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Whether preparing for an interview or meeting with an informant, investigators should spend a significant amount of time planning for the most important part of any human interaction—creating and building rapport. Consistently building rapport with various individuals of different genders and ages who represent diverse backgrounds, educational levels, experiences, ethnicities, and mental health concerns proves challenging to many law enforcement professionals. Everyone has their own personality and preference for how they like to give and receive information.1

One of the most powerful and proven ways of establishing rapport is isopraxis, or mirroring another’s behavior.2 From the time people are born, they learn to share mirroring behaviors. When a mother smiles, her baby smiles; when she giggles, her baby giggles; when she arches her eyes, her baby does the same. These mirroring behaviors continue into courtship behaviors reflected back as part of the mating game. People find comfort in and, therefore, seek mirroring behaviors. They also discover solace in processing information presented consistent with their personality and preferences.3

---

By ROBIN K. DREEKE and JOE NAVARRO, M.A.
Personality mirroring corresponds with nonverbal mirroring—it tries to match the thought process and style of communication a person prefers. Some people like to socialize as part of the communication process, while others prefer a more direct, task-oriented tact. People tend to favor information that they receive in a pleasing manner, and, consequently, they become more attentive and receptive. Studies have shown that individuals have different personality types for processing information, as well as preferences for how they give and receive information. Investigators who assess for such traits can effortlessly mirror communication styles to conduct more effective interviews and better develop informants. To demonstrate this concept, the authors offer an overview of a law enforcement professional’s attempts to develop a source and his partner’s assistance in doing so.

Background

Wilson has worked with the Joint Terrorism Task Force for a number of years, and, because of the great relationship with and mentoring from his training agent and partner, Smith, he has become one of the squad’s more notable interviewers and source developers. His techniques include active listening skills, personality and emotional assessments, and a consideration of the best tools to use when dealing with individuals.

Despite Wilson’s excellent track record in conducting interviews and developing sources, his encounters occasionally did not go as well as he hoped or planned. Sometimes, despite his best and concentrated efforts and the open minds of individuals he interacted with, his ability to develop a relationship proved elusive. Wilson typically dismissed these infrequent anomalies as part of the unpredictability of human nature. Because he had numerous successful results, he never fully explored the possibility that he may have had some responsibility in his occasional failures until he had one interview that forced him to reflect on and rethink his process.

The Interview

Wilson has been working on an investigation for some time and desperately wants an informant close to his subject who will help him gain a valuable personality assessment on the individual, as well as some firsthand knowledge of his criminal activity. One morning, Wilson asks his partner, Smith, if he has a few minutes to talk about his case.

“OK, so what do we have?” inquires Smith. Wilson briefly explains the investigation as Smith begins flipping through...
some of the surveillance logs. Smith quickly notes that the subject frequents a local tavern that he is familiar with from a case he worked years earlier and asks Wilson if he has had any success trying to get a source there. Wilson says that he has struck out in that area.

Smith details the case he had a few years ago, describing how his subject frequently hung out at the tavern for hours and socialized with patrons who came in after work. Smith had talked with the owner, formed a professional relationship, and opened him as a confidential source who provided valuable assistance to Smith’s investigation. After the case ended, Smith closed the source but occasionally reached out to him to check in and ask about him, his work, and his research. Smith says that although some time has passed, he feels confident that the owner, and former source, will give Wilson a hand. Wilson asks Smith to arrange an introduction.

A few days later, Smith sets up a coffee meeting between Wilson and the former source. Wilson begins preparing for the interview and asks Smith to tell him a little about the source. Smith informs Wilson that the owner is very busy running the tavern while pursuing research for his Ph.D. Further, he is a serious, analytical person with well-determined, long-range goals. Wilson asks Smith if the source likes baseball or any other sport that they might talk about to break the ice and develop some rapport. Smith replies, “I don’t think so; he is more studious. Because my background is in engineering like the source’s, that is generally what we talked about.”

Wilson shrugs it off and says, “That’s OK. I’m sure I can find something he’s interested in.” Wilson thinks to himself that this should be no big deal. He will just “chat him up” and touch upon myriad topics until one seems to strike a cord and work. Wilson thinks his high-energy approach should win the day.

Wilson arrives at the designated coffee shop a little early, like he usually does for a source meeting, and finds that the source has arrived before him and is sitting in an appropriate quiet back table looking at his watch and tapping his foot. Wilson strides toward him and introduces himself with his trademark broad smile and firm handshake, stating, “It’s a pleasure to meet you. My friend Smith said you are a great guy and sends his regards.” The source stands, slightly bows, and tightens his lips momentarily as he asks quizzically, “Do you mean Agent Smith?” Wilson responds, “Of course, our friend Agent Smith.” He gestures for the source to sit down and then offers to get them coffee. The source declines, stating that he does not have much time today.

Wilson thanks the source for coming and says he understands that he is busy and does not plan to take a lot of his time at this first meeting. Without giving him much time to respond,
Wilson asks the source to tell him something about himself, his work, and his Ph.D. research. The source again forces a half smile and shifts his chair so that he is not facing Wilson directly anymore but somewhat angled toward the front of the coffee shop and the exit. The source then sits up straight and places his hands on his lap as he thoroughly describes the nature of his research and studies.

Despite Wilson’s lack of knowledge of the source’s topic, he attempts to listen intently. But, before the source finishes speaking, he quickly interjects a question of where the source was born and grew up. “Oh, Riverdale in the Bronx, New York City,” the source responds. Wilson seizes what he perceives as his first opportunity to develop some rapport and quickly asks, “Ah, so you must be a Yankee fan? I also was born in New York and am an avid New York Yankee fan. We should try to catch a game together sometime. As a matter of fact, the Yankees are playing at home against the Boston Red Sox next week, and I have a buddy who has two extra tickets I could get. That sounds great doesn’t it?” The source leans back and away from Wilson and simply responds that his research and the tavern keep him occupied, and he does not really enjoy baseball anyway. Wilson responds, “That’s a shame; you’d love it. I’ll work on getting us some tickets for later in the season. We’ll coordinate your schedule to make it happen for you.”

The source angles himself more toward the door as he looks at his watch and begins to lean toward the door. Wilson again starts into a monologue about New York sports and what he perceives as some great rapport building with the source.

