

#257

INDIVIDUAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REPORT

In Response to a Request for Technical Assistance

By the

South Carolina Office of Law Enforcement Assistance Programs
for York County, South Carolina

December 4, 1973

NCJPS

DEC 11 1976

ACQUISITION

Prepared by:

Public Administration Service
1313 East 60th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637

(Per Contract J-LEAA-015-72)

38517

I. PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

- A. Consultant Assigned:**
George T. Felkenes
Professor of Criminal Justice
University of Birmingham
Birmingham, Alabama
- B. Date Assignment Received:**
September 24, 1973
- C. Date of Contact with LEAA Regional Coordinator:**
September 24, 1973
- D. Dates of On-Site Consultation:**
October 15-17, 1973
- E. Individuals Contacted:**
Gaines Boone
South Carolina Office of Criminal Justice Programs

Stan Bird
South Carolina Office of Criminal Justice Programs

James Schafer
District 3
Law Enforcement Planner
Rock Hill, South Carolina

J. M. Hunsucker
Chief
Rock Hill Police Department

W. E. Sutton
Sheriff
York County, South Carolina

William Craig
Captain
Rock Hill Police Department

William James
Director
District 3 Regional Planning Commission

Charles MacJunkin
District 3
Regional Planner

Floyd P. Foss
Chief
Fort Mill Police Department

Dr. Warren Montgomery
Deputy Director
South Carolina Office of Criminal Justice Programs

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

A. **Problem as per Request for Technical Assistance:**

York County is experiencing a tremendous growth rate and needs technical assistance to identify the expected impact on law enforcement activities and to recommend future program development.

B. **Problems Actually Observed:**

As stated.

III. FACTS BEARING ON THE PROBLEM

See attached Consultant's Report.

IV. DISCUSSION OF POSSIBLE COURSES OF ACTION

See attached Consultant's Report.

V. RECOMMENDED COURSE OF ACTION

See attached Consultant's Report.

CONSULTANT'S REPORT

NATURE OF ASSISTANCE

The Catawba Regional Criminal Justice Advisory Council requested technical assistance from the South Carolina Office of Law Enforcement Assistance Programs on August 1, 1973. The request for assistance derives from the rapid growth of this area of South Carolina which is adjacent to the Charlotte/Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, urban area. The specific South Carolina county for which the technical assistance was requested was York County, one of the four counties constituting District 3, the Catawba Region. Union, Lancaster, and Chester are the other three counties.

Identification of law enforcement problems created by rapid growth in the area is the concern of the technical assistance. York County is located approximately 25 miles south of Charlotte, North Carolina, in a triangular area bounded by Interstates 77 and 85. A large tourist attraction, Carowinds, has been constructed in South Carolina immediately adjacent to the North Carolina border. This spot attracted some 1½ million persons during the first half of 1973. Interstate 77, not yet completed in South Carolina, will link Charlotte and Columbia, South Carolina, and will be a major avenue of travel to and from Carowinds. Already several motels are being constructed in Rock Hill, South Carolina, 12 miles south of the amusement park. The two existing motels in Rock Hill are being renovated and enlarged to secure the expected influx of tourists.

A second major attraction, Lake Wylie, with a water area of some 12,455 acres, is fast becoming a very popular resort area for both North Carolina and South Carolina residents.

Because of these two areas with the concomitant development and growth of numerous residential areas, concern was expressed regarding the impact on law enforcement with some resulting recommendations for police plans.

FACTS BEARING ON THE PROBLEM

Lake Wylie. Lake Wylie is a man-made lake caused by backing the waters of the Catawba River. It covers 12,455 acres or about 195 square miles, and has about 325 miles of shore line. Approximately 75 percent of this area (9,341 acres, 146 square miles, 244 miles of shore line) is in York County. The North Carolina border is about 9.8 miles long. In the York County area surrounding the lake are found some 1,000 residences (based on a report from the electric power company servicing the area) with some 4,500 residents. There are four public landings, numerous private landings and areas suitable for boat launching, and over 15 concessions selling food, fuel, fish bait, tackle, and the like. Water recreational activities such as fishing, water skiing, boating, swimming, and picnics abound during the summer months.

In addition to the 4,500 residents, it is estimated that about 30,000 persons utilize public landing areas; and another 30-40,000 utilize the other areas suitable for launching boats, fishing, picnics, cook-outs, and similar activities each weekend.

A community site to be known as Tega Cay is being built in the northern York County area. It is expected that 12-15,000 people will reside in this area and that additional marinas, concessions, and boat houses will be built. A small island, Main Island, about two square miles in area, will be constructed on which a restaurant will be built.

Several individuals have been killed in boating accidents. Nevertheless, York County currently does not have water patrol capability other than that performed by game wardens informally. The North Carolina area is patrolled by both police and game wardens. Ground patrol by car in York County is limited because of lack of manpower and equipment.

During 1970 numerous crimes were committed in the area: three reported cases of rape, 200 cabins or residences burglarized (of the 200 reported, only 2 percent were solved, as opposed to a reported 75 percent solved in other parts of the County), numerous ~~autos~~ broken into at public landings, and many cases of public drunkenness. In addition, Goat Island, approximately four square miles in area, reportedly is used for gambling, drunken parties, and other questionable activities.

In one reported incident, a two-boat collision in which three people were killed occurred; and it was impossible to control curious fishermen, boating enthusiasts, and other spectators which delayed recovery of the bodies. Waters moved by boats caused shifting of bodies, and boats getting in the way of dragging operations seriously impaired all efforts until the North Carolina Boat Patrol came to the scene. A boat patrol is now planned to be put into operation. Two patrolmen with a two-way radio for a minimum of eight hours per day will be provided during the high activity months. All current members of the Sheriff's Department will be trained to perform boat patrol. Training will be primarily "on the job" as several members are now qualified.

It is anticipated that this operation will provide a means of improved detection and apprehension and act as a deterrent to crime. Of the 200 break-ins of residences and cabins, it is the opinion that many were committed by persons using boats as a means of access to the residence area, and with an effective boat patrol, possibly many more could have been solved.

