

chore that I think all commissions will accept wholeheartedly if they are given sufficient funds to initiate the needed programs.

The inspections program that I have outlined is an expensive endeavor. It will cost approximately \$18.50 for every inspection that is conducted. The number of inspections needed to adequately do the job in Florida represents more than a quarter of a million dollars annually.

For those of us who are funded primarily by the sale of hunting and fishing licenses, it is unfair to expect the sportsmen to shoulder such a financial burden. Programs such as this should be supported partially by the general public and specifically by the industry that must be regulated.

It is important that we recognize that every state represented here will in the coming years be dealing more and more with these problems. Since many of these areas will involve the interstate movement of animals, it is imperative that one hand know what the other is doing. I propose that each state review and publish its laws concerning exhibition, possession, transportation, importation and exportation of wildlife and that we exchange this material. Obviously all of our requirements will not be the same. However, an attempt to standardize where possible would help make an already complex problem less complicated.

In summation, we must recognize the severity of these problems, initiate projects to deal with them, specialize our personnel, exchange and where possible, standardize our requirements and in the process, exemplify the dedication of all state game and fish commissions to the conservation of all natural resources.

PLANNING AND FUNDING A COMPREHENSIVE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER TRAINING PROGRAM

Colonel J. Allen Woodburn

"What he don't know won't hurt him." How often we hear that quote, yet how ridiculously false it is. It is the *lack* of knowledge or the *misuse* of the knowledge one possesses which produces undesirable results.

Those charged with the responsibility of planning law enforcement training programs should ask themselves two questions:

1. What is training?
2. What is the objective of law enforcement officer training?

To *train* is to form by instruction, discipline or drill or to teach so as to make fitted, qualified or proficient.

The *objective* of the law enforcement training program is to make the officer prepared to skillfully perform the duties of his office and instill in him such confidence in his equals, superiors, subordinates and himself that he approaches his assignment with determination and enthusiasm.

Any law enforcement agency which fails to recognize that training must include instilling the will to enforce the law in each officer, as well as providing him the information he needs to perform his duties skillfully and with ease, cannot hope to bask in the limelight enjoyed by those who deliver superior performances.

Some may say, "What's the use of planning the most desirable training program? We don't have the money to place it in operation, so it would just be a waste of time." Well, don't you believe it. We must know where we are going, how we expect to get there and be able to justify the trip before the taxpayer is willing to pay the fare. A well planned, comprehensive training program is imperative if we are going to submit a sensible, reasonable and justifiable training budget request.

The first step toward planning and initiating a comprehensive law enforcement training program is the assignment of responsibility by the Chief, to some person in the central headquarters, for the program and delegating him the authority to carry out that responsibility.

The administrative and clerical duties in an intensive training program occupy considerable time; decisions must be made regarding subject matter to be presented and time allotment to each; length of school day determined; schedules must be prepared best suited to the work program of the officers and instructors; facilities for classroom, gymnasium, target range and demonstrations must be provided; records of attendance and examination scores must be kept; department and outside instructors must be assisted in preparation for their subject; material must be prepared for classroom distribution; enthusiasm for the program must be created and maintained; orders to initiate various phases of the program must be drafted.

Training is a continuous process and in addition to all the time consuming duties of the training officer listed above, it is his responsibility to assist superior or commanding officers in carrying out continuous training in techniques, procedures, policies and programs. Toward this end, he should prepare useful material and aid in its presentation, serving as an assistant (not necessarily present) of the officer in charge. He should provide each district a library sufficient to supply ready reference on law enforcement subjects applicable to the needs of the agency.

Chief Eye, recognizing these facts, on July 1, 1971, promoted a lieutenant to the rank of captain, assigned him to the Charleston Office, made him responsible for developing and activating the training program for the department and delegated him the authority to carry out that responsibility. It is a staff rather than a command position and he orders, directs or requests only in the Chief's name.

As the training officer approaches his job, he must classify the types of training to be offered and determine what the individuals at each level need to know to enable them to perform their duties skillfully and with ease.

