Policing entertainment districts

Blair J. Berkley

Management Department, School of Business and Economics, California State University, Los Angeles, California, USA, and

John R. Thayer

Santa Barbara Police Department, Santa Barbara, California, USA

Abstract Entertainment is now the largest trend in retailing and urban redevelopment, and is credited with revitalizing many downtowns. Consequently, many other cities are attempting to replicate this success by developing pedestrian-oriented entertainment districts consisting of movie theaters, nightclubs, bars, restaurants, and retail shopping. This paper summarizes the results of 30 police-manager interviews and a nationwide survey used to identify entertainment-district features that create problems and demands for police resources, and effective strategies and tactics for policing entertainment districts. The most effective policing is done at the district planning and design stage by engineering out features that cause problems. Good entertainment-district policing then requires continuous training and education of business managers and private security personnel. Finally, night-time district patrol requires a multi-prong effort to pre-empt problems and assure public safety.

Introduction

Retailing and urban redevelopment are now driven by entertainment. Entertainment attracts people to an area and creates pedestrian activity, repeat visits, and the perception of economic vitality. Today, almost all new large-scale commercial developments have significant entertainment components. Entertainment businesses are also credited with revitalizing many nearly abandoned downtowns. Many other cities are now attempting to replicate this success by developing downtown entertainment districts consisting of movie theaters, nightclubs, bars, restaurants, and retail shopping (Rubin *et al*, 1994).

Frequently, entertainment districts are not planned, they just evolve over time. Perhaps a city redevelops downtown infrastructure and a few bars or nightclubs move in. Before city officials recognize what is happening, 20 or 30 restaurants, bars, and nightclubs have moved into the area to create a large crowd-control problem. Since these districts are most active during the evening and night-time hours, and the police department is the primary 24-hour agency, responsibility for managing entertainment districts inevitably falls on the police department.

Research methodology

This paper summarizes the results of 30 police-manager interviews and a nationwide survey used to identify entertainment-district features and dynamics that create demands for police resources, and effective policing strategies and tactics. This information is useful because the most effective

policing is done at the planning and design stage by engineering out features that cause problems (Crowe, 1991; Robinson, 1998).

Interviews were used to identify the issues and tactics included in the survey instrument and the survey was used to obtain importance weights. Most of the entertainment districts selected for the interviewing stage of the research are located in Southern California so that interviews could be conducted in-person. The authors interviewed the managers responsible for policing 14 entertainment districts and in many cases additional supervisors (Table I). All interviews except the two noted in Table I were conducted in-person, and all interviews were taped and completely transcribed. Interviews ranged from one to three hours. Each interviewee was asked the open-ended questions listed in the Appendix. Interviews and open-ended questions were used so that the policing issues and tactics important to the interviewees could be identified without imposing the belief structures of the authors (Jesilow *et al.*, 1998, p. 454).

Interview results were used to construct a survey instrument. Police agencies responsible for every entertainment district known to the authors were telephoned to identify the managers responsible for policing the districts and to obtain commitments to complete the survey. A total of 38 surveys were mailed and 34 were returned. Survey respondents are given in Table II and the entertainment districts included in the study are given in Table III. Survey results are given in Tables IV and V. The survey instrument appeared identical to Tables IV and V except that check boxes replaced response frequencies.

Entertainment-district problems
Nightclubs and bars
Nightclubs and bars create frequent demands for police resources (Table IV(2)). The main problems are intoxicated, fighting patrons who are ejected by nightclub security onto the sidewalk where they become the city's problem (Table IV(22), (25)). The causes include over-serving alcohol, overcrowding, poorly trained nightclub security (Table IV(21)), inadequate police presence early in the evening and at closing time, and a reluctance of nightclubs to make proactive calls to the police department.

Nightclubs and bars create further problems where they are concentrated in geographic areas (Table IV(10)). At closing time, intoxicated patrons exit onto the sidewalk and create a crowd-control problem that can severely strain a department's entire night shift (Table IV(20)). In many cities, fights, altercations, and the potential for collective behavior and rioting are very predictable at closing time, particularly where several nightclubs catering to incompatible crowds are located in close proximity (McDermott, 1998).