Regional Crime Statistics. While this technical assistance report is to be concerned with York County, the entire District 3 region will be ultimately affected by any large-scale changes in the economic and demographic composition of York County. This is especially so for Lancaster County because of its close proximity to Lake Wylie and Carowinds.

A consolidated crime statistical report for all major law enforcement agencies in the District for the period 1970—1972 does not reflect any substantial growth in crime. The statistics do not take into account, however, the rapid development of the amusement industry in the area. Table 1 contains the District 3 consolidated report.

Table 2 lists the crime statistics for York County from 1968—1972. It is to be noted that the total UCR major crime index decreased as well as the total of all crimes from the 1971—1972 reporting period. During the 1969—1972 period, the trend has been constantly downward.

In York County, the two major law enforcement agencies are the Rock Hill Police Department (RHPD) and the York County Sheriff's Department (YCSD). A comparative analysis of the criminal activity in Rock Hill is found in Table 3. The 1973 figures are for the first nine months of 1973 (January—September). Rock Hill apparently will experience a dramatic increase in robbery, assaults, and batteries, and drug law violations during 1973. Other than these crime areas, increases will be minimal with frequent decreases in criminal activities.

The current work load in the YCSD (York County Sheriff's Department) is partially represented by Table 4, "Defendants Processed by Courts." The significance of the table is in the fact that during the 1971—1972 reporting period, 1,197 criminal defendants were processed through the York County courts by the YCSD. This total is second only to Richland County (Columbia) and is substantially greater than any other county in the State. Table 5 depicts the 1972—1973 work load in the Sheriff's Department. During the three-month period, July—September 1973, 1,130 criminal investigations were conducted by the YCSD. Extrapolating for the 1973—1974 reporting year, 4,520 investigations will be conducted, a 12 percent increase in this highly significant criminal activity area.

The City of Rock Hill. The City of Rock Hill has a population of 35,000 residents. The City lies in York County which has an estimated population of 88,000. Rock Hill has two notable characteristics which could conceivably affect the crime situation in that community. First, there is a large college population—Winthrop College has over 3,000 students—within the City which is not reflected in general population figures; and second, Rock Hill is located within easy access to the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area of Charlotte, North Carolina. The 1972 Uniform Crime Report Index, which is based on the commission of Type I crimes in that City, shows a total crime index of 932 for the population of Rock Hill (Table 6).

According to the 1972 Uniform Crime Report, the City of Rock Hill has a high rate of burglary, breaking and entering, indicating an index figure of 441 for this kind of Type I crime. The implementation of specific crime programs aimed at this type of crime and also directed toward other particular areas would be beneficial in the reduction of crimes. Other such areas might include larceny and auto theft, both of which have high rates in the Rock Hill area. The crime rate comparison for major South Carolina cities is contained in Table 7.

Rock Hill's Police Department has a total strength of 65 commissioned officers, giving a ratio of 1.7 officers per 1,000 inhabitants, and has an operating budget of \$745,188. The City Police Department has no formal cooperative agreements with other agencies; however, they participate in mutual aid with other area police agencies primarily in communications and investigations.

York County is in the 16th Judicial Circuit of South Carolina. There is no county level criminal court in York County; however, there is a family court which has jurisdiction over domestic matters and juveniles.

The Rock Hill Police Department operates an overnight lockup facility, and York County maintains a County Prison which normally operates at maximum capacity.

Rock Hill has a vital need to upgrade its law enforcement facilities, and needs to have a comprehensive management survey to update the departmental organization, implement some long-range planning capabilities, and develop standards for manpower utilization.

York County. York County has a population of 88,000 people. The western half of the County is rural, whereas the eastern half is largely urban with the City of Rock Hill the major population center. Also, in this part of the County or adjacent to the county line is located the Carowinds amusement complex and the Lake Wylie recreational area. Interstate 77 will also cut through this segment of York County. The fastest growing areas outside of Rock Hill are located in east York County.

Fort Mill has nine sworn officers and five civilian employees. It is about eight miles from Rock Hill and 8–10 miles from Lake Wylie and Carowinds. Fort Mill currently has about 4,500 residents. Serious consideration is being given to annexation of a much larger area so that the City will be increased to 15,000 people and to some 20 square miles from its present 2.2 square miles. Fort Mill has recently seen constructed five apartment complexes and some 400–500 new homes. According to Fort Mill respondents, a substantial number of new residents commute to and from Charlotte.

The Fort Mill Chief of Police indicated that traffic control problems are increasing daily. Any increase in the responsibilities of this one police department will necessitate radical changes. The current police facility is very small, about 625 square feet. There is a 16–person capacity jail, but there is no water or food service capability. Toilet facilities are available. Current space is totally inadequate and effectively restricts orderly growth of the department.

The YCSD has a substation in Rock Hill which coordinates the Sheriff's responsibilities in the Rock Hill area and eastern part of the County. As explained by the Sheriff, staffing his department is inadequate for present purposes, let alone any increase in population and traffic in the County. Indeed, it is the consultant's belief that unless some cooperative arrangements are developed between the County and various municipalities, the Sheriff will be unable to provide even minimally adequate law enforcement services to the total County. There is a pressing need for planning for the future.

York County Population Characteristics. Personal income is important because of its close relationship to educational attainment, employment, and housing values. Table 8 compares the per capita personal income with the Catawba Region and the State.

Family income for the region and York County has increased significantly. Table 9 shows an increase in York County from \$4,318 to \$8,399 during the decade 1959–1969. Both York and Lancaster Counties exceeded the levels in South Carolina but were significantly below the median family income in the United States. York and Lancaster Counties, which are the most heavily urbanized in the region, have the highest family incomes in the region.

In summary, the 1960–1970 decade showed a substantial increase in the per capita and median incomes. There was also an increase in home ownership as well as a rise in the educational levels of York County and regional residents. These factors will increase the protection demands placed on County and municipal agencies if past experience from other areas holds true.

