changed. But it takes time, and it takes a lot of energy and effort.

[KR] Well thank you both very much for coming and sharing with us. We're going to conclude the official program. Thank you very much for coming.