Closing-hour nightclub crowds are often in no particular hurry to go home and may linger on the sidewalk for a considerable period, extending the demand on police resources and the potential for large disturbances. Crowd dispersal is further slowed by valet parking, taxis, an absence of public transportation, sidewalk seating, and late-night restaurants. On the Sunset

policing is done at the planning and design stage by engineering out features that cause problems (Crowe, 1991; Robinson, 1998).

Interviews were used to identify the issues and tactics included in the survey instrument and the survey was used to obtain importance weights. Most of the entertainment districts selected for the interviewing stage of the research are located in Southern California so that interviews could be conducted in-person. The authors interviewed the managers responsible for policing 14 entertainment districts and in many cases additional supervisors (Table I). All interviews except the two noted in Table I were conducted in-person, and all interviews were taped and completely transcribed. Interviews ranged from one to three hours. Each interviewee was asked the open-ended questions listed in the Appendix. Interviews and open-ended questions were used so that the policing issues and tactics important to the interviewees could be identified without imposing the belief structures of the authors (Jesilow et al, 1998, p. 454).

Interview results were used to construct a survey instrument. Police agencies responsible for every entertainment district known to the authors were telephoned to identify the managers responsible for policing the districts and to obtain commitments to complete the survey. A total of 38 surveys were mailed and 34 were returned. Survey respondents are given in Table II and the entertainment districts included in the study are given in Table III. Survey results are given in Tables IV and V. The survey instrument appeared identical to Tables IV and V except that check boxes replaced response frequencies.

Entertainment-district problems
Nightclubs and bars
Nightclubs and bars create frequent demands for police resources (Table IV(2)). The main problems are intoxicated, fighting patrons who are ejected by nightclub security onto the sidewalk where they become the city's problem (Table IV(22), (25)). The causes include over-serving alcohol, overcrowding, poorly trained nightclub security (Table IV(21)), inadequate police presence early in the evening and at closing time, and a reluctance of nightclubs to make proactive calls to the police department.

Nightclubs and bars create further problems where they are concentrated in geographic areas (Table IV(10)). At closing time, intoxicated patrons exit onto the sidewalk and create a crowd-control problem that can severely strain a department's entire night shift (Table IV(20)). In many cities, fights, altercations, and the potential for collective behavior and rioting are very predictable at closing time, particularly where several nightclubs catering to incompatible crowds are located in close proximity (McDermott, 1998).

Closing-hour nightclub crowds are often in no particular hurry to go home and may linger on the sidewalk for a considerable period, extending the demand on police resources and the potential for large disturbances. Crowd dispersal is further slowed by valet parking, taxis, an absence of public transportation, sidewalk seating, and late-night restaurants. On the Sunset

District	Managers	Supervisors
Balboa Peninsula Newport Beach, California		Det. Sgt. Mike McDermott
Beale Street Memphis, Tennessee	Capt. S.N. Harvey[a]	
Brand Boulevard Glendale, California	Lt. Jack S. Bilheimer	
City Walk Universal City, California	Lt. W. Brad Welker	
Downtown Laguna Beach Laguna Beach, California		Sgt. Jenny Jones
Gaslamp District San Diego, California	Deputy Chief William A. Maheu Lt. Chris Ellis	Sgt. B. Rex
Hollywood, California	Capt. Constance M. Dial Capt. Tammy Tatreau	
Irvine Spectrum Irvine, California	Lt. Sam Allevato	
Mill Avenue Tempe, Arizona	Lt. Mike Ringo	Sgt. David Humble Sgt. Jon King Sgt. Bob Papke
Old Pasadena Pasadena, California	Deputy Chief Wayne D. Hiltz	Sgt. George Wiley
Old Town Santa Barbara, California	Chief Richard A. Breza Lt. Charles Calkins Lt. Robert J. Lowry	Officer Michael A. Lazarus
Pier Avenue Hermosa Beach, California	Chief Valentine P. Straser	
Second Street/Pine Avenue Long Beach, California		Cpl. Joel Cook
South Beach Miami Beach, Florida	Capt. Anthony Pizzo[a]	
Sunset Strip West Hollywood, California	Capt. Richard E. Odenthal	
Third Street Promenade Santa Monica, California	Lt. George R. Centeno Lt. Gary F. Gallinot	Sgt. Robert Almada
Venice Beach Strand Los Angeles, California	Comdr. Alan B. Kerstein	Sgt. Kelly Shea