Population size, density, and structure are significant factors in police planning decisions because of the increased demands for services and facilities which depend largely on population growth and decline. In general, three factors determine the population increase or decrease: historical trends, in and out migration, and birth to death ratios. Population trends for the Catawba Region and specifically York County are contained in Tables 10, 11, and 12.

It is noted that the region as a whole grew at a rate of 3.7 percent, considerably less than the State's 12.5 percent rate of growth. York and Lancaster Counties were the only two counties which gained in population with York having a net gain of 7,164 people or 10.0 percent and Lancaster showing a net gain of 2,281 people or 6.2 percent. During the 1960–1970 decade, Lancaster showed the greatest rate increase at 10.1 percent. York County also grew but at a slower rate than it had in the previous decade. Historically there does appear to be a growth in York County and the eastern part of the region.

Migration, Table 11, shows that the Catawba Region lost 13,596 people by out migration during the 1960–1970 decade, or a 7.6 percent loss of population. York County lost 3,971 persons or 5.0 percent of its residents. In summary, the region's out migration for 1960–1970 was greater than the State's. The economic significance of the migration loss of population is difficult to measure in terms of furnishing police services, but in terms of tax revenues, wages, and services, the loss to the region would appear to be substantial. It appears that out migration is stabilizing. It is conceivable that the region as a whole may continue to lose population by out migration during the 1970's but at a much slower rate. Should Carowinds and the Lake Wylie complexes continue to develop and the Charlotte, North Carolina, SMSA continue to expand southward toward York County in particular, it is entirely likely that the County and region will experience a net in migration during the 1970–1980 decade.

Table 12 substantiates migration conclusions for the region. The birth rate for the region for 1970 was 20.8, slightly above the State's rate of 20.2, while the regional death rate was 10.0 and 8.8 for South Carolina and 9.5 for the United States.

Where people live is a crucial factor in determining law enforcement needs. As defined by the U.S. Census of Population, urban areas are those having populations of 2,500 or more. Rural areas have less than 2,500. Table 13 shows the urban-rural composition of the region as compared with South Carolina.

Most of the region's rural population is suburban and nonfarm. In addition, many of the small communities within the region are classified as rural. In York and Lancaster Counties, there has been a large build-up of areas adjoining urban centers that are classified as rural but which are in fact suburban communities which are part of a large urban complex. While policing of this rural area has traditionally been the responsibility of local sheriff's agencies, the services required are largely those of a urbanized area requiring complex records and communications systems, facilities in or near the urban complex, special planning capabilities, and numerous functions which are not frequently seen in largely rural oriented sheriff's departments.

York County is the most urbanized County in the region with some 47,000 people living in urban areas. It is the only County in the Catawba Region that has over 50 percent of its people living in urban areas. During the 1960—1970 decade, it appears that the regional urbanization rate has been stable. This stability is partially attributed to the residential development of areas outside of urban centers. This development is attributable to several factors, but the one primarily of interest to law enforcement is the improvement of rural road systems that will increase the amount of traffic flow and transients in the area. This factor plus the development of Interstate 77 and its attendant opening up of largely rural areas for housing, recreational, and economic development will greatly increase the demands for police services. The small beginnings are already being experienced in York and Lancaster Counties.

Population Projections

Population projections for the Catawba Region and York County have been developed by the Catawba Regional Planning Council. Depending upon the method used—arithmetic, natural-increase, net migration, or geometric—York County will increase to about 98,000 by 1980 and about 115,000 by 1990 from its 1970 population of 85,216. From the current regional population of 187,585 persons, the projections are for about 197,000 in 1980 to between 203—212,000 by 1990.

The Regional Planning Council predicts for York and Lancaster Counties accelerated economic and population growth. The greatest growth in population will be in suburban areas. Projected York County growth is shown in Table 14.

Economic Factors

Economic factors which affect the delivery of law enforcement services in an area are a primary planning consideration. Particularly significant to York County and its anticipated growth are the previously discussed Carowinds and Lake Wylie recreation complexes. In addition to Interstate 77, Interstate 85 passes to the north of the County

between Atlanta and Charlotte. Interstate 77, when completed, will be a major artery from the Cleveland-Chicago area and will pass directly through the major urban area of eastern York County. Passenger and freight rail service is insignificant in York County.

Of considerable importance to the predicted growth of York County is its close proximity to major airports in Charlotte and Columbia. Douglas Airport in Charlotte, the largest in the Carolinas, is only about 10–12 miles from York County and about 25 miles from Rock Hill, wherein is located a large segment of the population of York County and the whole region. Four small airports for light aircraft are also found in the region including one in Rock Hill.

Commuting Patterns

A brief analysis of commuting patterns identifies the scope of the migration of members of the labor force in York County. Table 15 provides a comparison between 1960 and 1970 and indicates a considerable increase in out-commuting from York County by over 2,000 workers. The overwhelming majority commute to the Charlotte/Mecklenburg area. Coupled with the constant movement of large numbers of York County residents to and from nearby North Carolina, the labor force in York County increased by about 1,990 persons when 18 new industries located in the County from 1965–1970.

Some Conclusions Regarding York County

- A. There are three major factors affecting present and future growth in York County:
 1. Construction of Interstate 77.
 2. Rapid urbanization of Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, which includes Charlotte.
 3. Development of Carowinds Amusement Park and Lake Wylie recreation area.
- B. Decreases in the county population have been due to out migration, particularly among blacks.
- C. In 1970 whites composed 72.3 percent of the Catawba Region, an 8.8 percent increase from 1960. The black population declined by 4.5 percent during the same period.
- D. By 1990, 229,000 persons are projected for the region with over 60 percent of the total growth predicted by York County.
- E. There has been a shift from manufacturing to nonmanufacturing industries in the region.
- F. The regional unemployment rate is low compared with state and national rates.
- G. With increasing urbanization, employment, population, and transportation, law enforcement problems in the form of services provided, organization, increased crime, planning, purchasing, and records and communication will multiply.