Training can be classified in the following four categories:

1. Supervisory
2. Recruit
3. In-service
4. Special

Supervisory Training

The training plan is doomed to failure unless it provides adequate training for supervisory personnel. The officer's training begins the day he goes to work and continues throughout his employment. The vast majority of all the training he gets will be on-the-job training. His supervisor is charged with the responsibility of planning, directing, coordinating, evaluating and improving his performance and will make the major contribution in the development of his proficiency. The performance delivered at the operational level will be regulated by the ability of the supervisor to influence and motivate the officers under his command to work together in a common effort to achieve the purpose of the agency. Unless the supervisor is provided the knowledge he needs to apply proper techniques of supervision, even though he be a sincere and dedicated person, envy, discord and confusion may be created among the work force which results in the formation of incorrect opinions and the acquisition of faulty habits. Such opinions and habits once formed and acquired are much harder to change than it is to develop desirable ones from the beginning. A close knit law enforcement organization, striving in unity toward achievement of a clearly defined objective cannot be developed under the direction of a supervisory force lacking knowledge of the principles of their job, the application of which would en-

able them to create high morale, determination, enthusiasm, unity and pride in the officers they command.

Recruit Training

What the recruit needs to know will be regulated to some degree, by the scope of his responsibility and authority. The variation in natural resource law enforcement agency responsibilities, ranging from the enforcement of game and/or fish laws only, to authority to arrest for violation of any state law committed in the officer's presence, makes it readily apparent that no uniform natural resources law enforcement recruit training program can be devised which would be applicable to all states.

The purpose of recruit training is to enable the recruit to perform the tasks at the operational level with ease and, just as importantly, to form a foundation for continuous and special training in techniques, policies, procedures and programs which will be carried on by specialists, superior officers or commanding officers.

Remembering that we are providing a foundation for continuous training, there are some fundamentals such as, but not limited to, note taking, study methods, comprehensive writing, public speaking, law of arrest, search and seizure, rules of evidence, officer as a witness, interviews and interrogation, courts and court procedures, department organization and chain of command, supervisor-subordinate and officer-violator relationships, first aid, self defense, mechanics of arrest, statement taking, collection and preservation of evidence, police ethics, firearms training, human relations, warrant preparation, transportation of prisoners, police-press public relations and many others, which any person launching a law enforcement career must have thorough knowledge of. The time allotted even such basic subjects will deviate from state to state depending upon qualifications for employment established by the department.

Pre-course and post-course examinations should be conducted and records of the results kept on file. Such records can be utilized by the training officer to determine the extent of each trainee's knowledge of the various subjects prior to training, his degree of advancement in knowledge of the subject matter, his individual ability to comprehend and the ability of the various instructors to effectively present their subjects. Such determinations must be made in order to adjust the program to best fit the needs of the trainee.

The recruit training program must be geared to meet the needs of the least prepared and the presence of an occasional trainee with pre-employment or vocational training will have little influence upon the subject matter of the course.

In-Service Training

In-service training is the continuous process of keeping every officer abreast of changes in laws, policies, procedures, techniques, department regulations and programs and increasing his professionalism in the law enforcement field. Supervisory meetings, supervisor-subordinate contacts and conferences at the various levels, organization of wide training meetings at such intervals and of such duration as may be required to accomplish the purpose of the contact, conference or meeting are all commonly used means of in-service training.

There are many institutes in the country that provide both long and short course in-service training; some state departments of education provide regional schools for in-service training; many colleges and universities offer night courses in law enforcement and some provide correspondence courses.

The training officer should explore all avenues of approach to in-service training; many colleges and universities offer night courses in law enforcement and some provide correspondence courses.

The training officer should explore all avenues of approach to in-service training, weigh long term advantages against short term sacrifices, determine the most feasible methods of supplying the officers sufficient information to assure efficient performance and design plans to implement those methods.

Special Training

Special training, as referred to here, is training required by one or more officers to perform some special function or to cope with some special problem that all members of the department are not required to perform or cope with.