Wilson finally takes a break from his monologue long enough for the source to look at his watch again and ask Wilson what exactly he can do for him. Wilson nods and says, “Well, I’m just interested in your thoughts and opinions from time to time about some individuals who may be frequenting your tavern.” The source again reminds Wilson that he is very busy with his Ph.D. research and asks if Wilson has any specific needs or tasks in mind for the source to review to determine if he can accommodate them in his schedule. Wilson shrugs his shoulders and says, “Not really. I’m not that organized yet. I just wanted to chat with you and give you a brief idea of what I’m hoping to do and just take some time for us to get to know each other better.” The source responds, “I apologize; if you don’t mind, I have to be going. I need to get back to my office. I need to prepare for a class this evening and still have to go through last evening’s receipts from the tavern.”

Wilson stands and says, “Sure, by all means,” with another broad, somewhat nervous smile. Wilson then thanks him for taking the time to meet. He asks the source if they can get together again in a few weeks to possibly discuss some more details of how the source could provide assistance. The source responds that he is not sure because his schedule can be quite busy, so Wilson asks if it is OK to call him and set something up in a day or so after he reviews his schedule. The source agrees, and Wilson again thanks him for his time and the productive meeting while enthusiastically shaking his hand.

Back at the office, Smith asks Wilson about the meeting.

People tend to favor information that they receive in a pleasing manner, and, consequently, they become more attentive and receptive.
Wilson replies that he thinks it went well and that he will try to get baseball tickets for a game for them to go to in a few weeks to help build some rapport. Smith gives a quizzical look and asks Wilson to keep him posted.

Wilson documents what he perceives was a good interview and completes the necessary paperwork to reopen the confidential human source. After about a week, he attempts to contact the source but can only leave messages on his voicemail. After a few more days, Wilson finally reaches the source on the telephone and comments that he must be a very busy man. The source responds that he is and his research is in a critical stage. Wilson advises that he understands and adds that the source probably could use a break. Wilson quickly interjects that they should grab lunch together, so they both can unwind. The source says that he really does not have time.

Wilson politely presses for some sort of get-together. The source finally states that he does not think that he will be able to help him. Stunned, Wilson respectively responds that he understands and asks if he might contact him again in the future when his schedule allows. The source pauses and reluctantly agrees but advises that it will not be anytime soon.

**The Problem**

Wilson slowly hangs up the telephone, feeling extremely low and dejected. He had high hopes for both his case and the working relationship with the source. Now, he faces the embarrassment of closing a source he just opened. He decides that before he takes any action, he will talk to Smith. Maybe his mentor can shed some light on this puzzling problem.

Wilson relates the story of his contact with the source. Surprised, Smith asks details about their conversation. Wilson conveys these and explains how he tried to get the source to go to a baseball game and out to lunch but that the source absolutely refused, saying he would not be able to help him at all. Smith is shocked and says that the source had just completed his master’s degree when they met. He asks Wilson what the source’s Ph.D. research is about and how it is going. Wilson shrugs his shoulders and says, “I don’t know, we didn’t talk much about it.” Smith then asks Wilson what plan he proposed to the source that was not agreeable for them to work on together. Again, Wilson advises that they had not spoken about it. Smith begins to nod. Slowly, Smith looks up and says, “I think I know the problem.” Wilson exclaims, “Great! What should I do?” Smith offers that first, he would like to explain some of the highpoints of how he and the source used to work together on his case. Smith describes the case and how he had brought a detailed list and plan to the source for them to go over together. Following their planning session, the source had contacted Smith using the protocols they established, and they met for a businesslike, organized debriefing. The source

---

**Private individuals may avoid eye contact or stare unblinking. Their chins may not jut out, and their arms may be still or even restrained. They may orient their attention slightly away as they do not like to be stared at; look down at their feet; give short, rather than long, answers; and tend to touch less and illustrate less with their hands. Idle chatter is generally wasted on them.**
always was well prepared and thorough, checking off items on his list of points to cover. The source had stated it was a great diversion from his work, the different challenge was mentally stimulating, and he really enjoyed it. Smith adds that because the source’s contributions were so significant, he was able to get him a signed letter of appreciation from the director. Smith asks if any of this sounds familiar to the type of dialogue Wilson had with the source. Wilson replies, “Not even close.” Smith says, “That’s the problem.”

The Solution

Smith asks Wilson to remember the first interview they conducted together a number of years ago. Wilson recalls that Smith had acted more chatty and gregarious than he does around the office and in his personal life, and Smith had said he was practicing the “Platinum Rule.” Smith had explained that people want to be communicated with as they like to communicate, and four basic personality styles define how people prefer to give and receive information: directors, socializers, relaters, or thinkers.

Smith asks Wilson to recall his interaction with the source and describes how individuals are either people oriented or task oriented in how they prefer to communicate. He opens a notebook and shows Wilson a chart containing descriptors of the two (see chart 1).

Smith asks Wilson to think of the source in his work setting and, between the two columns, how he would best describe him. Wilson remembers the beginning of the interview when he introduced himself. The source corrected Wilson by stating Smith’s full title and then slightly bowed. Wilson circles the words formal, proper and regards the rest of the list, talking with Smith about each choice. He chooses focuses on facts and task oriented and describes how the source wanted to know Wilson’s specific task or plan. Wilson regards the next set, readily shares feelings and keeps feelings private and says that he does not know the source well enough from the one meeting to make an educated guess. Smith nods and suggests that people may not always be able to choose accurately between the two columns because these represent only illustrators of tendencies and are not definite.

Smith asks Wilson to describe how the source sat and communicated nonverbally. Wilson advises that the source seemed to look stiff in his chair with a straight posture, kept his elbows tucked into his sides, and was not very animated with his hands. Smith commends Wilson on his excellent observations and says that the source most likely fits the category of keeps feelings private based on several closed nonverbal displays.

Smith reminds Wilson to just look for tendencies in the source’s personality based upon a majority of observations, not
assess,” states Smith, who turns to another page in his notebook and shows Wilson another chart (see chart 4). Wilson determines that he is a socializer and chuckles as he regards the chart—he does not see the socializer personality type near the thinker. “I guess I was a bit off when trying to relate and develop rapport with the source,” Wilson said. “I probably would have gotten the nonverbal message over some time with the source, but I just went in there with my socializer style blazing away.” Smith explains that this review helps assess how individuals prefer to give and receive information, enabling investigators to more rapidly match, or mirror, it.