A Law Enforcement Plan for the Future

In the next five to eight years, there will in all likelihood be vast changes in the population, economic status, employment market, and physical conditions in York County, primarily in the eastern half of the County. What does this bode for the overall law enforcement considerations in the County? Will the City of Rock Hill be able to cope with a large influx of vacationers and transients? Will the Sheriff's Department, which quite conceivably would bear the brunt of rapid and expansive changes, be able to cope with new and more complex police problems? Law enforcement will in fact become a countywide, if not a regionwide problem.

Will the complete fragmentation of services, now peculiar to each agency, become so cumbersome that a countywide police department will be the solution to provide adequate police services? Police training, of which little is currently accomplished, will become more and more important as the jobs become more and more demanding. How will the training effort be handled?

Because of the close proximity of the Charlotte/Mecklenburg area, what is the feasibility of an interstate agreement between the states of North Carolina and South Carolina to police the areas on either side of the state border in some kind of cooperative arrangement? Such a compact may require coordination and cooperation at the highest state governmental levels.

The current cooperation between the two major law enforcement agencies in York County, the Rock Hill Police Department, and the York County Sheriff's Department is not good. Professional conflicts apparently exist, with each department concerned over its own identity and autonomy. In the future in York County, for the reasons outlined above, law enforcement will become a county and regional problem with little justification for walls drawn up around cities. Common law enforcement problems will not stop at the city or county boundary. For the police to cope with the vast changes in store for the area, significant changes in traditional police organization and techniques must be seriously considered.

While it is unrealistic to change the traditional city/sheriff law enforcement responsibilities at present (county lines and city boundaries are often sacrosanct in current political philosophy), there should be some long-range planning commenced immediately to study the feasibility of having a countywide police agency. The consultant is fully aware of the almost insurmountable problems of such a suggestion, but it does present a possible solution to otherwise divisive and destructive fragmentation of police agencies in a highly complex and mobile County. Such a step should be commenced under the overall supervision of the South Carolina Office of Law Enforcement Assistance Programs and direct operation supervision of the OCJP Regional Law Enforcement Planner in Rock Hill.

What are some immediate steps that can be taken to increase the cooperation and efficiency of York County law enforcement agencies to handle the delivery of police services in the next five years? Consolidation of specified functional areas must be carefully considered.

Need for Consolidation. Police organization in the United States is complicated by overlapping functions, duplication of activities, fragmentation of jurisdictions, and, all too often, professional police jealousies and a fear of future needs which may cut into the power that a local department possesses. In the United States, less than 10 percent of local government police agencies have more than 10 sworn personnel. Very few of the former could be classified as large. With the great number of very small police forces and a comparatively small number of small- to medium-sized agencies, coordination tends to be informal and sporadic at best, even with those agencies which are contiguous or overlapping.

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice has noted that many departments resist change, fail to determine the shortcomings of existing practices and procedures through research and analysis, and are reluctant to experiment with alternate methods of solving problems. In only a few of the largest police agencies have there been changes and innovations to face squarely the demands of fragmentation, duplication, and overlapping of police functions, tasks, and services.

The vast majority of local governments deem themselves capable of administering a complete law enforcement program within their various jurisdictions regardless of size, financial resources, or proximity to other police agencies. The question now confronting the small community (police force of 10–50 personnel) is whether it can afford to have an all-purpose small police force side by side or in close proximity to other small agencies. In reality the all-purpose, small force never really existed and will probably never exist in the future.

Interagency cooperation is absolutely essential in today's governmental environment. Such cooperation can only be achieved successfully by formal means and not by the traditional method of informal agreements to render service in specified crisis situations. In short, a fundamental change in the traditional police organization is necessary by eliminating duplication of traditional police functions and activities while still retaining local identity and control. The worst features of current fragmentation of functions and services performed must be subject to interagency control. It is just too expensive in terms of money and manpower to have separate records, planners, communications, training, purchasing, maintenance facilities, jails, dispatch operations, and facilities. Cooperative and consolidated staff and auxiliary services will assist in solving the problems.

In the near future (5–10 years), it is conceivable that more cities will develop in York County, e.g., Fort Mill Township and Teja Cay are already discussing incorporation. As this occurs, police and governmental fragmentation becomes more pronounced. Police services will become more duplicative and less effective and efficient. Police departments in York County likely to increase rapidly are:

- York County Sheriff's Department
- Rock Hill Police Department
- Fort Mill Police Department
- Clover Police Department
- York Police Department
- • Hickory Grove Police Department (very small)
- • McConnells Police Department (very small)

Basic Assumptions Regarding York County Consolidation. After an analysis of the growth potential, development of the vast recreational and amusement complexes, population and interviews with police functionaries and planners at the state, regional, county, and municipal levels, conclusions drawn are as follows:

1. Because of the political difficulties involving consolidation, there should be some community control of police services throughout the County without sacrificing reasonable quality and quantity of service.
2. Those police functions which are required for the proper performance of police duties and which are common to most, if not all, law enforcement agencies should be consolidated.
3. Consolidation of police services should occur without comprehensive reorganization within the affected agencies or of the city or county governmental units.

Local government will of necessity lose some freedom of individual action when it formally agrees to share services with other governmental units. Indeed, if a countywide (or even regional) police agency comes into existence, local police agencies may be eliminated. This is quite obviously a drastic step which involves controversial political negotiations. However, the sharing of facilities, consolidation of records, joint dispatching, and so on, offsets any disadvantage of consolidation because of the vast improvement of the quality and level of performance of police services which accrue as a result of cooperation and consolidation. Coordinated or consolidated police activities involve more than several agencies merely working together in a common venture. They must have the goal of improving the delivery of police services in their individual jurisdiction and in the collective area.

Some of the generalizations made by the consultant in this analysis of the future law enforcement needs do not apply with equal force to all functions in all municipal or county law enforcement agencies. In York County some of the police agencies are isolated, and as a result, do not have the same needs as those in the eastern half of the County. For example, the Rock Hill Police Department and the York County Sheriff's Department have different problems than the Fort Mill or York Police Departments.