Table I.
Interviewees

Note: [a] Taped telephone interview. All other interviews were in person

Strip, for example, most patron cars are valet parked. Hence, when nightclubs close, hundreds of patrons compete for the same valet service and it can take as long as one hour to clear everyone out. Naturally, if patrons are intoxicated and frustrated by a slow valet service, one hour can be a long time to stay out of trouble.

Edward A. Aasted	Captain	Santa Barbara, CA
Sam Allevato	Lieutenant	Irvine, CA
Gerald Alton	Sergeant	San Diego, CA
Blake Chow	Lieutenant	Los Angeles, CA
Jeff Connelly	Sergeant	Ann Arbor, MI
Ernest R. Demma	Captain	New Orleans, LA
Michael P. Downing	Captain	Los Angeles, CA
Anthony G. Ell/Jack Foster	Commander/Captain	Kansas City, MO
Mark Evenson	Lieutenant	Seattle, WA
John E. Garcia	Captain	Tampa, FL
Craig W. Gentile	Sergeant	Baltimore, MD
Gary Gingell	Captain	Cleveland, OH
Vincent Golbeck	Lieutenant	Dallas, TX
Joseph P. Griffin	Commander	Chicago, IL
Richard J. Guerrero	Commander	Chicago, IL
Eldon W. Harris	Lieutenant	Houston, TX
Wayne D. Hiltz	Deputy Chief	Pasadena, CA
Michael L. Holloway	Captain	Orlando, FL
Gary Jeandron	Commander	Palm Springs, CA
Kim P. Johnson	Lieutenant	East Lansing, MI
Jenny Jones	Sergeant	Laguna Beach, CA
Tom Kilpatrick	Commander	Boulder, CO
John W. Lamb	Captain	Denver, CO
Harold Piatt	Commander	Austin, TX
Anthony Pizzo	Captain	Miami Beach, FL
T.J. Reed	Lieutenant	Daytona Beach, FL
Mike Ringo	Lieutenant	Tempe, AZ
Gary Schofield	Lieutenant	Las Vegas, NV
George Silverwood	Captain	Madison, WI
Betsy J. Stratton	Lieutenant	Santa Monica, CA
John F. Walker	Lieutenant/Commander	Philadelphia, PA
Daniel Watkins	Lieutenant	Miami, FL
W. Brad Welker	Lieutenant	Los Angeles County, CA
Unknown	Unknown	San Antonio, TX

Table II.
Survey respondents

Sidewalk seating such as benches, planters, and fountains makes it more comfortable for closing-hour crowds to linger on the sidewalk. After exiting loud nightclubs, many patrons like to talk outside, exchange phone numbers, and make plans for the next stop. When people finally move on, they may head to an all-night restaurant.

Public urination
Public urination is often a problem in entertainment districts because large volumes of alcohol are consumed, nightclubs and bars often have inadequate restroom capacity, and cities have provided no public restrooms (Table IV(14)). In addition to contributing to the urination problem, which in turn has a very adverse effect on the tone of the district (Kelling and Coles, 1997, p. 15), an absence of public restrooms conveys the message that the city lacks courtesy and hospitality. Public restrooms, though, are not without problems

