

*Leadership and Networking  
Toward a Safer Community*

Athens-Clarke County (Georgia)  
Police Department:  
Case Study of an Effective and Comprehensive  
Youth Alcohol Enforcement Initiative

**Andrea Morrozoff, MA**

February 2002

Police Executive Research Forum  
Clifford Karchmer, Project Director  
1120 Connecticut Ave., NW, Suite 930  
Washington, DC 20036  
phone: (202) 466-7820      fax: (202) 466-7826

# Contents

- Acknowledgments ..... 1
- Foreword ..... 1
- Glossary ..... 2
- Overview ..... 3
  - The Chief ..... 4
  - Documenting the Problem ..... 4
- Getting Started and Gaining Support ..... 5
- Program Elements ..... 6
  - Hospitality Resource Panel ..... 7
  - Enforcement ..... 8
  - Shared Ownership ..... 8
  - Education ..... 9
  - Legislation ..... 10
  - Community Notification ..... 11
- Program Funding ..... 12
- Question and Answer Session with Police Chief Joseph Lumpkin ... 13
- Do's and Don'ts for Youth Alcohol Enforcement ..... 16
  - Do ..... 16
  - Don't ..... 17
- Endnotes ..... 17

# Success in Youth Alcohol Enforcement: One Jurisdiction's Experience

## *Acknowledgments*

The material contained in this case study was taken from personal communications with Athens–Clarke County (Georgia) Police Department personnel during telephone interviews. The author wishes to acknowledge the following participants, who helped provide the information for this case study:

Chief of Police Joseph Lumpkin, Sr.

Assistant Chief of Police Mark Wallace

Lieutenant Lawrence McCrary, Commander of Downtown Operations

Sergeant Randy Garrett, Permit Section

Officer Wesley Horney, Uniform Services Division

## *Foreword*

The nationwide incidence of juvenile alcohol use and the perils that result are once again rising. In 1998, in response to renewed awareness of this problem, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) awarded a grant to the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) for a project called “Training and Technical Assistance in Support of the OJJDP Underage Drinking Initiative: Developing Leadership Roles for Police Executives.”

PERF believes intervention strategies that restrict access to alcohol by underage populations offer considerable benefits that can be sustained over time. Through this project,

PERF has worked with progressive police executives and leaders of national advocacy, civic, and other organizations, as well as federal agencies, to define practical leadership roles that law enforcement executives can adopt and implement in their communities.

One result of these efforts is this case study, *Success in Youth Alcohol Enforcement: One Jurisdiction's Experience*. The Athens–Clarke County (Georgia) Police Department (ACCPD), which serves both the city and the county, was identified through nominations of successful programs that were solicited from government agencies and national advocacy organizations. The case study presents an example of how youth alcohol enforcement can be achieved through a continuous, yet low-cost and low-maintenance, community effort spearheaded by the local police executive. This case study walks through the experiences of the ACCPD as its leadership defined the problem of youth alcohol use in the community, developed an appropriate enforcement initiative, and introduced and implemented the enforcement effort in the community.

The Athens-Clarke County (ACC) case study highlights how the police executive initiated this effort and includes leadership issues such as developing community support, overcoming obstacles, and dealing with community opposition. In addition, this case study examines the *Program Initiative and Program Elements*, examines *Program Funding*, fields *Questions and Answers* with the chief of the ACCPD, and concludes with a list of

*Do's and Don'ts* for implementing an enforcement effort.

PERF hopes readers find this case study informative and useful in developing or expanding their own youth alcohol enforcement initiatives.

*Police Executive Research Forum*

## ***Glossary***

- ABC:** Alcoholic Beverage Control
- ACC:** Athens-Clarke County
- ACCPD:** Athens-Clarke County Police Department
- HRP:** Hospitality Resource Panel
- OJJDP:** Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
- PERF:** Police Executive Research Forum
- UGA:** University of Georgia

## Overview

Nationally, one of the most important yet frustrating challenges facing police departments is that of enforcing underage drinking laws. Underage alcohol use is prevalent and occurs in every community. Jurisdictions with extensive underage alcohol problems often have a large population of youth and young adults and tend to be located near college campuses or in communities with relaxed attitudes toward alcohol enforcement.

In those areas, it is often up to the local police department to raise community awareness of the problem and spur action. Doing so requires careful department planning and strong executive leadership. The Athens–Clarke County Police Department (ACCPD) had both of those ingredients, plus the desire to implement a comprehensive youth alcohol enforcement program.

Athens–Clarke County (ACC), a consolidated city and county in northeast Georgia, is home to the University of Georgia (UGA), Athens Vocational College, Piedmont College, and a satellite campus of Brenau University. ACC’s area is 120 square miles. Within that area are 236 businesses involved in the alcohol trade: 143 “by-the-drink” license holders, 89 packaged alcohol license holders, and four wholesalers.

The population of ACC is more than 100,000, with a median age of 25.5 years. Of that population, 31,000 are UGA students. UGA is known nationwide as a “party school” and, during the 1980s, was ranked among the top five party schools in the country.