However, every York County law enforcement agency has functions that may be profitably consolidated because the smaller agencies cannot afford to act independently in all police matters. Consolidated and coordinated police activities involve more than several agencies working together in a common venture. There must be a goal of improving the level of police service in the individual jurisdiction and in the collective area.

Possible Areas of Consolidation

Most local governments in the United States prefer to provide their own complete police services regardless of their capacity to do so adequately. The result often has been the attitude of the community, particularly in suburban areas and small communities, that the basic police mission of controlling crime and criminal elements is beyond the police capacity. A major reason for limitations on smaller departments is their failure to coordinate or consolidate their activities through some formal means. Too many police departments deplete limited resources by attempting to provide a full range of services of patrol and support activities without mounting a county or regionwide functional consolidation of commonly found functions in order for each individual to be more responsive and viable in delivering police services. To fully achieve the benefits of functional consolidation, the involved departments must give more than token support of resources and not be reluctant to utilize the consolidated services. Three areas in which there could be effective consolidation in York County are in police staff services, auxiliary, and field services.

Staff Services. In recent years, South Carolina has launched a statewide minimum training standards law. Prior to this time, training was accomplished at the local level if it was accomplished at all. Currently, the lack of advanced supervisory and command training is in the same position that recruit training was in prior to the minimum standards law. There is little, if any, at the local levels. The problem is magnified at the county level where there are several independent police agencies which could consolidate their training in order to cope with a rapidly developing transition from largely rural to largely urban policing. A consolidated training program would provide for in-service programs for all levels of personnel. It is needed now rather than 10 years hence.

Police planning and research will be a tremendous need in York County in the foreseeable future. Little is currently accomplished in the way of crime analysis. Because York County will be characterized by a highly transient population and interurban transportation, new and unique police problems must be addressed to develop a countywide or even regionwide posture for provision of police services. In short, planning for police responses to a wide-ranging burglary ring is essential whether it exist in Rock Hill or New York.

In addition to training and planning, personnel services such as recruitment and selection and personnel records each lend themselves to consolidation. Such administrative "housekeeping" duties as central purchasing, payroll preparation and management studies may be included in this area.

A criminal intelligence program involves the accumulation of knowledge concerning persons and organizations engaged in illegal activities. Unfortunately, many police agencies have refused or been unable to recognize the necessity for a viable intelligence gathering program. By consolidation, small agencies may be able to free a person to devote time and effort to this extremely important element in law enforcement.

Other staff functions that have some serious possibilities for consolidation include a regular schedule of staff inspections to discover weaknesses and irregularities. In small departments it is unlikely that a formal staff inspection is even conducted. With several

departments consolidating functions, a countywide inspection system is indeed practicable. For example, if records are consolidated, a staff inspection would be the means to ascertain compliance with proper procedures.

Internal investigation of personnel is primarily the responsibility of individual departments. A sharing of or establishment of a central office could perform a new service for York County agencies.

Auxiliary Services. Criminal records and communications provide the means by which a police agency should be able swiftly and efficiently to learn about crimes, store and retrieve pertinent information about crime and suspects, deploy personnel, and take other administrative and operational actions. A joint records and communications system for York County would be a significant benefit to the effective delivery of police services.

As the law enforcement problems become more complex, a basic problem arises in communications because too many small systems serve the same area, sometimes blocking out each other's transmissions. In addition, few are adequately equipped with modern devices to facilitate dispatching units. In short, an areawide communications center can improve the speed in answering citizen requests for service and in taking appropriate action.

Records systems suffer from the same fragmentation and duplication as communications systems. But the records problems found in most police records systems hamper successful police activity even more than fragmented communications systems. This occurs because it is the records system that must provide the police agency with an up-to-date accounting of its past and present activities with expediency. The meager, antiquated filing systems (which appears to be the York County situation) found in most small police agencies do not begin to meet this criteria because they were originally mere compiling of statistics.

The establishment of a countywide records and communications system is fundamental if York County is going to operate effectively in the coming decade. By consolidating, York County could adequately support a reasonably effective crime laboratory if the funds spent by individual agencies could be pooled. By laboratory services is meant (1) competent gathering of evidence at crime scenes and (2) the scientific analysis of that evidence.

Nearly every local police department has at least a small holding facility for temporary detention, and some operate full scale jails. Most, however, are inadequate (as duly noted by York County Sheriff). Unless there is a strong countervailing reason for local detention, a consolidated detention facility is more effective and economical.

Field Services. In York County there are a number of field or line services which lend themselves to joint performance because of their supportive nature. Included are such activities as criminal investigation, vice control, juvenile delinquency, and narcotics control. It is realized that local police officials and political leaders are often less willing to cooperate in joint field services than in records or communications because local control seems to be missing. However, there are compelling reasons to consider consolidation:

1. Most small police departments cannot afford full-time investigative specialists.
2. Mobility of criminals sometimes results in a number of individual departments pursuing separate investigations on the same person.

Currently there is an attempt at cooperating in the field of criminal intelligence in which several agencies from the four counties in the Catawba Region meet informally to discuss law enforcement problems. This effort should be expanded and must be expanded if York County is going to be in a position to cope with anticipated law enforcement needs in the future.

Summary

York County will experience a large growth in the next decade with an attendant increase in law enforcement problems. It is clear that some coordination of law enforcement efforts will be required to cope effectively and economically with the predictable mushrooming law enforcement needs. Consolidation of certain functional areas will aid in meeting the new needs and will cause the least political disruption. Functional consolidating is the most commonly applied solution to police problems in small agencies which cannot afford specialists and sometimes complex hardware to cope with the high crime incidence in America. This approach can be applied only to a portion of the police function, leaving intact the basic organizational patterns of authority. Functional consolidation is a suggested solution for anticipated needs in York County.

The specific approaches to functional consolidation are varied. However, they may take simply the form of cooperative arrangements between two or more agencies jointly to perform a part of the police function. Such areas as staff, auxiliary, and field services have been outlined briefly above.