With this powerful understanding of how people prefer to communicate, interviewers and human source developers can more rapidly adapt to someone’s style to develop better and quicker rapport.

Smith then asks Wilson to tally the results. Wilson has five in the task-oriented column and two undecided. “Perfect,” Smith says, “I think we can safely say we are dealing with a predominantly task-oriented individual and not a people-oriented one. Therefore, the source is either categorized as a thinker or director.” Smith uses another chart to determine whether the source prefers to be direct or indirect (see chart 2). Wilson notes that the source is predominantly task oriented and indirect and, therefore, confident that the source is a thinker. “Exactly what I also would

100 percent accuracy in any one column. Wilson quickly circles the phrases disciplined about time and prefers planning. He believes that the source most likely was thinking oriented, rather than feeling oriented, but he leaves that blank for now as well.

Smith then asks Wilson to tally the results. Wilson has five in the task-oriented column and two undecided. “Perfect,” Smith says, “I think we can safely say we are dealing with a predominantly task-oriented individual and not a people-oriented one. Therefore, the source is either categorized as a thinker or director.” Smith uses another chart to determine whether the source prefers to be direct or indirect (see chart 2). Wilson notes that the source is predominantly task oriented and indirect and, therefore, confident that the source is a thinker. “Exactly what I also would

assertive and reserved, listens and asks, and keeps opinions private. Smith states, “Again, we don’t have 100 percent, but we definitely can see a trend.” Smith then suggests that based on his knowledge of the source, he believes he takes risks and tends to be impatient. Smith explains to Wilson that having a mix is both normal and expected. Smith asks Wilson where he thinks the source falls in the four-domain personality model he described earlier (see chart 3).

Wilson regards the list and, from his conversation with Smith and the source, quickly discerns that the source makes cautious decisions, is less

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>takes risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swift decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confronting, expressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impatient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talks and tells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outgoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offers opinions freely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoids risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cautious decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less assertive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easygoing, patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listens and asks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keeps opinions private</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**To communicate with directors—**

- support their goals and objectives, if possible;
- remain businesslike in your dealings;
- use facts, not feelings, to convey your thoughts if you do not agree with them;
- be precise and well organized;
- remain brief with supporting analysis when recommending other actions;
- get to points quickly;
- do not repeat—they understand quickly; and
- emphasize winning results and growth potential.

Greet directors appropriately, use manners, be formal and precise, ensure nonverbals support your message, and use your hands to illustrate and demark what is important. Respect their space and use your body as a shield from others as they prefer privacy. Time is important to directors, so do not waste it. Use demonstrative materials sparingly; sit at angles but not too close; mirror their behavior; and look for intentional signals that indicate “We are done.” Avoid unnecessary touching; it is not usually welcome.


**To communicate with relaters—**

- be warm and genuine;
- support their feelings by showing personal interest;
- assume that they will take personally whatever facts you state;
- give them enough time to develop trust in you;
- if you disagree with them, do so with more personal feelings and not facts;
- communicate in a steady, slower, and informal manner;
- use active listening skills and encouragers; and
- give assurances of minimizing risks if possible.

With a relater, nonverbal communications are easier to mirror—take the lead from them. You can use more eye gaze behavior, sit closer, touch more often, interject more thoughts, and use hands to illustrate and punctuate with more frequency. These motions will be well received, as well as your emphasis with voice and such behaviors as arching of the eyes. Listen for the pace at which they deliver their message and match their speech and loudness.

To communicate with socializers—

- focus your interest on them;
- support their ideas, thoughts, and opinions when possible;
- communicate with a fast-paced, upbeat, stimulating conversation;
- be tolerant of digressions and allow time for the discussion to go on as long as possible;
- avoid arguing;
- be enthusiastic and casual;
- articulate how actions can enhance image and reputation; and
- avoid details.

Socializers generally appreciate comments about appearance or inquiries regarding their family. They tend to sit closer and even communicate while walking, often feel free to interject thoughts, which, at times, may not have any relevance (communication and fellowship are more important), usually interrupt more and expect you to chime in with thoughts. But, give socializers the last word. They maintain eye contact but will look away when relaxed. Socializers liberally use hand gestures and allow for touching to emphasize, especially hand-to-arm touching; share food and drinks as this is well received; and, although they view time as more flexible, investigators should not abuse this privilege.


To communicate with thinkers—

- be thorough and well prepared;
- support their organized and thoughtful approach;
- use actions, not just words;
- remain detailed, accurate, and logical;
- discuss pros and cons of actions;
- provide solid, tangible evidence, not broad speculations;
- have and adhere to established procedures; and
- assure them that decisions will not backfire.

Thinkers appreciate timeliness and brevity, seeking to minimize, rather than maximize, it. Once they understand, leave them to think. Do not interject; be ready with information, do not delay answers; be emphatic but not loud, and confident but not cocky. Avoid arrogance; limit amount of touch; allow for distance between parties; and, when seated, try to sit at 90 degrees. When the encounter is complete, shake hands briefly and leave promptly.

“This is a powerful tool,” Wilson declares. Smith adds that the lists they used to identify the communication style help interviewers mirror observable traits. Interviewers who adapt and mirror both before and during the interview greatly enhance their chances of success.

Smith says, “So, let’s look at the source again and devise encounter plans based on what we know behaviorally.” Wilson responds, “I’ll definitely adapt myself to communicating with a thinker as we have described here. The source likes procedures and protocols. I’ll have a detailed, accurate, and logical agenda so I don’t waste his time. I’ll then try to mirror him by being more formal and proper, fact focused, task oriented, and disciplined about time, especially his. I’ll also tone back my own personality and be less assertive, listen and ask questions more, and be more reserved. I’ll avoid the areas that we were unsure about until I can discover what his preferences are, but this is a great place to start.”

Both Smith and Wilson lean back in their chairs and breathe a long sigh. Smith feels good about being able to pass along this vital key he has successfully used over the years. Wilson appreciates Smith’s insight and is excited to recon tact the source and put his new tools into practice.

