

and for special analysis. Consideration should also be given to disseminating prosecution report information to levels below the central office. For instance, in West Virginia, only the central office and the district office involved with the prosecution have copies of the prosecution report. A new report with an alphabetical listing of all prosecutions for the month will be provided for each district office. Thus, past violations of individuals will be readily available for appropriate prosecution of repeat offenders. Statewide prosecution information at the district level should also reduce the number of special requests for information regarding particular individuals. This in turn should reduce the cost of the system.

Tremendous flexibility is possible in a computerized system. It is possible to sort the data in any conceivable way. It is also possible to group together all records that have a particular set of characteristics. The only requirement is that the characteristics of interest be included explicitly in the records or that they can be generated from information in the records. These, and other advantages, will entice more game and fish law enforcement agencies into computerized record-keeping systems. As this happens, there is likely to be increased interest in making the systems uniform for purposes of cooperation and comparison between the agencies. This has already been recommended by Morse (1973). It would be desirable to develop uniform procedures as soon as possible in order to reduce or eliminate the need for changes in established systems at a later date.

West Virginia's Division of Law Enforcement is at the beginning of its system. Hopefully its experiences will be valuable contributions when the necessary steps have been taken to develop uniform procedures for computerized record-keeping systems.

#### LITERATURE CITED

Morse, W. B. 1973. Law enforcement—one-third of the triangle. *Wildl. Soc. Bull.* 1(1):39-44.

### **ROADBLOCK JUNCTION - ARKANSAS STATE HIGHWAYS 53 AND 24**

by

*Arvin E. Jones  
Wildlife Officer*

*Arkansas Game and Fish Commission*

#### ABSTRACT

The following paper is a summary of the planning, operation, and results of the first highly successful roadblock used by the Enforcement Division of the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission. It was held at the junction of Arkansas Highways 53 and 24, about twelve miles south of Prescott, Arkansas, in Nevada County. This roadblock resulted in thirty-one arrests and \$3,826.00 in fines and court costs for game and fish violations.

Arkansans bought 265,431 hunting licenses for the 1973-74 hunting season. Approximately eighty-one percent of the people that buy these licenses are deer hunters.

Over the last forty years, the Arkansas deer herd has grown from a few hundred in the 1930's and 1940's to well over 300,000 in 1974. Also increasing with the deer herd are the number of licensed deer hunters that enter our fields and woodlands each year. When you see the number of hunters increasing, you know that violations of game laws also increase along with them. This can be verified by the increasing number of arrests and convictions over the last few years. For example —

On November 13, 1973, the Enforcement Division of the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission felt that history was made in respect to reducing the number of violations that will occur in Arkansas in future years. The bit of history that was made is not really

history to the majority of law enforcement people; the technique that was used dates back many years. It just had never been used effectively by Arkansas Wildlife Officers as a means to detect violations.

On the evening of November 14, 1973, near the junction of Arkansas State Highways 53 and 24, about twelve miles south of Prescott, Arkansas, the first successful Game and Fish oriented roadblock was held. The roadblock was not by accident or a spur of the moment operation. It began about two years ago when the Wildlife Officer Supervisor of District B-4, Abb Morman, and the Nevada County Wildlife Officer, Arvin Jones, discussed the idea of blocking strategic routes to major highways during deer seasons and checking all suspicious vehicles for possible deer hunting violations.

They had reason to believe that many vehicles traveling to and from the deer woods were engaged in hauling illegal deer or illegal deer meat. Concerned hunters had informed them of camps and individuals within the Nevada County area that were engaged in such activities. Both men had searched camp after camp that had been reported to be possessing illegal deer meat. Nothing was uncovered! The Wildlife Officers felt that there was a reason for the meat not being found in the camps. Through the years, most of the camps had been caught with some sort of illegal deer or meat in the immediate camp area. This had caused the camps to keep the illegal meat well away from camp until after dark. The violators in these camps were believed to be hauling the illegal meat, etc., from their camps to their residences. In Nevada County there is easy access from the woods to State highways and then from State highways or the interstate highway to all major towns or cities. Once at his residence, a violator could leave the meat and return to camp or to hunt the next morning with no violation hanging over his head. After talking it over, Officers Morman and Jones decided to begin thinking about setting up some type of roadblock that would allow them to search vehicles traveling the roads and highways adjacent to the deer woods. The idea almost fell through at this time because it was unclear as to what would be probable cause to initiate a search and seizure. Also, feelings were mixed as to how the County Enforcement people and the State Police would accept the idea of Wildlife Officers blocking State highways. Then one day during the 1972-73 deer seasons as Supervisor Morman and Wildlife Officer Jones were patrolling State Highway 53 near Reader, Arkansas, they noticed a pickup truck traveling in front of them with spots of blood on the tailgate. They immediately pulled it over and found thirteen bundles of deer meat packaged in plastic bags. Neither of the two subjects operating the pickup truck could satisfactorily explain where the meat had come from. Arrests were made and the subjects were convicted. After this event, Morman and Jones were very enthusiastic about developing a roadblock that would satisfy all.