While informal arrangements to handle jointly a portion of the police function have become relatively common in the United States, such is not the case in York County. For consolidation of police functions to be effective, more than informal agreements are necessary. Formal contractual arrangements are a must. It would appear that the agencies in York with the leadership of the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance Programs might profitably pursue the subject.

During the coming years, there will be a need to develop some formal law enforcement mutual aid agreements with the State of North Carolina. It is predicted that eastern York County will more and more become a haven for the crowded Charlotte/Mecklenburg area, both as a residential area and amusement complex. Cooperative agreements for police services on both sides of the border need to be negotiated, starting now.

TABLES

Table 1

DISTRICT 3 CONSOLIDATED CRIME STATISTICS
(MAJOR LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES)^{a/}

<u>Offense</u>	<u>Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter</u>	<u>Forcible Rape</u>	<u>Robbery</u>	<u>Assaults</u>	<u>Burglary</u>	<u>Larceny Over \$50</u>	<u>Auto Theft</u>	<u>Total UCR</u>	<u>Nontraffic Crimes</u>	<u>Total All Crimes</u>
1972	60	35	51	631	1,414	689	228	3,108	10,267	13,375
1971	51	26	33	723	1,304	570	246	2,953	10,230	13,183
1970	33	28	40	611	1,440	643	255	3,050	10,408	13,458
1969 ^{b/}	35	22	24	414	1,145	373	216	2,229	11,447	13,676
1968 ^{b/}	22	24	7	433	1,082	422	187	2,177	10,279	12,456

^{a/} Statistics furnished by the Catawba Regional Planning Office and are subject to the accuracy of the source.

^{b/} Does not include the Jonesville and Lancaster Police Departments.

Table 2

YORK COUNTY CONSOLIDATED CRIME STATISTICS^{a/}

<u>Offense</u>	<u>Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter</u>	<u>Forcible Rape</u>	<u>Robbery</u>	<u>Assaults</u>	<u>Burglary</u>	<u>Larceny Over \$50</u>	<u>Auto Theft</u>	<u>Total UCR</u>	<u>Nontraffic Crimes</u>	<u>Total All Crimes</u>
1972	15	25	25	263	937	439	157	1,861	5,819	7,680
1971	11	10	26	235	1,013	359	190	1,844	6,278	8,122
1970	14	13	27	190	1,142	420	193	1,999	6,211	8,210
1969	12	13	15	144	850	271	172	1,477	7,108	8,585
1968	10	9	4	172	824	219	132	1,370	6,444	7,814

^{a/} Includes statistics from the following police agencies in York County: Rock Hill, York, Clover, Ft. Mill, York Sheriff's Department.

Statistics furnished by the Catawba Regional Planning Office and are subject to the accuracy of the source.

Table 3

COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF OFFENSES REPORTED
ROCK HILL POLICE DEPARTMENT

Offenses	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	Jan.- Sept. 1973
Housebreaking and Attempt	285	277	377	396	539	560	460	360
Grand Larceny	68	76	82	69	105	123	135	98
Petty Larceny and	--	--	--	213	242	195	215	189
Shoplifting	285	233	241	97	87	92	75	62
Stolen Bicycles	--	137	153	216	200	152	183	120
Stolen Auto Accessories	226	190	163	182	113	86	107	89
Entering Auto	102	103	132	178	227	191	175	154
Stolen Auto	115	103	97	133	153	142	119	99
Burglary	5	5	2	2	2	1	8	--
Robbery	8	5	2	8	15	10	10	20
Safecracking	3	4	13	6	21	4	--	--
Recovered Stolen Goods	--	4	--	--	13	4	2	5
Possession Burglary Tools	--	--	1	1	1	--	--	--
Breach of Trust	--	--	--	--	--	6	--	6
Accessory Before and After Fact	1	2	1	--	4	--	1	--
Murder	--	1	7	10	6	3	7	3
Assault and Battery, etc.	21	18	34	35	32	31	41	101
Rape, Statutory Rape and Assault with Intent Ravish	6	4	4	8	7	2	13	9
Forgery and Uttering	44	67	56	144	111	95	84	43
Violation Liquor Law	5	5	2	4	2	3	10	--
Violation Gun Law	12	15	25	22	13	32	25	24
Contributing Delinquency Minors	--	--	--	--	1	2	6	1
Perjury	--	--	--	2	--	--	2	2
Indecent Exposure	3	--	3	5	11	4	22	16
Peeping Tom	1	1	2	1	1	--	2	--
Practice Medicine without License	--	--	--	--	11	--	--	--
Abandonment and Exposure of Child	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--
Flim Flam	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Murder by Auto	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Arson-Burning of Building	3	4	--	--	4	2	2	3
Violation Drug Law	--	2	1	1	7	19	38	54
Hit and Run	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1
Reckless Homicide	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
Lewd Acts on Child	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--
Conspiracy	--	5	--	--	--	4	--	3
Neglect of Children	1	1	1	--	--	--	--	--
Malicious Destruction of Property	3	--	1	1	--	1	--	--
False Pretense	--	--	--	2	--	--	1	1
Obscene Literature thru Mail	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--
Pointing Firearms	--	1	--	3	--	1	6	5
Molesting Child	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--
Assault on an Officer	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--
Resisting Arrest	--	--	--	--	2	1	5	3
Buggery	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	1
Purse Snatching	--	--	--	--	1	2	--	--
Using Profane-Obscene Language on Telephone	--	--	--	--	--	2	2	3
Bomb Threats	--	--	--	--	--	10	2	1
Abortion	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--
Ill Treating Children	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--
Shooting into Dwelling	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	--
Obscene Film	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--
Gaming Device in Possession	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--
Operating Gaming House	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--

Table 4
DEFENDANTS PROCESSED BY COURTS
(July 1, 1971-June 30, 1972)