Even excluding the UGA population, the community is still young, with a median age of 26.5 years. Alcohol use is common in ACC, and per capita, the area has the highest alcohol consumption in Georgia. Simply put,

ACC is northern Georgia’s entertainment center.

During the late 1980s, the university began to respond to alcohol problems on the campus by developing strict alcohol policies to regulate fraternity and sorority parties. Fraternities and sororities were not allowed to have open parties, and the only parties they were allowed to hold on campus were governed by size and safety requirements. On campus, students were no longer allowed to use shared alcohol containers (such as kegs) or hold unregulated gatherings. These changes in UGA policy pushed alcohol use into downtown Athens. In response, downtown businesses decided to appeal to students and, to meet the increase in student patronage, bars began to “spring up” throughout the area. In the 1980s, city officials were concerned that other businesses would begin to migrate from the downtown area to the suburbs, leaving empty or abandoned space, so they did not place a limit on the number of restaurants and bars in the area.

Within 10 years, the number of bars in the downtown area rose dramatically. ACCPD Lieutenant Lawrence McCrary was assigned to the downtown district. He noted that within a *four-block* radius of downtown Athens are 57 entertainment centers—including bars, restaurants, and clubs—that serve alcohol. On any given Friday or Saturday night, this area accommodates 8,000 to 12,000 people.

Due to this change, crime rose downtown. Alcohol-related assaults, public intoxication, and other incidents that were previously rare in that area became frequent occurrences. The bars that admitted patrons who were 18 years of age and over distinguished the underage and legal age populations through various methods, such as wrist bands and stamps, but there was still a significant amount of underage drinking.

Soon, alcohol-related problems grew out of hand, and four youths were hospitalized for alcohol overdose. Three of them were UGA students, and one was a local high school student. Their blood-alcohol levels registered .30 percent and higher. These youth overdoses and corresponding media coverage heightened awareness of the problem of underage and irresponsible drinking practices in Athens.

During the mid-1990s, Athens–Clarke County was not the only jurisdiction experiencing these problems. Media stories around the country told of young people dying from binge drinking and alcohol-related student hazing practices. At that time, the ACCPD received calls about underage drinking every day, sometimes from parents and sometimes from public school administrators, who also received many parent complaints. Residents of nearby counties complained that their children were traveling to Athens to drink alcohol.

The Georgia Department of Revenue, Alcohol and Tobacco Division, then sent undercover agents to ACC and found that, indeed, there was a significant underage drinking problem. Even without this undercover initiative, the police department was well aware of the problem and was working on a program to prevent underage drinking in the area.

### *The Chief*

Chief of Police Joseph Lumpkin, Sr., has worked for the ACCPD for 27 years. He was born and raised in ACC, attended the University of Georgia, graduated from Brenau University, and knows the community's alcohol problem all too well. During the 1980s, Chief Lumpkin was instrumental in presenting tape-recorded footage of alcohol-related issues to the ACC Commission, the city and county's legislative body, to help the com-

missioners understand the problems the police were facing. The effort resulted in an ordinance prohibiting open alcohol containers in the public right of way, except for licensed sidewalk cafes.

In 1992, he left the department (as bureau chief of operations) to take the position of chief of police in Toccoa, Georgia, about 60 miles north of Athens. Sixteen months later, he became the chief of police in Albany, a city in southwest Georgia. In 1997, he returned to the ACCPD as chief of police.

He immediately recognized the underage drinking problems and decided to act on preventing alcohol-related fatalities before they occurred in Athens–Clark County. The police department studied the problem and determined what would have an impact on high school and college underage drinking.

### *Documenting the Problem*

Initially, the police department gathered incident-based information to document when and where the problem was occurring. Its approach was based on research and the problem-oriented policing (POP) approach<sup>1</sup> to crime prevention that the chief had studied while attending several of PERF's POP Conferences.

Police conducted sting operations to assess the sources of alcohol for youth. The police department began to investigate bars that allowed persons below the legal drinking age to enter. The police soon found that some of the bar owners had virtually built their businesses on selling to underage drinkers.

Next, the department pulled the state's Department of Revenue into the sting operation. The Department of Revenue checked 11 bars and issued 26 arrest warrants for alcohol violations. Attention to detail and understanding the nature of illegal alcohol retailers made the problem documentation

problem documentation and initial sting operations a success.

## *Getting Started and Gaining Support*

Given the national and local situation and the department's assessment of the alcohol violations in the community, it was undeniable that there were problems and, until now, many people had been turning their heads. The police department reviewed National Institute of Justice (NIJ) publications and other law enforcement journals and examined other departments' successful programs.

The department decided to implement a *consequence-based* program that would work on many levels. The program would stress consequences for establishments that serve underage drinkers, for underage persons who drink alcoholic beverages, and for persons who sell or purchase alcohol illegally or purchase alcohol for the intended purpose of underage alcohol consumption.

From its research and community analysis, the police department realized the program should be comprehensive. It began to look at other tools that could be added to the initiative, rather than relying only on strict enforcement and punishment. Those tools included education and training by and for the community, especially for bar owners, their employees, and alcohol regulation violators. In addition, the police needed to build larger partnerships with all key stakeholders (namely, all concerned individuals and groups, including the community, the universities, and others who might be affected by the changing and increasing enforcement efforts).