Balboa Peninsula	Newport Beach, CA
Beale Street	Memphis, TN
Brand Boulevard	Glendale, CA
City Walk	Universal City, CA
Coconut Grove Business District	Miami, FL
Deep Ellum	Dallas, TX
Downtown District	East Lansing, MI
Downtown Experience	Palm Springs, CA
Downtown Laguna Beach	Laguna Beach, CA
Downtown Entertainment District	Houston, TX
Downtown Entertainment District	Orlando, FL
Flats, West Sixth	Cleveland, OH
French Quarter	New Orleans, LA
Gaslamp District	San Diego, CA
Hollywood	Hollywood, CA
Irvine Spectrum	Irvine, CA
LoDo	Denver, CO
Mill Avenue	Tempe, AZ
Old Pasadena	Pasadena, CA
Old Town	Santa Barbara, CA
Pearl Street Mall	Boulder, CO
Pier Avenue	Hermosa Beach, CA
Pioneer Square	Seattle, WA
Riverwalk	San Antonio, TX
Rush Street	Chicago, IL
Seabreeze Boulevard/Atlantic Avenue	Daytona Beach, FL
Second Street/Pine Avenue	Long Beach, CA
Sixth Street	Austin, TX
State Street/University Avenue	Madison, WI
South Beach	Miami Beach, FL
South Street	Philadelphia, PA
South University	Ann Arbor, MI
Sunset Strip	West Hollywood, CA
The Block	Baltimore, MD
The Strip	Las Vegas, NV
Third Street Promenade	Santa Monica, CA
Venice Beach Strand	Los Angeles, CA
Westport	Kansas City, MO
Wrigleyville	Chicago, IL
Ybor City	Tampa, FL

Table III.
Entertainment districts studied

(Table IV(1)). If they are not well maintained, attended, and well lighted, public restrooms host drug dealing, alcohol consumption, physical attacks, lewd behavior, and become condominiums for the homeless.

Transients and panhandlers
Entertainment districts attracting large numbers of tourists and people with disposable income are naturally appealing to transients and panhandlers. Sidewalk benches to sit on, unattended public restrooms and fountains to bathe in, and lax panhandling, street-performing, sidewalk-vending, and loitering

	Always a problem (1)	Frequently a problem (2)	Sometimes a problem (3)	Rarely a problem (4)	Never a problem (5)	Mean	Standard deviation
Entertainment-district features							
1. Public restrooms	8	5	10	6	5	2.8529	1.3736
2. Nightclubs and bars	6	10	17	1	0	2.3824	0.8170
3. Inadequate district lighting	0	3	11	15	5	3.6471	0.8486
4. Inadequate street capacities	2	16	11	4	1	2.5882	0.8916
5. Inadequate parking capacities	10	12	9	0	3	2.2353	1.1562
6. Incompatible businesses in close proximity	1	8	6	16	3	3.3529	1.0410
7. Narrow sidewalks and sidewalk obstructions	4	8	8	10	4	3.0588	1.2295
8. Public benches and other available sidewalk seating	0	6	6	16	6	3.6471	0.9811
9. Unsecured, unattended, or poorly lighted parking lots	0	8	16	7	3	3.1471	0.8921
10. Concentrations of alcoholic-beverage outlets (e.g. bars, nightclubs)	10	11	11	2	0	2.1471	0.9255
Entertainment-district dynamics							
11. Noise	4	10	18	2	0	2.5294	0.7876
12. Cruising	3	11	9	6	5	2.9706	1.2182
13. Valet parking	0	7	9	9	9	3.5882	1.1042
14. Public urination	6	11	10	6	0	2.4848	1.0038
15. Street performers	2	5	8	15	3	3.3636	1.0553
16. Transients and panhandlers	13	10	7	2	1	2.0303	1.0749
17. Traffic congestion and gridlock	4	17	10	2	0	2.3030	0.7699

(Continued)

Table IV.

	Always a problem (1)	Frequently a problem (2)	Sometimes a problem (3)	Rarely a problem (4)	Never a problem (5)	Mean	Standard deviation
18. Crowds released from movie theaters	0	1	9	10	13	4.0606	0.8993
19. Street closures creating crowds and party atmosphere	0	7	7	14	5	3.5152	1.0038
20. Crowds released from bars and nightclubs at closing time	10	9	11	2	1	2.2424	1.0616
21. Poorly trained private-security personnel (e.g. bar and nightclub security)	0	12	10	9	2	3.0303	0.9515
Violations and law enforcement							
22. Public fighting	2	14	16	2	0	2.5294	0.7065
23. Auto burglaries	4	13	11	6	0	2.5588	0.9274
24. Officer burnout	0	3	13	14	4	3.5588	0.8236
25. Public intoxication	9	18	6	1	0	1.9706	0.7582
26. Noise ordinance is difficult to enforce	5	10	10	7	2	2.7353	1.1364
27. Reliance on officers working overtime	2	8	7	12	5	3.2941	1.1685
28. Drugs (e.g. narcotics, Ecstasy, GHB)	4	7	19	4	0	2.6765	0.8428
29. Officers with the wrong demeanor for the district	0	1	8	23	2	3.7647	0.6060