The following is the method that Officers Morman and Jones planned, and how it was used to carry out the entire roadblock operation. It includes objectives, personnel used, and an evaluation of the accomplishments that were made.

Before the legal means and extremes of the roadblock were discussed, Jones and Morman had to decide on a major highway route from the deer woods to Interstate 30. Interstate 30 is where the main flow of traffic headed to take the easiest route back to major towns and cities. The route picked was at the junction of Arkansas State Highways 53 and 24. After the spot was picked, it was decided that the major peak of movement of hunters to and from the deer woods would be from 5:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. Now that a time and place had been decided upon, the legal aspects could be discussed with law officials.

To be able to operate a roadblock to its maximum effectiveness, the County Sheriff and the Arkansas State Police had to be consulted to find out what their attitudes would be toward the whole operation. A meeting was arranged between the County Sheriff, Arkansas State Police Supervisors, and Officers Morman and Jones. During the meeting, other aspects related to the roadblock and a plan was talked over and agreed upon that would serve all the enforcement people. It was decided that all three groups would work the roadblock together. In this case, both traffic violations and deer hunting violations would be checked for at the same time.

Now that the State Police and County Enforcement people had decided to work with the Game and Fish personnel, there was still some discussion as to what would be probable cause for search and seizure of a vehicle. The Municipal Judge was then questioned concerning this matter. The Judge stated that probable cause could be — numerous hunting items inside a vehicle; hunting items worn by the subjects inside a vehicle, including guns, hunting clothes, shells or any other items related to hunting that might be visible. Blood on a subject or on any item related to hunting would also be probable cause, as well as, a complaint turned in on a vehicle or an individual. If any of these items were sighted, the subject could then be asked to allow the Wildlife Officer to search the vehicle. If the subject refused, a search warrant would have to be obtained. The question was then asked as to how long a person could be held while a search warrant was obtained. The Judge advised that the subject could be held a reasonable amount of time. He was briefed on the location of the roadblock and after the briefing, he ruled that it would take only a minimum of time to cover the distance from the roadblock to the courthouse in case there was need of a warrant. After the talk with the Judge and after receiving his approval of the roadblock, the Prosecuting Attorney was notified. He was also briefed on the entire plan and gave his approval.

Now that the legality, time, and place was confirmed and all agencies had agreed to work together, the final step was taken before actually setting up the roadblock. Chief of Enforcement, Bill Rice, was contacted and briefed on the entire plan. He, too, gave his approval.

It was decided to hold the roadblock on the second day of the first deer season, November 14, 1973. This would allow the hunter to settle, hunt a day, and attempt to move any illegal meat or deer that had been taken.

The actual roadblock began at 5:30 p.m. with seven Game and Fish Personnel, four State Troopers, the County Sheriff, and two County Deputies present. The number of personnel that each group had was felt to be sufficient to cover all the vehicles. The main block was established on a stretch of road that had easy "on" and "off" access. This enabled violators to be pulled to the shoulder of the road and arrested without fear of an accident with an oncoming vehicle. Two State patrol cars were placed facing each other on the north and south shoulder of the road. They were left running and their blue lights left flashing. This would be the warning signal for oncoming traffic to stop. There was a Game and Fish vehicle with one Wildlife Officer and one State Trooper hidden just at the curve where an oncoming vehicle could see the blue flashing lights and still have time to turn around or throw out any illegal object, such as deer meat or a can of beer, etc. The hidden car could then stop the vehicle before it could turn around and make a getaway. By having a Trooper and a Wildlife Officer together in the hidden car, any illegal object could be used as probable cause.

At 5:30 p.m., the first car was stopped at the roadblock and found to be clear. From then on, until the roadblock was discontinued, an extremely higher percentage of cars stopped were involved in a deer hunting or traffic violation. Five of the seven Wildlife Officers checked cars. Once a violation was discovered, the vehicle was made to pull over. Citations were then written by the other two Wildlife Officers while the others went ahead and checked the next vehicles. The four State Troopers, County Sheriff, and the two County Deputies wrote the traffic citations themselves as they came to them. However, as the cars were being checked, all enforcement people would check for the other violations. For example, a Wildlife Officer might notice an opened can of beer. In this case, he would alert a nearby Trooper or Sheriff. On the other hand, if a Trooper or Sheriff noticed guns, blood on the bumper, etc., a Wildlife Officer was alerted. This worked quite well because all cars were inspected for a number of violations; either game or traffic, and really made it possible to cover more cars faster and more thoroughly with fewer personnel. At 9:30 p.m. the traffic had slowed to almost nothing. With a feeling of satisfactory accomplishment by all personnel at the scene, the operation was broken up.