Experience led the chief to the conclusion that efforts that worked in other jurisdictions might not fit appropriately into his community. The effort must be developed in and

“owned” by Athens–Clarke County residents. The police department decided to make the issue a community project, with all community members taking responsibility.

Community support of the effort began during a series of town hall meetings. Meetings of all stakeholders were necessary for gaining support and obtaining viewpoints and concerns within the community. Persons and agencies contacted to participate in the town meetings included these:

- UGA vice president of student affairs
- UGA public safety department
- Downtown Development Authority
- EMS
- Police
- Fire
- Community-Oriented Policing Leadership Council
- Students
- Religious groups
- School board members
- Downtown business representatives
- Restaurant and bar owners
- Concerned citizens

The chief *personally* called most of the potential partners and requested their attendance at the town hall meetings. The meetings were well publicized, and the chief orchestrated the settings, dates, and locations. The chief held three meetings over a four- to six-week period in different areas of the town.

During the meetings, the chief set the stage for the discussion, but he let the community

representatives and local agencies determine each meeting's direction and make recommendations. The police department merely provided the forum for the meetings, offered facts on youth alcohol consumption and problems with enforcement, and then let the attendees have the floor. The chief remembers initiating the community effort as a labor-intensive undertaking, but having the community's support as worth the work in the long run.

The town hall meetings were well attended, and most of the attendees became eventual supporters and key players in the community initiative. Above all, the town hall meetings sparked new partnerships. Although supportive, the police department tried to maintain a peripheral role in developing the program because it was such a volatile issue in the community.

The local MADD chapter, together with healthcare agencies and professionals, was very supportive of the initiative. Since the alcohol issue also impacts traffic, waste, state regulatory agencies, government offices, and juvenile justice and other agencies, the department kept program partners and the community in general up to date on program activities. Following these meetings, participants were assigned tasks from the meetings, such as looking into the stakeholders' program suggestions.

These meetings gave the community and other stakeholders time to make recommendations and to express concerns. Eventually, a common ground emerged among the parties and stakeholders.

The ACC initiative was developed in these town hall meetings. Once the initiative began, the strongly motivated community would not let the police forget about the issue. Program recommendations were recorded, and the police department developed

a report of the meeting's findings for submission to the ACC Commission.

## *Program Elements*

Community involvement was of utmost importance in developing the ACC youth alcohol enforcement effort. Once the department had conducted research on the issue and documented the problem in Athens–Clarke County, it was prepared to present the issue to the community. The issue was presented through the town hall meetings. The department allowed the stakeholders to shape the program based on the stakeholders' concerns.

The comprehensive community initiative that resulted from this effort required every stakeholder to take responsibility for preventing youth alcohol violations. The program was based on the following elements:

1. **Business Education and Training:** Business owners learned to “police” themselves and provide training and education for their employees, with minimum guidance from the police department.
2. **Enforcement:** The ACCPD developed a variety of enforcement efforts, sometimes aided by the state's alcohol regulatory agency. These efforts included newspaper advertisements for the employment of underage purchasers, stings utilizing underage operatives equipped with video/audio taping devices, and advertisements of the availability of a Cops-in-Shops Initiative. An Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) officer was placed in the department as a liaison to help coordinate these efforts.
3. **Education:** Education efforts were expanded in the local school districts and on the UGA campus. Through UGA, the ACCPD was also able to encourage local judges to divert offenders to education



and counseling courses in lieu of criminal prosecution.

4. **Legislation:** Based on its own judgment and recommendations from the community, the department petitioned the ACC Commission to change several local ordinances to reduce youth alcohol violations and help in police enforcement.
5. **Notification:** The police department, the media, and the downtown business authority helped notify the community of new enforcement efforts. By putting the community on notice, the department indicated it would not be trying to surprise anyone—potential offenders would have fair warning not to violate alcohol laws.

### *Hospitality Resource Panel*

Establishment of a Hospitality Resource Panel (HRP)<sup>2</sup> of local bar and restaurant owners, city officials, and others was a recommendation made at the town hall meeting for the entertainment industry to “police” itself. Chief Lumpkin believes that in the long term, it is better for the industry to set its own standards for business owner and employee education and training than for the police department to do so.

The ACCPD is a member of the panel but does not dictate the issues and policies that the panel discusses. Instead, it provides crime information and resources for training on such topics as recognizing fake identification. The police department tries to maintain a low profile in the HRP meetings but, if pressed, makes it explicit that the department’s job is to enforce the law.

Chief Lumpkin describes the process of implementing the HRP: “First, we talked to people who had implemented successful hospitality panels of stakeholders in the issue—stakeholders such as retailers, wholesalers, the university officials, public safety officials,

and members of the convention and travel industry.”

Lieutenant McCrary, the police department’s downtown operations commander, adds that this particular form of HRP was modeled after the San Diego Hospitality Resource Panel. The Athens–Clarke County community then developed a guide to implementing its own HRP.