**Conclusion**

The challenge that Wilson faced often occurs in the law enforcement profession. Investigators encounter individuals with whom they just cannot seem to make a connection or develop rapport, not only during the interview but in human source development as well.

---

**Chart 4**

**Compatible Combinations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best combinations at task compatibility</th>
<th>Second best combinations at task compatibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thinker – Relater</td>
<td>Thinker – Thinker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director – Relater</td>
<td>Relater – Relater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socializer – Relater</td>
<td>Socializer – Thinker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Endnotes**


2 Special Agent Dreeke draws upon his vast experience as a qualified practitioner of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and the Personality DISCernment Instrument for information in this article regarding personality and communication styles.


5 Allesandra and O’Conner, 5-6.

6 Allesandra and O’Conner, 5-6.

7 Ibid., 63.

8 Ibid., 61.

9 Ibid., 63.

10 Ibid., 119.

---

The author invites readers interested in discussing this topic to e-mail him at Robin.Dreeke@ic.fbi.gov.
On August 27, 2007, the Fort Bend County, Texas, Sheriff’s Office received notification of a dead body found at an electrical power plant in Richmond, Texas. Upon investigation, authorities recovered the body of a nude white male victim from the coal sifter hopper. It is believed the victim was dumped into the coal car after suffering two lacerations to the head. Estimations place the date of death as August 23, 2007. Investigations determined that the line of coal cars left Coal Creek, Wyoming, on August 23, 2007, and arrived at the power plant on August 27, 2007. Before arriving in Richmond, Texas, the cars made five stops, three in Colorado (Denver, Pueblo, and La Junta) and two in Texas (Amarillo and Temple). Anyone with information about the identity of this person should contact Detective Mark Williams of the Fort Bend County, Texas, Sheriff’s Office at 281-341-4689 or mark.williams@co.fort-bend.tx.us, referencing case number 07-18404; or Crime Analyst Rick Blankenship of the FBI’s Violent Criminal Apprehension (ViCAP) Unit at 703-632-4191 or rblanken@leo.gov, referencing case number 2007TX00029.

Unidentified Recovered Body

Age: 25-50 years old
Height / Weight: 5’0”- 5’4”; 150-165 lbs.
Hair / Eyes: Brown / Brown
NCIC#: U960019360

The victim has a jailhouse-type tattoo of the word RUSH on his right bicep, extensive dental work, three surgical pins in his left knee, and right-hand fingernails painted blue.

NCIC Dental Codes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maxilla</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mandible | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 |
|           |   |   |   | V |   | V |   | V |   | V |   | V |   | V |   | V |   | V |   | V |

NCIC Dental Codes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maxilla</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>43</th>
<th>44</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>48</th>
<th>49</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>51</th>
<th>52</th>
<th>53</th>
<th>54</th>
<th>55</th>
<th>56</th>
<th>57</th>
<th>58</th>
<th>59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mandible</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>61</th>
<th>62</th>
<th>63</th>
<th>64</th>
<th>65</th>
<th>66</th>
<th>67</th>
<th>68</th>
<th>69</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>71</th>
<th>72</th>
<th>73</th>
<th>74</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>76</th>
<th>77</th>
<th>78</th>
<th>79</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>81</th>
<th>82</th>
<th>83</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The city of Lincoln, Nebraska, covers about 82 square miles and serves as the state capital and home to the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, as well as several other colleges. Lincoln is growing at a robust and stable rate, adding about 30,000 residents in the past decade, with a current population of 252,000. Yet, the Lincoln Police Department (LPD) is not that large, employing 317 sworn officers. The ratio of officers to residents is 1.26 per 1,000. Such thriving cities reach a point where deploying law enforcement from a central headquarters no longer works effectively. Precinct houses or full-service substations inevitably become necessities.

Currently, LPD has two fully functioning substations and eight smaller storefront offices. Its experience regarding substations exhibits the lasting benefits of such an initiative—decreasing crime rates and increasing cost savings. Moreover, the two facilities play a critical role in neighborhood revitalization.

CHARACTERISTICS

LPD’s substations constitute a completely operational law enforcement facility with area command staff and support resources. With locker rooms, supervisors’ offices, a parking lot for patrol vehicles, and additional features of a police station, they closely resemble headquarters. Officers report to work at the substations, which serve as the nucleus of their assigned area and provide a constant police presence in a neighborhood. Many residents view these facilities as much a part of their locale as the post office and grocery store.
LPD’s first substation, Center Team, opened in February 2000 and addressed the issue that officers needed to be based in the areas they worked. The facility provides space for command staff; rooms for holding community meetings, conducting briefings and interviews, and writing reports; areas for employees to use during breaks and for exercise purposes; and a garage for processing vehicles. The publicly accessible front lobby has a service desk where citizens can request victim/witness assistance; copies of accident, crime, or incident reports; crime prevention and Neighborhood Watch information; and handgun-purchase-certificate applications. Residents also can report junk or abandoned vehicles, invite an officer to conduct a presentation, inquire about using the community room, verify fix-it tickets, and return found property. Such services mirror those available at headquarters.

In 2005, a local developer approached LPD and offered to renovate a vacant building for a new substation. Serendipitously, the neighborhood around the building was in the midst of a redevelopment project, and many community entities believed that the office would play a pivotal role in this process. When it opened in December 2006, the Northeast Team substation consisted of a 10,000-square-foot facility that provided space similar to Center Team and police headquarters.

Consequently, substations provide an alternative should the primary facility become overwhelmed or incapacitated. For example, in September 2005, water flooded LPD’s main station and left mud and debris that took several months to clean up. Within hours, due to its ability to provide all law enforcement services, the Center Team substation became the temporary police headquarters. Lincoln, like other plains towns and cities, experiences severe weather during all seasons, whether tornados in the summer or crippling snowstorms in the winter. When LPD built its second substation to aid neighborhood revitalization, part of the design strategy included disaster redundancy and response.

Law enforcement agencies should not consider the availability of inexpensive or free office space as the sole determinant for selecting a location for a substation. LPD’s facilities are not in neighborhoods the largest of size or population or in areas farthest from headquarters. Rather, they are positioned where a constant police presence is necessary to achieve revitalization goals.