<u>Counties</u>	<u>1970-1971</u>		<u>1971-1972</u>	
	<u>Tried</u>	<u>Probation</u>	<u>Tried</u>	<u>Probation</u>
Abbeville	122	102	93	77
Aiken	319	102	271	175
Allendale	37	37	74	24
Anderson	390	220	299	202
Bamberg	44	18	64	46
Barnwell	27	18	21	15
Beaufort	130	56	189	77
Berkeley	56	26	90	34
Calhoun	82	44	52	27
Charleston	769	394	747	425
Cherokee	284	225	293	202
Chester	178	100	152	101
Chesterfield	182	160	218	141
Clarendon	65	48	80	56
Colleton	74	54	66	34
Darlington	161	120	149	89
Dillon	158	90	107	67
Dorchester	50	15	89	65
Edgefield	77	55	134	63
Fairfield	178	71	97	64
Florence	395	213	496	241
Georgetown	190	113	182	100
Greenville	698	287	626	244
Greenwood	217	142	204	150
Hampton	69	32	68	42
Horry	365	258	533	248
Jasper	50	26	61	38
Kershaw	102	69	91	56
Lancaster	141	109	184	121
Laurens	448	313	418	335
Lee	54	38	84	48
Lexington	233	143	256	121
Marion	140	98	132	87
Marlboro	110	68	96	64
McCormick	107	44	82	30
Newberry	181	125	203	151
Oconee	195	132	208	115
Orangeburg	175	87	314	157
Pickens	320	157	252	156
Richland	1,065	482	1,349	458
Saluda	47	26	63	22
Spartanburg	707	413	698	417
Sumter	219	132	293	143
Union	217	165	172	130
Williamsburg	117	85	130	88
York	<u>1,143</u>	<u>341</u>	<u>1,197</u>	<u>283</u>
Totals	<u>11,088</u>	<u>6,053</u>	<u>11,677</u>	<u>6,029</u>

Source: York County Sheriff's Department.

Table 5

WORK LOAD ACTIVITY - YORK COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT
July 1, 1972 - June 30, 1973

Transferred to industrial school	47
Transferred to penitentiary	118
Returned from out of state	6
Warrants for other authorities	315
Papers served for county court	1,454
Magistrates civil papers	747
Civil papers common pleas court	1,207
Illegal whiskey destroyed	1 Gallon
Mash destroyed	1,200
Other activities	4
Investigations	3,116

Source: York County Sheriff's Department

Table 6

INDEX OF CRIME, 1972
STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREA

<u>City</u>	<u>Total Crime Index</u>	<u>Criminal Homicide</u>		<u>Forcible Rape</u>	<u>Robbery</u>	<u>Aggravated Assault</u>	<u>Burglary</u>	<u>Larceny-Theft</u>		
		<u>Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter</u>	<u>Manslaughter by Negligence</u>					<u>Over \$50</u>	<u>Under \$50</u>	<u>Auto Theft</u>
Rock Hill, S.C.	932	7	1	31	9	89	441	275	528	170

Table 7
CRIME RATE PER 1,000 POPULATION
(IN PERCENTAGE)

<u>Area</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>Total Crime Index</u>	<u>Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter</u>	<u>Forcible Rape</u>	<u>Robbery</u>	<u>Aggravated Assault</u>	<u>Burglary</u>	<u>Larceny \$50 and Over</u>	<u>Auto Theft</u>
Columbia SMSA	341,000	36.51	.11	.34	.86	5.71	14.04	12.65	2.77
Charleston SMSA	316,000	30.80	.15	.40	1.63	2.79	14.22	8.12	3.49
Charlottesville SMSA	309,000	36.21	.20	.20	1.41	2.71	15.84	11.08	4.75
Spartanburg SMSA	177,000	22.02	.16	.16	.52	2.52	8.22	7.27	3.35
Anderson SMSA	27,900	26.67	.14	.11	.32	4.12	10.22	9.39	2.37
Florence	26,300	31.22	.30	.23	1.44	.87	11.75	14.18	2.43
Rock Hill	34,900	26.70	.20	.32	.03	2.55	12.63	7.88	2.87

Source: South Carolina Office of Criminal Justice Plans.

Table 8

PER CAPITA PERSONAL INCOME
CATAWBA REGION, SOUTH CAROLINA
1965 and 1969

	<u>1965</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>Percent Change</u>
Chester	\$1,720	\$2,669	+55.2
Lancaster	1,986	2,622	+32.0
Union	1,827	2,635	+44.2
York	1,880	2,611	+38.9
Region	1,868	2,627	+42.0
South Carolina	1,877	2,737	+45.8

Source: Bureau of Business and Economic Growth, College of Business
Education, University of South Carolina, November 1971.

Table 9
FAMILY INCOME
CATAWBA REGION, 1959-1969

		<u>Median Family Income</u>	
	<u>Households</u>	<u>1959</u>	<u>1969</u>
Chester	\$ 8,800	\$3,700	\$ 7,410
Lancaster	12,600	4,482	8,561
Union	9,000	4,115	7,752
York	24,500	4,318	8,399
Region	54,900	4,217	8,173
South Carolina	709,300	3,821	8,367
United States	--	5,660	10,048

Source: U.S. Population Census, 1969 and 1970.

Table 10
POPULATION TRENDS
CATAWBA REGION
1950-1970

	<u>1950</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>Net Change</u>		<u>Percent Change</u>	
				<u>1950-1960</u>	<u>1960-1970</u>	<u>1950-1960</u>	<u>1960-1970</u>
Chester County	32,597	30,888	29,811	-1,709	-1,077	-5.2	-3.5
Lancaster County	37,071	39,352	43,328	2,281	3,976	6.2	10.1
Union County	31,344	30,015	29,230	-1,319	-785	-4.2	-2.6
York County	<u>71,596</u>	<u>78,760</u>	<u>85,216</u>	<u>7,164</u>	<u>6,456</u>	<u>10.0</u>	<u>8.2</u>
Regional Total	<u>172,608</u>	<u>179,015</u>	<u>187,585</u>	<u>6,417</u>	<u>8,570</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>4.8</u>

Source: U. S. Census of Population, 1950, 1960, 1970.