“The idea behind the HRP,” according to Chief Lumpkin, “is not to have a government association control the problem, but to have a forum of stakeholders find a compromise between the regulatory agencies and people in the industry. This also helps the stakeholders get to know each other and understand the different perspectives and problems, and decreases the ‘us vs. them’ perspective.”

The Downtown Development Authority is in charge of the HRP and has devoted a part of its budget to funding a coordinator to keep panel members informed and committed to group membership and initiatives. The coordinator serves as the primary source of communication among panel members and plans the monthly meetings.

Stakeholder discussion determined that the panel would train management personnel and bartenders (teaching them how to intervene with intoxicated persons or underage persons) and would address sales promotions that lead to problem drinking practices, such as binge drinking.

The organization is issue-driven; as an issue arises, the HRP brings it to the table. Additionally, the HRP attempts to anticipate problems and address them before they occur.

A major benefit of the HRP is that it has provided resources that were not available before. For example, the HRP now receives underage-drinking prevention funding from alcohol wholesalers that are members of the

group, such as Miller Brewing Company and Anheuser-Busch. Those companies provide funding and other resources as part of their public relations and community support campaigns to preempt alcohol problems in the area. Local distributors also fund education initiatives in the schools.

Lieutenant Lawrence McCrary serves as a member of the HRP's eight-member executive council. The panel meets monthly, and more often if a special enforcement, education, or training initiative is in progress. Lieutenant McCrary says that the police role in the HRP is not to dictate how the organization should run or to impose a law enforcement presence on the group of industry stakeholders. Rather, it is to provide resources to solve problems with illegal alcohol use or enforcement of underage drinking laws within the bars. The department also provides the industry with information on underage drinking, crime trends, and enforcement issues in the area.

## *Enforcement*

Initial enforcement efforts developed by the police department were designed to target bars and restaurants that were consistently operating in violation of alcohol laws. However, Chief Lumpkin did not want the initiative to take a heavy-handed enforcement approach, alienating business owners who could potentially be good partners for the program. Still, the chief explained, "you must demonstrate that there are consequences and that you have the ability to inflict bad and good consequences." Consequences must be demonstrated early in the effort, but not often.

The chief stresses that when "bad" consequences occur, or when strict enforcement is implemented, the police department should ensure that it is targeting the "bad apples" or the most noncompliant establishments. Overall, initial enforcement efforts should not

target the establishments that are mostly compliant. The chief observes, "You do not want to punish good people; this only causes you to lose their trust."

## *Shared Ownership*

The police department sought to decentralize responsibility for the program and involve many departments and agencies. One city department with which the police worked closely was the solicitor general's office.<sup>3</sup> The solicitor general's office, under the direction of Solicitor General Ken Maudlin, worked closely with the ACCPD and other stakeholders to ensure that bartenders and other alcohol servers would be held liable for serving underage persons, and that bar owners and retailers would be held legally responsible for their staff. Additionally, these efforts sought to ensure prosecution of underage persons who attempt to drink or present fake identification.

The police department collaborated with the solicitor general's office to secure a grant from the governor's office for investigators to work on education, training, and enforcement. The investigators worked for the solicitor general's office, allowing the solicitor general to share enforcement responsibility. The solicitor general's position is not as politically sensitive as the police chief's position, and the chief and the solicitor general felt that any backlash from the initiative would be less damaging if the two offices shared responsibility for investigations and enforcement.

Another example of an enforcement and prosecution effort coordinated among the solicitor general, the police department, and the courts is the alternative sentence for alcohol violations: a fine plus a class and counseling attendance at UGA. Rather than a jail sentence or a criminal record, alcohol violators have the option of attending special courses

offered by UGA. These courses focus on alcohol education and group counseling. The intensity of the courses varies with the needs of the offender.

The solicitor general is now trying to work out a system to reward “good” (compliant) business practices. For example, if a business has been the target of an enforcement effort before and no new violations are documented, then that fact is recorded. If there are enforcement efforts in the future and a violation is noted, previous good standing may provide a mitigating factor in prosecution or fines. This system has not yet been implemented, but the effort, along with additional program elements, is in the works.

The ACCPD’s ABC liaison officer primarily coordinates the police department’s enforcement initiatives. One initiative is the party patrol, which consists of a two-officer car that is on duty on Friday and Saturday evenings and other special days, such as holidays, to patrol areas in which drinking, especially underage drinking, may occur. The party patrol responds to all noise violations and disturbance calls that may be related to alcohol or parties. Party patrol officers are trained to deal with intoxicated persons, to handle large numbers of underage drinkers, and to break up mass gatherings and parties.

Another initiative is “Cops in Shops.” As a matter of local policy, the chief of police holds sole authority to permit a Cops-in-Shops sting. An officer can be placed in a convenience store or other outlet that sells alcohol. Posing as a clerk, he or she will check for fake identification or youths attempting to purchase alcohol illegally. The chief does not need the mayor or store manager’s authority to place an officer in a store—the police department determines when the action should take place. Officers also conduct “shoulder-tapping” watches. These watches involve surveillance in and

around retail outlets where customers are suspected of making illegal purchases for minors.