Attached is a list of the type of violations and fines obtained from roadblocks held on the 14th, 15th, 16th, and 18th of November. It includes all citations that were issued by all parties that participated in the roadblocks.

The previous report is a detailed description of the planning and actual setup and operation of the first successful Game and Fish Commission oriented roadblock. Roadblocks were used throughout the continuing days of the 1973 deer seasons. They were held at different locations and at different times. Much was accomplished, and many ideas were brought to mind during these blocks. One restriction was made by Chief Bill Rice on setting up future roadblocks — at no time would interstate highways be blocked.

The main thing that enabled the roadblock to work so safely and successfully was the fact that all enforcement factions were aware of the benefit that could be derived. The success of any court system is usually attributed to the cooperation that each law enforcement agency gets from the other. The entire roadblock was a total success because each phase was analyzed and understood by each group represented. Through cooperation and understanding between the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission, the Arkansas State Police, the County Sheriff and his department, the Municipal Judge and the Prosecuting Attorney, more lives will be saved and more people will think twice before pulling the trigger on an illegal deer.

### CITATIONS WRITTEN DURING FOUR ROADBLOCKS

#### Citations Written By The Arkansas Game and Fish Commission

Violation	Total Arrests	Total Bond w/Court Cost*
No Written Information on Meat (\$49.25)	15	\$ 738.75
Possessing Illegal Deer (\$124.25-\$814.25)	6	1,944.75
Failure to Check Deer (\$74.25)	1	74.25
Non-Resident Hunting on a Resident License (\$74.25)	1	74.25
Killing Illegal Deer (\$124.25)	8	994.00
TOTAL—	31	\$3,826.00

#### Citations Written By The Arkansas State Police & County Officers

Violation	Total Arrests	Total Bond
D W I	6	Information
Vehicle License	7	was not
Minor Possession	1	available
No Tail Lights	1	
No Driver's License	1	
Drinking on Highway	14	
Warnings	27	
TOTAL—	57	

\*Court Cost in Nevada County is \$24.25

\*\*All Citations issued by Wildlife Officers were to residents of major towns and cities outside of Nevada County

PERSONNEL USED IN ROADBLOCK AT #53 AND #24  
ON DECEMBER 14, 1973

*Arkansas Game and Fish Commission*

Mr. Bill Rice, Chief of Enforcement  
Mr. Dick Broach, Administrative Assistant  
Mr. Abb Morman, Wildlife Officer Supervisor  
Mr. Arvin Jones, Nevada County Wildlife Officer  
Mr. Jack Starnes, Ouachita County Wildlife Officer  
Mr. Kenneth Griffin, Ouachita County Wildlife Officer  
Mr. Greg Mathis, Game and Fish Technician

*Arkansas State Police*

Mr. Cleve Barfield  
Mr. Phil Straub  
Mr. Bob Cockman  
Mr. Tommy Carman

*Nevada County Sheriff and Deputies*

Mr. Clyde Covington, Sheriff  
Mr. William Mullins, Deputy  
Mr. Paul House, Deputy

**AN OPINION ON THE POTENTIAL FOR APPLYING  
PUBLIC RELATIONS TO THE REGULATORY PROCESS**

by

*Aaron Pass*

*Public Relations and Information Specialist  
Georgia Department of Natural Resources*

**ABSTRACT**

This essay deals with the regulatory function common to all wildlife resource management agencies, and addresses this process specifically from the public relations aspect. It is hoped that these thoughts will stimulate thinking on the parts of both I & E personnel and top-level administrators on how to better utilize the regulatory publication to put forward agency goals and programs.

One of the harbingers of spring, as surely as the first bouts of hay fever, is the annual duty of producing and publishing the state hunting and/or fishing regulations for the year forthcoming. Aside from the pedestrian task of printing the official, "regulations as passed" to fulfill the legality of public notice, there is often the more sinister obligation to produce a "popular guide" form of these same regulations. This popular guide is the rosetta stone by which the dreary legalese of the official form is interpreted, and thus fulfills the spirit of public notice. More often than not, these tasks fall to the Information and Education Office.

To observe that the latter project is seldom viewed with unbridled joy in the I & E shop would not be an overstatement. To the I & E Chief it is a necessary evil, a time consuming complexity which further strains the capabilities of his already meager staff. To the staffer who is stuck with the job, it seems a dreary, boring task separating him from more prestigious magazine or television assignments. Some shops may have been so fortunate as to dodge the project altogether by shifting the responsibility to management or enforcement divisions - with a hearty sigh of good riddance, no doubt.

This is unfortunate because that dull little booklet may well have the largest potential readership of any publication produced by a public wildlife or natural resources