In both city strategy and citizen perception, the substations anchor these restoration efforts. When developing its substations, LPD held detailed planning meetings to examine their use and what issues, in addition to those associated with the revitalization attempts, the stations would help address.

**CHALLENGES**

Although departments may have several reasons to pursue creating such a facility, they must understand the challenges of developing and maintaining one. Leaders must continually address financial, organizational culture, communication, logistical, and maintenance concerns.

**Financial**

Establishing stand-alone substations with space for command staff, officers, and support services can be expensive. Often, existing structures...
must be completely remodeled to meet the needs of law enforcement. In recent years of decreasing tax revenues, funding a substation can prove difficult, if not impossible; partnerships with community groups and developers are usually necessary. The Northeast Team substation presented a major financial challenge as the facility was not part of any city or department budgeting or development plan. Only the cooperation and donations of over 25 public and private entities, including individuals, enabled its creation with support ranging from the building to furniture and supplies.

Although LPD views substations as critical to respond to the city’s geographic growth, funding such projects always will prove difficult, even when anticipated a decade or more before establishment. However, agencies also must consider the costs associated with not decentralizing. Before construction of the second location, a lack of decentralization meant that five times a day, 42 employees drove from police headquarters to the Northeast Team area, about 12 miles roundtrip. Since opening the substation, the staff has saved over 7,000 gallons of gasoline.

Organizational Culture

Obviously, officers and employees can more easily maintain a common sense of purpose and identity and function cohesively as a department when everyone works in the same building. One side effect of using substations includes employees, mostly officers, feeling that the department starts to look like a collection of independent police stations, instead of satellite locations of a single, united force. Will an agency suffer if officers do not see each other in a hallway? Such a question proves difficult to determine. However, if leaders consider organizational culture when planning a substation, they can review concerns to ensure assigned personnel feel like a part of the bigger group, rather than just their team. Predominantly, this occurs through communication efforts, but organizations also can address such issues through departmentwide training exercises and classes, special assignments to other teams, and similar activities. Promotions and shift changes tend to blend team assignments, so officers know one another and have a sense of who they are and who they work for. In this age of information, the use of electronic bulletin boards and Web logs (blogs) can prove particularly helpful in handling organizational culture issues.

Communication

Officers reporting for duty at LPD attend a shift briefing traditionally called a lineup. Duty commanders discuss such issues as wanted persons, approaching weather, and crime trends. When the Center Team substation opened, officers attended lineup via speakerphone. This worked until resources expanded and visual elements appearing on large plasma monitors at the main station were added. Then, the department started using Web sites that provide conferencing capabilities. Substations sign on for the visual content while a Voice-over Internet Protocol (VoIP) system furnishes the audio portion of the briefing. Many agencies in Nebraska and other states have signed on to view how the system works. Currently, lineups reach officers at headquarters, both substations, and the off-site narcotics office.²
Standard communication lines, like the U.S. Postal Service, also present challenges when using a substation. All mail is delivered to the main station, eliminating the need for three or four different addresses and providing secure delivery. Team sergeants take interoffice mail, such as reports and tickets, to headquarters once per shift. In turn, they retrieve mail and other paperwork for their substation’s employees.

Evidence

Handling evidence created particular problems for officers working at both substations. Obviously, chain of custody must be maintained, yet LPD has one evidence desk at the main location. Northeast Team officers either drove their evidence downtown, thus defeating a major goal of using the substation, or signed it over to another officer who also needed to transport evidence. These trips resulted in overtime and increased fuel costs. To combat this, team members piloted a new strategy. They use online software to retrieve a property number from any computer and then log their evidence into the system. Next, they deposit it into a secure drop box and, once each day, a property clerk picks it up from the substation. Because only the property unit has keys to the storage areas, the chain of custody is preserved.

Maintenance

Vehicle maintenance for LPD occurs at a single police garage. Patrol units from the substations must be taken there and brought back in such a manner as to not interfere with the officers’ use of the cars, a task that requires an effective and efficient schedule. It is important for officers to make use of downtime and stops at the main station to address this issue. For example, they fuel vehicles at any time—regardless of the fuel level—when they drive downtown for court or other business. These trips also provide the necessary idle time needed to remotely update the cruisers’ mobile data computers at the garage facility.

If the building is privately owned, rather than by the government, the agency needs a beneficial relationship with the owners to determine maintenance costs and responsibilities. Managers may have tasks at a substation that they probably do not at police headquarters. In many ways, maintaining an off-site station can resemble having a second home that requires attention to such duties as elevator inspections, fire tests, system maintenance, window washing, lawn mowing, garage cleaning, ADA compliance and inspections, snow removal, office equipment maintenance and repair, and building inventory and tracking. Managers should assign an individual, likely a sergeant, to ensure that the substation has the necessary supplies from paper clips, toilet paper, and batteries to working and available shotguns. Additional duties include inventorying, checking, stocking, resupplying, and transporting to make sure officers have what they need to do their jobs or care for themselves while at work.

Benefits

LPD has discovered some clear-cut benefits to establishing substations. These locations have positively impacted surrounding neighborhoods, not only regarding a decrease in crime but also an apparent economic advantage and reduced departmental fuel costs.

...agencies should not consider the availability of inexpensive or free office space as the sole determinant for selecting a location for a substation.
Effects on Neighborhoods

In the first 12 months after opening the Northeast Team substation, misdemeanor arrests increased by 15.5 percent and narcotics by 31.1 percent. Crime rates dropped as well, such as auto theft by 4.7 percent; vandalism, 7.5 percent; forgery, 4.5 percent; and larceny, 2.3 percent. Clearance rates for serious crimes maintained notable rates: assault with a weapon, 65.3 percent; sex crimes other than rape, 50.7 percent; robbery, 48.9 percent; auto theft, 35 percent; and rape, 25.9 percent.

Although not yet quantified in Lincoln, an economic impact to the neighborhoods surrounding a substation obviously exists that goes beyond the fact that a safe area nurtures business. Rather, the significance stems from having dozens of employees report to work in the area they patrol. They buy gasoline, medications, and food and patronize businesses in the area because of the proximity to their duty station. For localities seeking to revitalize, this increase of consumers who earn a professional wage can constitute the boost needed to make other efforts a success.