Another enforcement tactic is to advertise in the local papers for students willing to work undercover with the police to check bar and restaurant alcohol policies in practice. Working as an agent of the department, underage individuals attempt to purchase alcohol at various locations that may or may not be suspected of violations.

Simply running these advertisements can serve as a deterrent. The chief notes that about a third of the time, the department runs the ads with no intention of conducting operations. The threat of an undercover enforcement operation automatically ensures that bar and restaurant owners will review their alcohol policies and tighten them up if necessary. As staffing is sometimes a problem and the department cannot implement as many enforcement efforts as it would like, the advertisement provides a low-cost and low-resource reminder of the department’s efforts.

## *Education*

Continued education of the community, college students, youth, business owners, and servers of alcoholic beverages is a large portion of the Athens–Clarke County youth alcohol prevention and enforcement effort. Alcohol education, as part of the Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE) program, is conducted in local school districts with the help of the department’s ABC coordinator and funding from several alcohol distributors that serve the area. Education is also offered by UGA for its students in general and for alcohol law and ordinance violators diverted from the criminal justice system. The HRP works with the police department and other parts of the community to provide education and training for business owners, retailers, bartenders, servers, and others who control

minors' access to alcohol. This education and training is a key part of the community's effort to prevent youth access to alcoholic beverages.

## ***Legislation***

Eventually, evidence of illegal alcohol sales, coupled with community support for preventing underage alcohol consumption, helped the police department present persuasive arguments for creating new local ordinances and changing existing ones.

Stakeholders helped develop new legislation and strong arguments in favor of it. This approach helped several items pass the council. Although the ACC Commission did not want to be overbearing and come down harshly on the entertainment industry, it eventually adopted the following recommendations:

1. **Requiring individuals who serve alcohol to be at least 21 years of age.** Prior to this change, individuals 18 years of age and older were allowed to serve alcohol. It was reasoned that younger alcohol servers (mainly college students) would be more influenced by older college students, sorority or fraternity members, or friends to serve underage students. Older servers would not be as influenced by younger peers and, approaching graduation, would see they had more to lose by violating underage drinking laws.
2. **Establishing an ABC liaison position within the ACCPD.** The officer would initiate enforcement efforts.
3. **Requiring lighted checkpoints at the entrances of bars and clubs and requiring clubs to accept only state-issued, legal identification verifying consumer age.** In response, some retailers have even adopted "ID everyone" policies.
4. **Changing local bar closing time from 4:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m.** This ordinance was aimed at reducing late-night drinking and alcohol-related assaults and other violent incidents in the downtown area.
5. **Implementing a juvenile curfew ordinance that would not allow persons under age 18) to be in public areas after 11:00 p.m. without adult supervision.** This ordinance was adopted by the ACC Commission and implemented.
6. **Increasing the range of administrative action—instead of criminal—that could be taken against alcohol license holders and those charged with the responsibility of serving or selling alcoholic beverages.** Many of these initiatives were initiated by the police department's work with the solicitor general's office.

Two other proposed ordinances did not pass. A requirement that hospitals report alcohol toxicity in minors did not pass, as the council and others feared violating privacy and discouraging overdose victims from seeking necessary medical attention. A keg registration ordinance, which would track the buyer's name and the location where the keg would be kept, was not adopted. However, a 2001 Georgia statute accomplished the same purpose.

Moving the closing time of bars from 4:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m. decreased alcohol-related problems and violence throughout the jurisdiction. Among other benefits, the hours between 3:00 a.m. and 7:00 a.m. are no longer associated with high rates of alcohol-related violence.

Enforcing the curfew ordinance allowed the department to place some of the responsibility for preventing underage drinking on parents. Youth in violation of the ordinance can be assessed a fine, as can their parents. This ordinance helped reduce the volume of prob-

lems with youth, particularly high school students from other counties coming to ACC with the intention of drinking illegally.

Increasing the variety and severity of administrative sanctions that may be levied against license holders makes it easier to hold them responsible for both their business practices and the behavior of their employees. Administrative sanctions, rather than criminal sanctions, provide enough punishment for smaller violations that may have gone unsanctioned previously, without an excessive (and often costly) reliance on criminal prosecution.

Additionally, it is now possible to sanction the server, store manager, and license holder for a violation, whereas before they may not have been held legally responsible. (Currently, the police department is working on an ordinance proposal that would require the revocation of *any* alcohol license upon the second conviction for a criminal violation of alcohol regulations within a 12-month period.)

As the commission continues to adopt progressive legislation, the police department would also like to see Athens–Clarke County implement zoning regulations that limit the number of alcohol-serving businesses downtown and attach parking space requirements to alcohol business license holders. This would allow for a diversity of businesses to thrive in the downtown area and attract people there for reasons other than the consumption of alcohol.

### ***Community Notification***

An important element of this program that has, fortunately, received sustained community support is the department’s insistence on *community notification*. The police department wants the entire community to be notified of its efforts so those persons or businesses choosing to violate youth alcohol laws

will have been fairly warned by the department.