	Very effective (1)	Effective (2)	Minimally effective (3)	Ineffective (4)	Very ineffective (5)	No chance to observe	Mean	Standard deviation
Strategic planning								
1. Crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED)	3	7	6	1	0	17	2.2941	0.8489
2. Police department participation in development review (planning) committees	3	10	6	1	1	13	2.3810	0.9735
3. Conditional-use, entertainment, or dance permit requirement that police department must approve business's security plan	5	7	3	0	0	19	1.8667	0.7432
Community policing								
4. Community police advisory boards	3	11	5	1	0	14	2.2000	0.7678
5. Problem-oriented policing (POP) projects	8	20	2	0	0	4	1.8000	0.5509
6. Police department interaction with merchant associations	13	17	3	0	0	1	1.6970	0.6366
7. Police department trains and educates business operators/managers	5	16	1	0	0	12	1.8182	0.5011
8. Police department or state alcoholic beverage department trains alcohol servers	7	9	3	2	1	12	2.1364	1.1253
9. Periodic citizen surveys regarding perceived problems and police department performance	2	5	11	0	2	14	2.7500	1.0195

(Continued)

Table V.

	Very effective (1)	Effective (2)	Minimally effective (3)	Ineffective (4)	Very ineffective (5)	No chance to observe	Mean	Standard deviation
10. Police department trains and educates private security personnel (e.g. bar and nightclub security)	2	5	4	0	0	23	2.1818	0.7508
11. Full-time beat co-ordinator to facilitate communication and serve as liaison and contact point for people in the district	9	14	1	0	0	10	1.6667	0.5647
Deployment								
12. Foot patrol	22	11	0	1	0	0	1.4118	0.6568
13. Bicycles	21	10	2	0	0	1	1.4242	0.6139
14. Motorcycles	8	13	5	0	0	8	1.8846	0.7114
15. Marked patrol cars	10	11	9	3	1	0	2.2353	1.0747
16. Unmarked vehicles	5	9	11	5	2	2	2.6875	1.1198
17. Horses	9	8	7	0	0	10	1.9167	0.8297
18. Jail van	6	13	8	2	0	5	2.2069	0.8610
19. Plain-clothes officers	6	14	9	2	0	3	2.2258	0.8450
20. Gang units	4	10	6	1	1	12	2.3182	0.9946
21. Probation officers	3	6	5	0	1	19	2.3333	1.0465
22. Non-sworn community-service officers (uniformed)	1	4	5	1	0	23	2.5455	0.8202
23. Private-security officer patrols of public streets and parking structures	2	9	1	2	2	18	2.5625	1.2633

(Continued)

	Very effective (1)	Effective (2)	Minimally effective (3)	Ineffective (4)	Very ineffective (5)	No chance to observe	Mean	Standard deviation
24. Detoxification center located in district	2	4	1	5	2	20	3.0714	1.3848
Entertainment-district patrol								
25. Clear enforcement priorities	18	13	2	0	0	1	1.5152	0.6185
26. Intermittent traffic diversions to disrupt cruising	4	11	2	1	0	16	2.0000	0.7670
27. Large congregations of people are discouraged and broken up	8	20	4	1	0	1	1.9394	0.7044
28. Enforcement actions taken early in the evening to set a tone	14	15	5	0	0	0	1.7353	0.7096
29. Regular, proactive business walk-throughs (e.g. bar checks)	12	18	1	0	0	3	1.6452	0.5507
30. Multi-agency (police, fire, code enforcement, health) bar and nightclub inspections teams	9	14	4	1	0	6	1.8929	0.7860
31. Quick contacts of obvious, potential troublemakers as soon as they arrive to the district	11	17	3	0	0	3	1.7419	0.6308
Ordinances								
32. Cruising ordinance	2	3	4	1	0	24	2.4000	0.9661
33. Curfew ordinance	9	14	8	1	1	1	2.1212	0.9604
34. Street performer ordinance	4	4	7	1	0	18	2.3125	0.9465
35. Boom-box (including automobile stereos) noise ordinance	7	15	3	3	2	4	2.2667	1.1427

Table V.