Instructor training, polygraph operation, ballistics and scuba diving are a few examples of special training. All training of an individual or group to prepare him or them to perform a special service for all members of the organization can be placed in this classification.

Specialization is a means of providing efficient service in areas which do not normally require a sufficient amount of every officer's time and attention to warrant the expense of training and equipping all members of the department to perform a specific function.

Budgeting

Once the training needs have been determined in each classification and a program devised to meet those needs, a cost analysis must be made for each type of training showing the number of men to be trained, the cost per trainee and the total cost.

Now that we know who is to be trained, what, where, by whom and for how long at what cost, the "when" must be determined. "When" depends upon one minor and one major consideration. The minor consideration, when will the place, equipment and instructors be available at a time that the department can best relieve the trainees of their normal duties? Familiarity with the organization's responsibility and knowledge of the availability of the instructors and facilities make the answer to that question easy. The major consideration, how will the program be funded?, usually presents a more complex problem but not an insurmountable one.

A check will quickly determine the amount of training money in the department's current budget. If a truly comprehensive program has been planned, it is highly probable that the amount budgeted will be insufficient to permit the immediate initiation of all phases of the training plan. If the state budget will not support the program, then the possibility of obtaining federal matching funds for that purpose should be explored.

Each state has an agency which controls funds allocated to the state by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration which came into being in June of 1968 through passage by the United States Congress of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act.

Attached to the copies of this paper is a list showing the name and address of the agency having control of L.E.A.A. funds for each state represented here and a copy of a list showing the allocation of planning and action funds to each state of the United States for 1969, 1970 and the estimated total amount of federal funds allocated each state for fiscal year 1971.

Seventy-five percent of all L.E.A.A. funds allocated are for local government use and twenty-five percent for state use. Ask your State agency for a copy of the publication, "The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, a Program for a Safer, More Just America," which provides a wealth of information with regard to allocation of these funds and their use.

In all probability, the agencies' training budget problem will be solved if it can convince the State agency handling these funds of its eligibility to share in them, as they would provide ninety-percent of the funds for training, salaries excluded. All you chiefs are familiar with House Bill H.R. 15605 which would amend the

Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act in such a way that the question of eligibility of agencies, enforcing environmental recreational laws to share in L.E.A.A. funds, would be eliminated.

West Virginia has been able to convince the Governor's Committee on Crime, Delinquency and Correction of the eligibility of its Natural Resources Law Enforcement Division to share in the L.E.A.A. funds. Power of arrest for violations of any State law, occurring in the officer's presence, proved to be a major argument and was probably the deciding factor in obtaining the eligibility.

Thus far, such funds have been utilized to provide training as follows:

1. Six men, ten weeks, Basic Police Training. Held at the West Virginia State Police Academy with civilian, State Police and Department Instructors presenting the material. Cost per man was approximately \$1500 or a total of \$6000.

2. Twelve men, two weeks, Drug Law and Abuse Training. Conducted at Morris Harvey College in Carlestown, West Virginia, by the United States Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs who also provide all instructors. Cost per man was \$300, total cost \$3600.

3. Twelve men, three days, Police Combat Instructor's Course, Held at Camp Perry, Ohio, with the N.R.A. providing the instructors. Cost per man \$100, total cost \$1200.

4. Twenty-six men, all sergeants, lieutenants and one captain, two weeks, Supervision of Police Personnel Training. Conducted at the West Virginia State Police Academy by Northwestern University who provided the instructors. Cost per man \$225, total cost \$5850.

Further funds have been committed to provide ten weeks basic police training for at least thirty men in a school to start in early January, 1973, the placement of up to five men in such a school every three months if the need exists and two weeks supervision of police personnel. Training for the seven captains who have not taken the course has been tentatively agreed upon. This represents a commitment of approximately \$50,000 and it is anticipated that additional funds will be available to provide special training for which planning is underway.