Fuel Savings

Additionally, the substation has impacted departmental fuel usage, a significant budget item difficult to address given price volatility. Members of LPD drive about 2.5 million miles a year; therefore, reducing mileage and fuel proves critical to alleviating budgetary pressures. During the first 12 months after opening, the team decreased gasoline use by 7,269 gallons (about 22 percent) and miles driven by 81,849 (about 19.5 percent), adding a full year to the life of the vehicle fleet.

CONCLUSION

As cities expand geographically and demographically, law enforcement departments face increased challenges, especially when determining the most efficient and effective ways to utilize officers and resources. Once cities reach a particular size, deployment from a single, centralized facility becomes problematic. Stand-alone substations, modern precinct houses from which officers report for duty and conduct a majority of their business, can provide a reasonable solution. If planned carefully and considered a facet of neighborhood revitalization, they can offer an affordable answer to deployment issues, especially given the benefits of lower crimes rates and significant resource savings. The experience of the Lincoln Police Department illustrates these payoffs and further has cemented the substation’s role in reviving neighborhoods.

Endnotes

1 A store-front office is small and usually located in a strip mall, office complex, or other low-cost space. It allows for limited interaction between the community and police and, at times, increases law enforcement presence in an area. However, due to space-related issues, these facilities are not always staffed and cannot provide a wide range of services. Although effective in some regards, offices of this size cannot adequately address larger issues of consistent police presence in the community, especially in areas undergoing revitalization, or the challenges of response time due to urban spread.


Chief Casady heads the Lincoln, Nebraska, Police Department.

Mr. Arp has served as a volunteer consultant for the U.S. Army and is pursuing a certificate in forensic science from North Central State College in Mansfield, Ohio.
**Right to Privacy**

The online guide “Strengthening Sexual Assault Victims’ Right to Privacy” from the Office for Victims of Crime, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice provides practical assistance to statewide sexual assault coalitions and rape crisis centers to help them maintain victim confidentiality. This e-publication contains general recommendations, addresses common challenges, provides core concepts, and offers practical tips for improving confidential services to victims of sexual violence.

Maintaining confidentiality proves vital for sexual assault victims to receive the assistance they need and deserve. However, many factors can compromise their right to privacy. Advocates are crucial in ensuring victim confidentiality, but they need support to effectively, consistently, and successfully protect victims’ right to privacy.

The focus of this online guide, developed by Connecticut Sexual Assault Crisis Services, Inc., is sexual assault victims’ right to privacy. It reinforces the importance of keeping information confidential and highlights the power of employing consistent practices to create a culture of respect for victims’ privacy. To view the guide (NCJ 226501), access the National Criminal Justice Reference Service’s Web site, http://www.ncjrs.gov.

---

**Juvenile Arrests 2007**

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) has released *Juvenile Arrests 2007*. The document summarizes 2007 juvenile crime and arrest data reported by local law enforcement agencies and cited in the FBI’s online publication “Crime in the United States, 2007.” Overall, 2 percent fewer juvenile arrests occurred in 2007 than in 2006, and arrests for juvenile violent crime decreased 3 percent.

While some offense categories increased, the majority declined, with most changes being less than 10 percent in either direction. Specifically, juveniles accounted for 16 percent of all violent crime arrests and 26 percent of all property crime arrests in 2007. The murder arrest rate in 2007 was 4.1 arrests per 100,000 juveniles ages 10 through 17. This was 24 percent more than the 2004 low of 3.3 but 72 percent less than the 1993 peak of 14.4. For the 10 years of 1998 through 2007, juvenile arrests for aggravated assault decreased more for males (22 percent) than for females (17 percent). During this period, juvenile male arrests for simple assault declined 4 percent, whereas female arrests increased 10 percent. *Juvenile Arrests 2007* and other OJJDP publications can be accessed at http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ojjdp.
For the first time in more than a generation, law enforcement agencies are dealing with the deployment of their members to military active duty combat tours. These deployments, which began in the months following the September 11 attacks, have involved law enforcement officers who also serve with military reserve or U.S. National Guard units in support of operations in Afghanistan and Iraq. Agencies face the challenges of providing appropriate support to employees and their family members prior to and during the period of deployment and ensuring an effective reintegration to civilian law enforcement duties once it ends. The proliferation of such deployments and a desire to identify and share best practices motivated the authors to research this issue.

**BACKGROUND**

During a recent training event for various chiefs and sheriffs of Northern Virginia’s law enforcement community, the authors conducted a group discussion about this duty-related concern. They posed four questions to police chiefs and sheriffs: What are we doing right that we should continue? What are we not doing very well that we should stop? What are we not doing that we should start? Is there anything else to add to this discussion? Further, they asked leaders to relate these questions to
predeployment, deployment, and postdeployment. The chiefs and sheriffs acknowledged a number of steps that agencies are doing right and should continue, as well as several that they are not doing but should start. For example, during predeployment, leaders recommended conducting a formal orientation on navigating agency requirements and paperwork, including providing a predeployment packet; continuing officers’ salaries and benefits; initiating and maintaining contact with their families; distributing officers’ e-mail addresses to use during deployment; and establishing a more formal policy for the storage of issued property and equipment. While the officers are deployed, departments should continue peer-to-peer contact with them (both formal and informal) and their families, especially during holidays and on the officers’ birthdays. Finally, the chiefs and sheriffs believed that organizations should guarantee the preferred assignment to returning veterans; reorient them on agency policy and procedure, emphasizing use of force; ensure they comply with mandatory in-service requirements and firearms qualifications; partner them with another officer for a certain period of time; and continue peer-to-peer contact. This confluence of ideas regarding what various law enforcement departments employ as best practices for their returning veterans stimulated the realization of creating a focus group of some of these officers to complete a more exhaustive study to share across the law enforcement profession.