475

Policing entertainment districts

(sidewalk-sitting) ordinances make such areas even more attractive (Table IV(8)). A total of 23 cities characterized transients and panhandlers as either "always a problem" or "frequently a problem" (Table IV(16)). Transients and panhandlers contribute to a perception of lawlessness and are primarily a problem during the day when they sit in front of businesses and scare away patrons, thus provoking confrontations with business owners.

Noise

Entertainment districts generate noise that impacts nearby residences and hotels. Noise also makes crowd control challenging because radio communication is more difficult and people cannot understand what officers are saying. Noise also contributes to stress and an atmosphere of chaos. As noise levels increase, crowds become more unruly (Table IV(11)). Nightclubs produce noise when they have inadequate soundproofing or conduct musical performances with open doors and windows. Cruisers have loud stereo systems and street performers and religious groups can be loud if they are allowed to use amplification. Other street performers with no talent are annoying and can drive away sidewalk diners (Table IV(15)).

Few cities have enforceable noise ordinances (Table IV(26)). Decibel limits are too low, ambient noise levels are too high, and it is difficult to attribute noise to sources. Enforcement requires specialized equipment, training and, sometimes, citizen complaints.

Traffic congestion

Traffic congestion is frequently a problem in entertainment districts (Table IV(4), (17)). Few entertainment districts are located in areas with sufficient road and parking capacities to accommodate several thousand people arriving and departing within a narrow time frame. Actual road capacity is reduced by valet parking, cruising, taxis, pedicabs, and horse-drawn carriages. Valet parking can back traffic up for miles if arriving patrons leave their cars in the middle of the street, double and triple parked, and valets cannot keep up (Table IV(13)).

Cruising is almost always present in entertainment districts with through traffic (Table IV(12)). Entertainment businesses put large numbers of attractively dressed patrons on the sidewalk and this proves to be an irresistible attraction. On Mill Avenue in Tempe, Arizona, the cruisers stay in the curb lane and stop to talk to the hundreds of teens sitting on curbside planters. The curb lane does not move and cars get trapped in intersections and block traffic when lights change.

The consequences of congestion and gridlock include an impression of disorder, frustration, altercations, and reduced access for emergency vehicles. When traffic slows to a crawl, pedestrians begin jaywalking through cars, interacting with automobile passengers, and even climbing on cars. Passengers exit vehicles in the middle of traffic, yell to pedestrians, and turn up stereo volumes to attract attention. When vehicles block intersections the result may be fights or even riots (Anonymous, 1998).

Parking facilities
If parking capacities or parking-structure ingress are inadequate, traffic backs up as people search for parking and people fight over parking spaces (Table IV(5)). Parking shortages create a need for valet services which, in turn, create additional impacts. If people are forced to park in remote areas, they impose impacts on neighborhood residents and can become victims of crime. In densely populated areas the mere fact that entertainment-district patrons occupy needed on-street parking is a problem. When nightclub and bar patrons return to cars parked in residential areas, they can be loud and boisterous and leave litter and vandalize property. As people park further and further away from the main entertainment district, police coverage declines and street lighting becomes dimmer. People are robbed as they walk down dark streets wearing fine clothes and jewelry (Dial, 1998; Odenthal, 1998).

Unsecured, unattended, and poorly lighted parking lots are attractive for underage drinking, drug dealing, gang congregations, auto burglaries, and assaults (Table IV(9)). Closing-hour nightclub and bar fights often move into unattended parking lots.

Pedestrian crowding
Narrow sidewalks and sidewalk obstructions create frustration, bumping, and shoving that can lead to altercations (Table IV(7)). Sidewalk bottlenecks force people together with other people they may find intimidating or offensive, and create opportunities for pickpocketing and sexual batteries (Kerstein, 1998).