Community notification can be handled in many ways. One method the ACCPD uses is to air warnings of the new enforcement efforts related to the department’s “zero tolerance” alcohol policy on local public access cable television channels. Notice is also given to area visitors through the city’s public relations office, the Downtown Development Authority, the HRP, and UGA. Therefore, visitors to ACC, students and citizens can be expected to be aware of alcohol enforcement initiatives.

Partnering agencies also notify and remind the community of enforcement initiatives. Chief Lumpkin often requests that the local Community-Oriented Policing Leadership Council remind the community of responsible drinking and serving practices. That council’s cooperation reminds the community that other agencies are involved and concerned, not only the police department. “Partners really help, and ask for help,” the chief observes.

Finally, the chief suggests notifying the community of enforcement issues by showing violators that there still are consequences. “Do not neglect the problem, or allow blatant violators to go unpunished,” he notes. Enforcement efforts that target blatant violators remind legitimate business owners and others that the department will pursue legal consequences for those who have been warned many times before and still violate alcohol laws and ordinances.

## Program Funding

The alcohol enforcement program of Athens–Clarke County and the ACCPD requires *no additional funding for the police department*.

The table below shows program elements and related funding sources.

Program Element	Local Funding Source
<i>Department ABC Liaison Officer</i>	Funding for the ABC liaison officer is allocated in the police department’s operating budget.
<i>Party Patrol</i>	The police department allocates overtime funds for a two-officer car designated to party patrol on Friday and Saturday evenings and for special events.
<i>Alcohol Investigators</i>	The county solicitor general’s office received a grant from the Governor’s Office of Children and Youth Coordinating Council for personnel to assist with training for the hospitality panel and to investigate alcohol violations.
<i>Hospitality Resource Panel</i>	This panel and its coordinator are funded through the Downtown Development Authority’s budget. The Downtown Development Authority has a vested interest in encouraging downtown businesses to comply with alcohol laws.
<i>Education</i>	DARE and other educational programs are funded through the police department’s operating budget and through alcohol wholesale merchant donations.
<i>UGA Education and Counseling for Offenders</i>	Offenders offered the option of being diverted to UGA alcohol education courses or counseling are required to pay for their own classes.

Other sources of funding include the following:

1. *Wholesalers*: Several wholesale alcohol dealers provide funding to the Hospitality Resource Panel and the community to prevent underage drinking. Anheuser-Busch and Miller Brewing Company fund these initiatives, and it helps them

build an image of caring and concern within the community.

2. *Graduated fines and court costs*: There are graduated fines for those who repeatedly violate alcohol laws, whether the offender is the consumer, seller, server, or manager, and these funds, including most court costs, are available through the general fund to be allocated toward

the community's alcohol enforcement and prevention efforts.

## ***Question and Answer*** ***Session with Police Chief*** ***Joseph Lumpkin***

### **Q. Why do you think you are an effective program leader, and how were you able to mobilize ACC stakeholders and community members?**

*Chief Lumpkin:* The credibility and trust of a leader is an important aspect of implementing a successful program. I was in a unique situation. I was recruited as chief because of an increase in the homicide and rape rate in ACC, and we were successful in decreasing these rates. Additionally, ACC community members are familiar with me and trust me. I am a lifetime resident of ACC (minus the five years I was chief in other departments), and a leader on many state committees.

My credibility as a resident of ACC and as a demonstrated, effective police leader made me capable of demonstrating the link between underage alcohol use and behaviors that are unacceptable. I was able to mobilize the community to develop a comprehensive prevention program by merely describing, documenting and presenting the problem.

### **Q. What qualities make a chief a successful leader?**

*Chief Lumpkin:* The chief must have a genuine desire to make a difference and see each block or neighborhood of a community become safer than the day, week, or month before. Trustworthiness, competency, and quality of character are necessities. Other qualities include being a good listener, empowering people, and learning from others, but also teaching. A successful chief will

develop a learning organization where employees want to improve themselves and the way they approach their job. A chief should create a value-added force where officers want to work hard and take risks for your vision.

A successful leader and chief should always look for processes and structures that should be changed and improved, but not make changes for the mere sake of altering things. A successful chief should not fear change and should avoid becoming comfortable with the status quo. Change will and should be continuous, but not at such a rate that it threatens contributing internal or external customers.

### **Q. What elements of your program do you feel have led to its success?**

*Chief Lumpkin:* One element of our program's success is that we have tried to avoid appearing as the "occupying army" in the community. Clearly, illegal businesses had to be sanctioned, and if that did not work, then put out of business. We focused our enforcement efforts on people and businesses that were setting up illegal markets that provide alcohol to youth and threatened the business of other, law-abiding establishments.

Enforcement efforts did not target or attempt to sanction the restaurants or businesses that were law-abiding 99 percent of the time, the businesses that tried to maintain a legal and safe establishment. Our focus was aimed at the businesses that did not attempt to comply with alcohol laws. By avoiding nit-picking, the department gained the trust, respect, and cooperation of the majority of law-abiding establishments.