**FOCUS GROUP**

The authors constructed and forwarded an e-mail invitation regarding the study to chiefs and sheriffs in Northern Virginia in an effort to solicit participation from recently returned veterans. Ten military veterans representing eight law enforcement agencies participated in the focus group discussion and completed a short demographic survey. They averaged 38.9 years of age (youngest 32 and oldest 46) and were employed by county and municipal police departments and sheriff’s offices. Eight of the 10 were married, and two were divorced. Their duty assignments varied from patrol officer and detective to sergeant and second lieutenant. They had been deployed to a variety of locations, including Afghanistan, Bosnia, Kosovo, Kuwait, and Egypt, and all had served in Iraq except one who was deployed to Kuwait in 1991 during Desert Storm. Their varied law enforcement and military backgrounds and experiences provided significant value to the quality of the discussions, and all enthusiastically and willingly contributed to the study. The authors asked
what the agencies were doing—whether well or poorly—or not doing that they should start, stop, or continue to better assist officers who also serve as military or combat veterans.

**Predeployment Issues**

One participant suggested that military reservists and National Guard members comprise a “special needs” population within the department. Officers believed that agencies should begin their efforts to assist military veterans at the predeployment stage, which can be both confusing and stressful. Some related their concerns about determining the status of their apartment leases during their absence and deciding what to do with their pets, while others did not know the type of medical benefits for which their spouses and children would be eligible. Further, organizations should be flexible when weighing employees’ requests for leave to address family and predeployment matters.

Respondents suggested that departments develop and publish policies and procedures related to pay, benefits, leave, promotions, and equipment and assist employees as they navigate these processes. While some agencies’ policies related to pay and benefits may be more generous than required by law, all leaders should become familiar with the minimum requirements of the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act (USERRA) of 1994. Officers requested that organizations become educated and well-informed regarding employee and employer rights and responsibilities. USERRA can help veterans understand and maintain compliance with employer obligations and rights. In addition, agencies should ensure that they are in compliance with recent amendments to the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) contained within the National Defense Authorization Act of 2008. As a result of this Act, the FMLA was amended to create additional protections for qualifying military exigency leave and military caregiver leave.

The veterans also expressed concern about how departments handled the disposition of issued police equipment. Some felt like they were treated in the same manner as officers whose police powers were suspended. One exclaimed, “They even took my pens!”

Focus group participants advised that leaders should articulate clear expectations with central themes of flexibility and a single point of contact (POC). Flexibility during predeployment proves key to many issues, such as granting leave to satisfy family and personal logistics. Further, agency heads should designate a single and alternate POC from the organization and the jurisdiction’s human resources office. The POC should have previous deployment experience, which would help establish rapport, and maintain contact with the employee’s family regarding medical, financial, and morale issues. Further, the selected person could communicate with a military POC.

Respondents recommended developing a comprehensive checklist for out processing in coordination with the human resources POC. This would alleviate the burden on the employee for navigating such bureaucratic issues as finances, leave, and health and medical coverage items. Such a checklist also should reinforce the...
Assisting Law Enforcement Officers with Military Deployments

Predeployment
• Ensure that agencies are educated and well-informed regarding employee and employer rights and responsibilities
• Articulate clear expectations to veterans with central themes of flexibility and single points of contact
• Develop a comprehensive checklist for out processing
• Establish a policy on equipment (differentiating between items returned for reissue and those stored for or retained by veterans)
• Schedule an exit meeting with the chief or sheriff

Deployment
• Ensure quality communication with the veteran and family
• Maintain a single point of contact during deployment

Postdeployment
• Schedule a return meeting with the chief or sheriff
• Restore the veteran’s employment status
• Schedule appropriate transitional steps back to duty
• Expedite retraining on critical skills, policies, and procedures
• Monitor the veteran’s reintegration progress

need to complete power of attorney and will documents and for counseling upon return. Law enforcement leaders also should establish a policy on equipment that differentiates between that returned for reissue (cruisers), stored for officers (weapons), and retained by them (credentials and uniforms). Additionally, the status of military veteran employees should be correctly defined while deployed. Participants recommended an exit meeting with the agency head regarding details about eligibility for promotions and specialized assignments while deployed and whether their position will be available upon their return. Participants wanted assurance that leaders take into account their unique circumstances when promotional and other advancement opportunities occur. Without this communication and fueled by coworker speculation, one deployed officer became so concerned that he would lose his K-9 partner that he felt compelled to call from Iraq to either confirm or deny the rumor.
Deployment Concerns

While deployed, participants clearly delineated between formal and informal communications yet noted their equal importance. They appreciated the opportunity to stay updated on changes within the agency related to such issues as policy, procedure, and personnel. One surprising finding concerned how veterans appreciated letters received through the mail. They spoke unanimously about how special it was to receive a letter and how written notes served as distractions while they were in a combat zone. Respondents also valued the birthday cards, care packages, and other informal communications they received while deployed.

Participants reported that once deployed, it was important to have a POC at the law enforcement department who maintained a regular schedule of communication with veterans and their families. They cited stories about inaccurate pay steps, unpaid benefits, and, in one case, how the veteran’s fellow soldiers established a fund to help pay his mortgage and avoid foreclosure. A POC also could ease the transition to returning to law enforcement duty by creating a file (electronic or paper) of departmental issues and changes to update the returning veteran.

Respondents specifically recommended that leaders ensure quality communication with them and their families. They suggested that the agency notify all personnel, employee associations, and other support groups via e-mail and department newsletters regarding the officer’s deployment. Department staff should receive information regarding the veteran’s birthday, holidays, and other significant dates, and retaining items that can wait until their return.

Postdeployment Considerations

Veterans’ personal experiences upon reentry into their law enforcement duties proved different for each focus group participant. However, all agreed that their deployment changed them. As one stated, “After 12, 15, or 22 months of deployment, they may be all right, but they are definitely not the same person.” Respondents acknowledged that although the transition back into a successful work and family life could be challenging, it would be easier if agencies maintained quality communications with their veterans. In much the same way participants felt when they prepared to deploy, they also valued meeting with their chief or sheriff upon return. Beyond a formal acknowledgement of their absence and return, this afforded agency heads an opportunity to debrief the officers, discuss assignments to which they would return, and address how to capitalize on missed promotional and other advancement processes.

Participants agreed that there should be a series of appropriate transitional steps back to duty when they return to their agency, such as meeting with
the individual who served as their POC during deployment. This allows POCs to provide a final update on changes in policy and procedure and to review correspondence they may have filed for the veterans.