Once an agency has developed a comprehensive training plan, it is in a position to show the need for training and provide a solution to the need on which to base its request for training funds. Difficulties, obstacles and disappointments may present themselves as the funds are sought to convert the plan to action, but they should be only temporary if the plan is sound and properly presented. Patience, perseverance and diplomacy may be required. The responsible person should bear in mind the quotes "Rome wasn't conquered in a day" and "If at first you don't succeed, try, try again." Someone once defined a diplomat as a "Person who can tell you to go to hell in such a way that you actually look forward to the trip."

Who knows, perhaps if every natural resource law enforcement agency's plan is carefully conceived and the persons responsible for devising, funding and initiating them are sufficiently endowed with those virtues the day may come when all Conservation Officers are diplomats.

**DIRECTORY
OF
STATE PLANNING AGENCIES**

ALABAMA

Alabama Law Enforcement Agency
State Capitol
Room 117, Public Safety Building
Montgomery, Alabama 36104
205/269-6665

ARKANSAS

Commission on Crime and Law Enforcement
1009 University Tower Building
12th at University
Little Rock, Arkansas 72204
501/371-1305

FLORIDA

Inter-Agency Law Enforcement Planning Council
Tallahassee Bank Building, Suite 608
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
904/224-9871 (FTS 904/791-2011)

GEORGIA

State Planning Bureau
270 Washington Street SW
Atlanta, Georgia 30304
404/524-1521 (FTS 404/526-0111)

KENTUCKY

Commission on Law Enforcement and Crime Prevention
Room 130, Capitol Building
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
502/564-6710 (FTS 502/582-5011)

LOUISIANA

Louisiana Commission on Law Enforcement
and Administration of Criminal Justice
P.O. Box 44337, Capitol Station
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804
504/539-5859

MARYLAND

Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement
and Administration of Justice
Executive Plaza One, Suite 302
Cockeysville, Maryland 21030
301/666-9610

MISSISSIPPI

Division of Law Enforcement Assistance
345 North Mart Plaza
Jackson, Mississippi 39206
601/354-6525 or 6591 (FTS 601/948-7821)

MISSOURI

Missouri Law Enforcement Assistance Council
500 Jefferson Building
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
314/635-9241

NORTH CAROLINA

Law and Order Division
North Carolina Department of Local Affairs
422 North Blount Street
Raleigh, North Carolina 27601
919/829-7974 (FTS 919/828-9031)

OKLAHOMA

Oklahoma Crime Commission
820 N.E. 63rd Street
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105
405/521-3392

SOUTH CAROLINA

Law Enforcement Assistance Program
915 Main Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
803/758-2654 (FTS 803/253-8371)

TENNESSEE

Tennessee Law Enforcement Planning Agency
216 Capitol Boulevard
Suite 604
Nashville, Tennessee 37219
615/741-3521 (FTS 615/242-8321)

TEXAS

Criminal Justice Council
Executive Department
810 Littlefield Building
Austin, Texas 78711
512/478-7468

VIRGINIA

Law Enforcement Administration
9 North 12th Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219
703/770-6193

WEST VIRGINIA

Governor's Committee on Crime,
Delinquency and Corrections
1704 McClung Street
Charleston, West Virginia 25311
304/348-3689 or 348-3692