Additionally, we approached the problem by listening, learning, and knowing what worked in the past, both problems that oc-

curred and solutions to these problems that worked well. The town hall meetings were a benefit to the initiation of our program and all persons that attended. We let everyone have a chance to speak and to voice their concerns, and then let them generate ideas for program initiatives. Community involvement definitely increased the buy-in to our program and demonstrated the police department's willingness to listen, learn, and lead, helping to breakdown the "us vs. them" perspective on the issue.

Using a variety of approaches to the problem is also important to success. For example, the unified government of ACC uses more tools than just arrest. We use a variety of sentencing options, such as community service, fines, education, and counseling. In our program, even violators may become eventual program supporters, because people don't have to come out with a criminal record. Arrest and criminal prosecution is only one tool. By eliminating the necessity of a criminal record, this may eliminate the backlash that often occurs when "good" kids get arrested for alcohol possession or DUI, or an upstanding business owner is cited for an alcohol violation.

The experience of other police departments that had implemented similar programs also helped us determine how to begin our initiative. Seminars for police executives were a large help in developing the ACC initiative. These seminars and conferences, such as the annual PERF International Problem-Oriented Policing Conference in San Diego, allow police executives to hear other professionals discuss their efforts and how they were successful. Our department contacted the people that discussed similar initiatives at these conferences and requested information and abstracts that described their initiatives and program experiences.

**Q. Overall, what do you think is the program's greatest strength?**

*Chief Lumpkin:* The program was organized and spearheaded by those whose interest was needed. Additionally, the program kept the interest of the necessary parties through the Hospitality Resource Panel and the panel's coordinator.

**Q. What initiative has been the most embraced by the community?**

*Chief Lumpkin:* The Hospitality Resource Panel. This panel did several things. First, it set up a broad base of community support and gathered all the stakeholders. Second, it enabled the development of narrowly defined objectives for the prevention of underage drinking. The panel also helped to establish trust and common ground in the interest of moving forward on the issue together. Before the HRP, the groups were somewhat fragmented.

**Q. What groups were unsupportive of your program?**

*Chief Lumpkin:* The media were not as cooperative in accepting the initiative in the beginning as we would have liked. They were focused on the potential conflict that might come out of this type of town meeting.

Once the media saw how inclusive the meetings were and how the police approached the issue and developed recommendations around the community and business owners' ideas, the media reports became an excellent source of information and a promoter of the recommendations. After the town meetings, the initiative was no longer just a police initiative, but a community initiative through a government office, coordinated by the police department.



Other unsupportive groups involved people under the age of 21 who wanted to drink, and some bars and restaurants that continually operated on the fringe of legality. Of course they were opposed to *any* new police or regulatory initiatives.

**Q. How did you deal with program opposition and non-supporters?**

*Chief Lumpkin:* Once the community became involved and the police department opened the forum for discussion, overcoming non-supporters was not difficult. In general, we dealt with non-supporters by allowing their positions and concerns to be voiced and *listening* to them. The town hall meetings were the predominant forum for this discussion.

Then, we let other community members—not the police—refute their arguments for not implementing a youth alcohol enforcement program. It helps to use arguments other than “because it is illegal.” We let the community give non-supporters concrete examples of why the behavior cannot be tolerated (for example, overdoses, DUI and traffic fatalities, date rape, school performance, etc.). This makes for a stronger argument and gives non-supporters’ arguments little credibility with the rest of the community. Additionally, we had a neutral party take minutes during these sessions and later report what was said, especially what the community members and organizations said in response to the opposition.

**Q. Was anyone hesitant or difficult to work with?**

*Chief Lumpkin:* Not really. The three town meetings were heavily attended by religious leaders, students, UGA officials, bar owners, community members, and others. The meetings were held several weeks apart from each other to encourage additional atten-

dance and give each entity time to regroup and rethink the situation. Recommendations from these meetings were a compromise that, surprisingly, pleased almost everyone. If any one group was apprehensive, it would be the bar owners, but in most cases their apprehensions were assuaged.

**Q. How do you maintain program support and community interest?**

*Chief Lumpkin:* Most support and community interest is maintained through the Hospitality Resource Panel. The Downtown Development Authority hired an HRP coordinator, whose job is maintaining panel activities and coordinating monthly meetings with the HRP Executive Board. Members of the HRP board include representatives from businesses (two bars and one restaurant), a representative from the convention and welcoming center, one representative from the Solid Waste Agency, and two from the police department [Chief Lumpkin and Lieutenant McCrary].

These monthly meetings ensure that the executive representatives from a variety of organizations revisit the issue continually, and guarantee that current alcohol-related issues are quickly addressed. Additionally, the solicitor general really drives the initiative. As the grant recipient, the solicitor general has two full-time investigators that work on alcohol-related problems directly from his office.

So, overall the HRP motivates the community for the long term. Neighborhood Watch participants and groups, DUI enforcement efforts, other enforcement efforts, and weekly party patrols maintain community and police department awareness of the problem year-round. The police department also uses the media and national events to bring the focus back to the alcohol issue and the initiative in ACC. Tragic stories from

around the country related to youth alcohol abuse are also used to demonstrate the importance of our program and continue to gain and maintain support for the initiative.