Table 11
COMPONENTS OF POPULATION CHANGE BY RACE
CATAWBA REGION
1960-1970

<u>County</u>	<u>Population</u>		<u>Change</u>		<u>Components of Change</u>			
	<u>1960</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>Absolute</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Births</u>	<u>Deaths</u>	<u>Net Migration</u> <u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
York	81,760	82,616	9,198	8.2	11,490	7,063	- 3,971	- 5.0
White	59,195	64,022	7,827	13.9	11,561	4,736	1,002	1.8
Nonwhite	<u>22,565</u>	<u>21,194</u>	<u>1,371</u>	<u>-6.1</u>	<u>5,929</u>	<u>2,327</u>	<u>- 4,973</u>	<u>-22.0</u>
Region	178,015	187,585	13,448	4.8	39,017	16,851	-13,596	- 7.6
White	123,613	135,622	11,009	8.8	24,456	11,051	- 2,396	- 1.9
Nonwhite	<u>54,402</u>	<u>51,963</u>	<u>2,439</u>	<u>-4.5</u>	<u>14,561</u>	<u>5,800</u>	<u>-11,200</u>	<u>-20.6</u>

Source: U. S. Census of Population and South Carolina Board of Health.

Table 12
 BIRTHS AND DEATHS PER 1,000 POPULATION
 IN REGION, STATE, AND NATION
 CATAWBA REGION
 1960-1970

<u>Births</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>
Region	24.4	21.3	20.4	17.7	18.4	18.4	20.8
South Carolina	25.1	22.2	21.3	20.9	20.6	21.2	20.2
U.S.A.	23.6	19.7	18.7	18.0	17.7	17.9	18.0
<u>Deaths</u>							
Region	8.9	9.3	9.4	8.9	10.0	9.7	10.0
South Carolina	8.6	9.2	9.4	9.1	9.8	9.6	8.8
U.S.A.	9.2	9.5	9.4	9.5	9.6	9.5	9.5

Source: U. S. Census Reports and South Carolina Board of Health.

Table 13
RESIDENTIAL COMPOSITION
CATAWBA REGION
1960 and 1970

<u>County</u>	<u>Urban Population</u>		<u>Percent Urban</u>		<u>Rural Population</u>		<u>Percent Rural</u>	
	<u>1960</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>1970</u>
Chester	9,936	9,772	32.2	32.8	20,952	20,039	67.8	67.2
Lancaster	14,254	14,937	36.2	34.5	25,098	28,391	63.8	65.5
Union	10,191	10,775	34.0	36.9	19,824	18,445	66.0	63.1
York	40,977	46,938	52.0	55.1	37,783	38,278	48.0	44.9
Region	75,358	82,422	42.1	43.9	103,657	105,153	57.9	56.1
South Carolina	981,386	1,232,195	41.2	47.6	1,401,208	1,358,321	59.8	52.4

Source: U. S. Census of Population, 1960 and 1970.

Table 14
PROJECTED GROWTH
YORK COUNTY AREAS

	<u>1970</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1990</u>
Catawba-Leslie Division	5,303	5,700	6,300
Clover Division	3,506	3,800	4,200
Clover Town (3,506, 3,800, 4,200)			
Clover East Division	3,696	4,600	5,600
Clover West Division	2,423	2,600	2,800
Ft. Mill Division	8,957	14,600	18,600
Ft. Mill Town (4,505, 4,800, 7,000)			
Hickory Grove Division	2,996	3,000	3,400
Hickory Grove Town (377, 400, 400)			
Sharon Town (268, 300, 300)			
Smyrna Town (85, 100, 100)			
McConnells Division	1,243	1,200	1,400
McConnells Town (213, 200, 300)			
Rock Hill Division	33,846	37,500	42,000
Rock Hill City (33,846, 37,500, 42,000)			
Rock Hill North Division	7,546	8,500	9,700
Red River Town (222, 250, 250)			
Rock Hill South Division	3,728	4,000	4,500
Rock Hill West Division	1,809	1,900	2,000
York Division	10,163	10,600	11,000
York Town (5,081, 5,500, 6,100)			
	<u>85,216</u>	<u>98,000</u>	<u>115,000</u>

Source: U. S. Census, 1970 and the Catawba Regional Planning Council.

Table 15
COMMUTING PATTERNS
YORK COUNTY
1960 and 1970

<u>In-Commuting From</u>		<u>1960</u>	<u>Out-Commuting To</u>	
<u>County</u>	<u>Number</u>		<u>County</u>	<u>Number</u>
Cherokee	271		Cherokee	25
Chester	628		Chester	118
Fairfield	24		Lancaster	76
Lancaster	517		Richland	26
Spartanburg	33		Union	44
Union	4		Elsewhere	2,078
	<u>1,477</u>			<u>2,367</u>
		<u>1970</u>		
Cherokee	120		Cherokee	116
Chester	689		Chester	140
Fairfield	29		Fairfield	7
Kershaw	34		Lancaster	88
Lancaster	538		Laurens	7
Newberry	8		Newberry	5
Spartanburg	12		Richland	58
Union	23		Spartanburg	49
Cleveland, N.C.	53		Union	82
Gaston, N.C.	178		Cleveland, N.C.	118
Mecklenburg, N.C.	257		Gaston, N.C.	1,348
Union, N.C.	198		Mecklenburg, N.C.	3,061
			Rutherford, N.C.	11
			Union, N.C.	14
	<u>2,139</u>			<u>5,104</u>

Source: Unpublished Reports of U.S. Census of 1960 and 1970.

Table 16

NEW INDUSTRIES IN CATAWBA REGION
1965-1970

	<u>Number of Industries</u>	<u>Estimated Employment</u>
Chester	5	1,100
Lancaster	6	200
Union	4	450
York	18	1,990
Region	33	3,740

Source: South Carolina Industrial Directory, South Carolina
State Development Board, 1970.

END

7 ables/min