**Allocation of Planning and Action Funds
Fiscal Years 1969, 1970 and 1971
(Amounts in Thousands)**

STATE	Fiscal Year 1969 (Actual)			Fiscal Year 1970 (Actual)			Fiscal Year 1971 (Estimates) ¹		
	Planning	Action	Total	Planning	Action	Total	Planning	Action	Total
Alabama	\$ 338	\$ 434	\$ 772	\$ 369	\$ 3,175	\$ 3,544	\$ 456	\$ 5,906	\$ 6,362
Alaska	118	33	151	121	249	370	128	463	594
Arizona	210	201	411	228	1,503	1,731	128	2,795	3,064
Arkansas	232	242	474	252	1,787	2,039	300	3,325	3,625
California	1,388	2,352	3,740	1,566	17,287	18,853	2,039	32,162	34,201
Colorado	233	243	476	258	1,863	2,121	309	3,466	3,775
Connecticut	297	360	657	326	2,669	2,995	399	4,965	5,364
Delaware	135	64	199	141	480	621	154	894	1,048
Florida	504	737	1,241	575	5,597	6,172	728	10,414	11,142
Georgia	404	555	959	450	4,127	4,577	563	7,678	8,241
Hawaii	150	91	241	159	699	858	178	1,300	1,478
Idaho	147	86	233	154	639	793	172	1,189	1,361
Illinois	833	1,339	2,172	938	9,877	10,815	1,208	18,376	19,584
Indiana	436	614	1,050	487	4,565	5,052	612	8,493	9,105
Iowa	285	338	623	312	2,501	2,813	381	4,654	5,035
Kansas	253	279	532	375	2,065	2,340	332	3,842	4,174
Kentucky	315	392	707	347	2,906	3,253	426	5,407	5,883
Louisiana	346	449	795	384	3,344	3,728	475	6,221	6,696
Maine	165	120	285	175	882	1,057	199	1,640	1,839
Maryland	347	451	798	384	3,349	3,733	476	6,231	6,707
Massachusetts	465	666	1,131	516	4,902	5,418	650	9,119	9,769
Michigan	678	1,055	1,733	763	7,817	8,580	977	14,544	15,521
Minnesota	340	439	779	380	3,302	3,682	470	6,143	6,613
Mississippi	258	289	547	280	2,117	2,397	337	3,939	4,276
Missouri	409	565	974	452	4,155	4,607	566	7,731	8,297

Montana	147	82	229	153	627	780	170	1,167	1,337
Nebraska	197	176	373	211	1,310	1,521	247	2,437	2,684
Nevada	130	55	185	134	405	539	145	753	898
New Hampshire	146	84	230	154	634	788	171	1,179	1,350
New Jersey	571	860	1,431	641	6,372	7,013	815	11,856	12,670
New Mexico	168	123	291	176	896	1,072	200	1,677	1,867
New York	1,333	2,251	3,584	1,490	16,392	17,882	1,939	30,496	32,435
North Carolina	439	619	1,058	492	4,625	5,117	619	8,604	9,223
North Dakota	143	78	221	148	562	710	163	1,046	1,209
Ohio	803	1,284	2,087	911	9,563	10,474	1,173	17,792	18,965
Oklahoma	267	306	573	294	2,291	2,585	357	4,263	4,620
Oregon	234	246	480	253	1,806	2,059	303	3,361	3,664
Pennsylvania	882	1,427	2,309	998	10,591	11,589	1,288	19,704	20,993
Rhode Island	161	111	272	169	819	988	192	1,523	1,715
South Carolina	274	318	592	304	2,406	2,710	370	4,476	4,846
South Dakota	145	83	228	151	599	750	167	1,115	1,282
Tennessee	362	478	840	402	3,562	3,964	500	6,627	7,127
Texas	831	1,334	2,165	942	9,926	10,868	1,213	18,468	19,681
Utah	169	126	295	179	929	1,108	204	1,729	1,933
Vermont	128	51	179	133	387	520	143	719	862
Virginia	405	557	962	452	4,150	4,602	566	7,721	8,287
Washington	308	380	688	352	2,971	3,323	433	5,527	5,960
West Virginia	221	221	442	239	1,640	1,879	284	3,050	3,334
Wisconsin	382	515	897	422	3,795	4,217	526	7,061	7,587
Wyoming	121	39	160	125	290	415	133	540	673
D. C.	154	99	253	161	723	884	181	1,345	1,526
American Samoa	102	4	106	102	28	130	103	51	154
Guam	106	12	118	108	90	198	110	167	277
Puerto Rico	281	330	611	308	2,454	2,762	375	4,566	4,941
Virgin Islands	104	7	111	104	50	154	106	93	199
TOTALS	\$19,000	\$24,650	\$43,650	\$21,000	\$182,750	\$203,750	\$26,000	\$340,000	\$366,000

*Estimates based on House-approved FY 1971 appropriation (House Report No. 91-1072)