Sidewalk capacity is lost when restaurants install sidewalk dining as a way of accommodating smoking patrons. Sidewalk capacity is further reduced by such features as trees, light posts, benches, planters, fountains, newspaper vending machines, mail boxes, valet parking stands, and sidewalk vending carts. Crowds that block sidewalks while watching street performers or while waiting for admission to a movie theater or nightclub are particularly troublesome because such crowds block entrances to businesses and have no desire to move. Pedestrians who wish to pass must either walk out into street traffic or attempt to push their way through the crowd.

Visitor knowledge
Local citizens learn what constitutes acceptable behavior. First-time visitors, on the other hand, must be constantly educated by police officers, particularly if local ordinances are not clearly posted. Enforcing open-container laws or drinking in public is a problem in many areas because laws vary widely across the country. Foreign visitors over 18 may assume they are of legal drinking age. Auto burglaries are common because visitors, unaware of the risk, leave valuables in automobiles (Harvey, 1998; Odenthal, 1998; Table IV(23)).

Strategic planning
There are two basic approaches to planning and policing an entertainment district. One approach is to allow districts to randomly evolve over time, issue

land-use permits based on political or tax-revenue considerations, then toss the "hot potato" of district management to the police department. The police department then responds with high levels of enforcement to solve problems, at least temporarily. The district is flooded with officers who write citations for everything and there are many conflicts and arrests. This approach is very labor intensive and can generate personnel complaints, adverse publicity, and lawsuits. A much more economical approach is to develop a specific plan for the area and involve the police department in the earliest development stages so that problematic district features are avoided (Table V(1),(2)).

Once an entertainment district is in place, the police department must develop a dialogue with local residents, entertainment-business owners and patrons, politicians, and city officials to determine what the community is willing to tolerate, what the community expects from the police department, and what the community is willing to pay for. Community standards vary widely from those that are very tolerant (e.g. New Orleans) to those that no longer particularly desire large late-night crowds and the associated impacts (Parks et al., 1999, p. 488). Thus, a "one size fits all" policing approach does not work. Policing style must be closely matched to community standards and to what the community is attempting to accomplish in the district.

One of the biggest challenges in policing entertainment districts is satisfying the competing factions and balancing the many tradeoffs. For example, closing hour requires a large number of officers while, at the same time, residents expect their neighborhoods to be patrolled. Some people want entertainment districts to be orderly while others prefer a carnival atmosphere to attract people. Patrons like sidewalk vendors and street performers while business owners want them removed. Business owners want officers to maintain a friendly profile while simultaneously running off gang members and those with no money to spend. Residents demand late-night peace and quiet while nightclubs try to make a living. Obviously, the police department cannot satisfy everyone. The best it can do is involve the community in the decision-making process and facilitate communication.

Merchant associations are very helpful for communicating the desires of the business community and for alerting the police department to evolving problems (Table V(6)). Just as important, merchant-association meetings provide the police department opportunities to review ongoing efforts, which may not be visible to the business community, and to manage merchant expectations that otherwise might become unrealistically high. Community police advisory boards (CPABs) perform a similar function (Table V(4)). For example, in Hollywood the LAPD maintains a successful CPAB, consisting of 40 citizen-representatives from every element of the community, that works closely with the department to set priorities, solve problems, and provide education.

Community policing
Problem-oriented policing is effective in entertainment districts because many problems are easily solved through training, education, and communication

(Goldstein, 1990; Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 1998; Peak and Glensor, 1996; Table V(5)). Sometimes business operators do not understand their responsibilities or know what to do. For example, some operators hire security companies but do not know how to charge or task the security officers on site. Others hire valet-parking services then assume the havoc created by the valets is the valet service's problem. Nightclub operators may be the victims of their own success: clubs become overnight sensations and operators are unprepared to manage the crowds that quickly grow from 200 to 1,000. In such cases, education is very effective (Table V(7)). "Nine times out of ten it will work. If you tell operators exactly what to do, most will do it. They want to be successful" (Tatreau, 1998).