Respondents also placed a high priority on flexibility during this transition period. While some returned directly to work, others needed to take time off to decompress and manage family affairs. Thus, they recommended alternate duty assignments with a schedule more amenable to this needed flexibility.

Finally, the officers emphatically stated their belief that agencies must become actively involved in the mental health of their returning veterans. Most respondents noted that when asked about any traumatic combat experiences during military out processing, many veterans will deny any problems so as not to slow down the process for returning home. For that reason, the officers recommended a mandatory referral to the employee assistance program (EAP) for counseling upon return to law enforcement duty and that this provision be clear during the predeployment phase to remove any perceived stigma. Participants advised that issues may not be readily apparent upon the veteran’s return and could present symptoms months later. The agency should provide EAP sessions every 30 days and, along with monitoring the progress of reintegration, extend at least 90 days after veterans return. Preferably, the EAP professional should understand combat and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) issues. Agencies without capable resources should seek outside assistance from private organizations, and first-line supervisors should be aware of EAP resources and warning signs for PTSD.

Most important, respondents stated the need for practical acknowledgement of their military work experience. After having responsibility for 169 soldiers in a combat zone, one veteran was happy to come back to work as a corporal, needing little ramp-up time. One participant deployed directly from his field training program needed complete retraining.

Returning veterans stressed the importance of restoring their employment status. They wanted to know whether they were on parity with their peers in the department or if they had lost time and could capitalize on missed opportunities. Leaders should consider giving credit for military training toward promotion where applicable. They should ask their veterans if an alternate position with work hours more conducive to family reorientation would be more appropriate and assist in their transition. Upon return to duty, veterans may need to be “re-recruited” into police work, but they do not want to be treated like a rookie. Perhaps, they could ride
along with an officer for a short time to ease back into their law enforcement duties. The partnered officer should be a supervisor or at or beyond the experience level of the veteran. The ride along also could occur with the agency POC or the veteran’s mentor.

Training Needs

The majority of the participants agreed that a standard training protocol would validate proficiency prior to returning to law enforcement duties and reduce any stigma potentially attached to any mandated training topic or regimen. All agreed that agencies should conduct this reentry training one-on-one or in small group settings. One veteran stated, “Don’t just throw us in with a big group.” Specific to a standardized block of training applicable to every returning veteran, the participants recommended expediting retraining on critical skills, policies, and procedures. To address the role conflict between combat and policing models, agencies should develop a standard training protocol that covers a use-of-force review; weapons refamiliarization and qualification, including less lethal ones; and a judgmental shoot/don’t shoot refresher through a firearms simulator system, if available. Additional training should include an emergency-vehicle operations refresher, legal and search-and-seizure updates, and state-mandated in-service training.

CONCLUSION

Today, Americans have adopted a positive attitude toward veterans returning from the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts. Much more can and should be done for law enforcement military veterans. After all, they comprise a unique class of professionals who voluntarily place themselves in harm’s way through service to their nation in their military assignments, as well as to their communities as law enforcement officers.

Various law enforcement leaders representing agencies throughout Northern Virginia provided significant support, input, and encouragement to ensure that the needs of law enforcement combat veterans be more accurately identified and successfully addressed now and in the future. Respect for the service of veterans, especially law enforcement ones, should be highly valued. The practices recommended in this article, identified by the focus group participants and validated by comparison to previous discussions with police chiefs and sheriffs and during individual interviews with veterans, can serve as a guide for agencies as they consider how best to assist their military and combat veterans prior to, during, and upon return from military deployments. Agencies can implement many of these suggestions by formalizing policies and procedures and adopting the strategies offered by veterans and agency heads.

The authors thank the numerous law enforcement leaders for their support in making this initiative a high priority. They express their gratitude to the 10 members of the combat-veteran law enforcement focus group (and to the four veterans who participated in individual one-on-one interviews prior to the focus group meeting) for their candor, passion, enthusiasm, and humor while relating their deployment experiences and assisting in identifying best practices for law enforcement agencies to consider for implementation. And, once again, the authors thank them for their selfless service to this nation and to their departments and communities.
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Law enforcement officers are challenged daily in the performance of their duties; they face each challenge freely and unselfishly while answering the call to duty. In certain instances, their actions warrant special attention from their respective departments. The Bulletin also wants to recognize those situations that transcend the normal rigors of the law enforcement profession.

Sergeant Randy Malloy of the Newberry, South Carolina, Police Department responded to an apartment fire. Upon his arrival, he saw tenants running frantically from the scene and smoke coming from the top of the residence. After learning that someone remained inside, Sergeant Malloy entered the smoke- and flame-filled apartment building. He called out and received no answer, so he began checking each room. After finding an elderly woman unconscious on a bathroom floor, he pulled her outside and summoned emergency medical personnel. Ultimately, she survived the horrible incident.

While off duty, Officer Tony Reznicek of the East Grand Forks, Minnesota, Police Department was walking his dog along a trail near a river. He was accompanied by his wife and mother. Officer Reznicek heard two snowmobiles speeding on the frozen river and knew the drivers were heading toward a boulder-strewn dam area that had open water. Unaware of these conditions, the drivers launched off the end of the frozen surface. One crashed into the rocks and sustained various injuries; the other landed in the water where he clung to the edge of the ice, trying to keep the current from pulling him under. Officer Reznicek quickly called 911 for assistance and raced onto the ice to help the individual in the water. A bystander, along with Officer Reznicek’s mother, a retired nurse, also came to assist, and the three individuals pulled the victim onto solid ice. Later, both drivers received treatment for injuries.

Nominations for the Bulletin Notes should be based on either the rescue of one or more citizens or arrest(s) made at unusual risk to an officer’s safety. Submissions should include a short write-up (maximum of 250 words), a separate photograph of each nominee, and a letter from the department’s ranking officer endorsing the nomination. Submissions should be sent to the Editor, FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, FBI Academy, Quantico, VA 22135.
The shoulder patch worn by the uniformed members of the Nebraska State Patrol has remained basically the same in design since 1937. At its center, it features a stylized representation of the Nebraska State Capitol Building.

The patch of the Gaston County, North Carolina, Police Department displays a replica of the county seal. The year 1957 signifies the year the agency was empowered by the North Carolina Legislature.