**Q. How did you deal with conflicting or overlapping interests?**

*Chief Lumpkin:* This is dealt with mainly through the Hospitality Resource Panel. The panel is a group of issue stakeholders overseen by an executive board representative of the stakeholders themselves. Issues are discussed and viewpoints are considered by all members of the HRP prior to attempting to find a satisfactory compromise for all involved.

**Q. How do you build support for the program within the police department?**

*Chief Lumpkin:* Before we held the first town hall meeting, officers were not ignoring the alcohol enforcement laws, so to the department, it is not as though we were enforcing *new* laws. We were adding community oriented policing and problem solving to the equation with the community being central to our efforts. We only added different dimensions to how we approached the enforcement of youth alcohol laws, and this is how we approached the initiative within the department. It was not difficult to build support for laws that were already supported by our officers.

**Q. Whose support or approval outside of the department did you seek before initiating the program?**

*Chief Lumpkin:* When beginning the program, we solicited support from the ACC manager, the executive director of the Downtown Development Authority, the vice president of Student Affairs of the University of Georgia, MADD, the hospitality industry members, etc. In terms of funding support, the Governor's Office on Children

and Youth Coordinating Council funded the investigators that were allocated to the solicitor general's office for education, training, and enforcement activities. The mayor and commission allocated appropriate funds for the department to authorize overtime for the party patrol and sting operations.

Otherwise, the Downtown Development Authority provided the funding for the rest of the initiative, mainly the Hospitality Resource Panel. They have an interest in maintaining the downtown area and funded the effort through retail property taxes.

## *Do's and Don'ts for Youth Alcohol Enforcement*

### *Do*

1. *Do* maintain the focus on youth alcohol enforcement and provide the forum, but let the community develop its own program. The community has to understand what needs to be done, engage in discussion, and draw its own conclusion about policy implications and which program is right for their area. The approach cannot be "canned." Community interaction and understanding of all perspectives from a meeting of stakeholders is imperative to program success.
2. *Do* use a major event, such as a juvenile DUI, binge drinking event, or arrest of an underage drinker to initiate your enforcement effort or community program. The event can occur in your jurisdiction or in another part of the country.
3. *Do* establish a broad base of support in your community and throughout the state. Involve all stakeholders and build trust among stakeholders with opposing objectives. This encourages buy-in from

the stakeholders and members of the community. Additionally, when a problem arises, it is best if the community or violators see more participants than just the police department. Find common ground and work together.

4. *Do* set attainable goals for your community and program and work on team building through the goals.
5. *Do* demonstrate that there are consequences and that you have the ability to inflict bad and good consequences. Do so early in the effort, but not often. When you conduct a sting or make an arrest, make sure you target the most non-compliant establishments or those that operated illegally more than once.
6. *Do* maintain open communication with stakeholders and the community. Communicate on all levels and in every possible way. For example, explain citations to citizens, use a public relations officer or a public access television station to communicate with citizens, or set up a link to the enforcement efforts on the department's Web page.
7. *Do* monitor the community and environment and ensure that the department is following the law and meeting the community's expectations. Assure continuous improvement. Changes may not happen overnight, but it is important to improve problem approaches and initiatives; develop statutes, legislation, and ordinances, and ensure that legislation passes.

### ***Don't***

1. *Don't* take a heavy-handed approach to enforcement. Work patiently to build cooperation first.
2. *Don't* play favorites or have hidden agendas.

3. *Don't* merely react. Once the program is established, work to anticipate and prevent events that may lead to underage access to or use of alcohol.
4. *Don't* assume people know your position, problems, or perspectives. You need to discuss them.
5. *Don't* dominate the issue. As the police chief, you should stay above the issue, but you should also let the community know you are concerned. Invite community members to come into your office and tell you how to approach the problem.

### ***Endnotes***

<sup>1</sup> See W. Spellman and J. E. Eck, "Newport News Tests Problem-Oriented Policing," *NIJ Reports*, January 1987, pp. 2-8.

W. Spelman and J. E. Eck, "Problem-Oriented Policing," *Research in Brief*, National Institute of Justice, January 1987.

Herman Goldstein, *Problem-Oriented Policing* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1990).

<sup>2</sup> Hospitality Resource Panels (promoted by the Responsible Hospitality Institute, a nonprofit organization dedicated to promoting legal and social awareness programs for the hospitality industry) are local programs that "assist people before they open a hospitality business, nurture a trained and professional workforce, facilitate the role of government as a resource and partner in business development and create a business-friendly helping hand to anyone moving off-track of a professionally managed establishment." More information is available at [www.hospitalityweb.org](http://www.hospitalityweb.org).

<sup>3</sup> The solicitor general serves as the prosecuting attorney in the courts of ACC. Ken Maudlin has served as ACC solicitor general for 10 years and is a member of the Executive Committee of the Alcohol Responsibility Council for ACC. Prior to the publication of this report, Mr. Maudlin was elected to the position of district attorney and began his term on January 1, 2001.