Permit conditions requiring police department approval of security plans not only assure adequate staffing and effective deployments, but also create a working relationship between business owners and the police department (Table V(3)). An alternative is to permit off-duty officers to work security details. In New Orleans and Miami Beach, for example, many nightclubs employ uniformed officers in outdoor assignments and these officers are successful in developing relationships with private security. However, many cities prohibit off-duty employment in security details to limit liability and conflicts of interest. Officers who become fixtures at nightclubs or bars are not known to be aggressive in enforcing laws (Kelso, 1995). In most cases, co-ordinating police and private-security efforts requires ongoing education and training.

Frequent problems at nightclubs and bars indicate a need for remedial training. Most cities or states offer training for alcoholic-beverage servers and it seems effective (Table V(8)). Some cities even provide training for private security personnel (Table V(10)). Such training must be continuous because management, alcohol-server, and security-guard turnover is constant.

Entertainment-district patrol

Entertainment districts illustrate the "broken windows" principle, that visible, low-level crimes escalate to more serious crimes, every night (Bratton and Knobler, 1998, p. 152; Kelling and Coles, 1997, pp. 19-20; Wilson and Kelling, 1982). Pedestrian violations, illegal parking, noise, littering, open containers, and minors in possession left unattended create an atmosphere of "anything goes" and escalate into fighting, public intoxication, and DUI later at night. Similarly, enforcement action, or at least contacts and attempts to gain voluntary compliance, taken early sets the tone for what is going to happen at closing time (Table V(28)). Thus, it is important for officers to contact everyone violating a law. Even verbal warnings are adequate to educate citizens, establish behavioral standards for the crowd, and facilitate obtaining voluntary compliance.

Given the multitude of violations in a large entertainment-district crowd, officers must carefully choose their battles. Citing every jaywalker, for example, creates more problems (conflicts, debates, time consumed by

disagreements) than it solves. Overly-strict approaches also drive away patrons and jeopardize relationships with businesses the police department has spent years cultivating. Conversely, nonassertive and excessively lenient styles contribute to unruly and illegal behavior.

Enforcement levels for particular violations depend on general policing priorities (as determined by the police department and community advisory boards through strategic planning) and their relationship to such patrol objectives as assuring public safety, setting a tone, maintaining high visibility to create a perception of safety, and crowd and traffic control. For example, individuals who threaten public safety through driving while intoxicated or reckless operation must be approached with zero tolerance (Greene, 1999; Novak et al, 1999). Conversely, friendly attempts to gain voluntary compliance are best, at least initially, for lower-grade safety threats created by crowds – e.g. customer queues blocking sidewalks and forcing pedestrians into the street. Force levels are easily escalated, but it is difficult to pull back without appearing to have lost the battle.

Since enforcement levels vary widely among violations, are the consequence of complex tradeoffs, and have long-term strategic implications, it is too much to ask patrol officers to make judgments on the fly. When they hit the street, they must know when and where enforcement action is to be taken.

Clear enforcement priorities are also essential to maintaining perceptions of police-department service quality and reliability (consistency) (Table V(25)). If officers are given no direction, they will develop their own priorities, because it is impossible to cite every minor violation, and enforcement will be haphazard. Citizens see this inconsistency (e.g. Officer Smith enforces jaywalking but Officer Jones does not), Officer Smith gets a personnel complaint, and the police department earns a reputation for inconsistency and unreliability. To clarify priorities, officers should be given written enforcement guidelines and these guidelines should be reinforced at daily briefings.

Staffing
Law enforcement in noisy, crowded, and stressful entertainment districts requires officers with certain characteristics (Table IV(24)). First, officers must enjoy a high-energy atmosphere and meeting new people. They must be personable and treat each citizen, tourist, or merchant inquiry as an opportunity to provide hospitality and superior service. Officer demeanor should attract such inquiries. Officers also need the versatility to be able to dispense hospitality to mom and pop visiting from Kansas, then turn around and be aggressive with a gang-banger who needs to be arrested.

Entertainment districts require mature officers who are confident and well grounded in basic law enforcement. Since they work in the limelight, officers need to know the law and why they are stopping people. Officers need to know when to diffuse situations and when to be firm and make arrests. Empathetic officers are most able to diffuse situations and gain voluntary compliance (Thompson and Jenkins, 1993) while those with unfriendly demeanors incite

crowds and attract personnel complaints (Table IV(29)). Foot-patrol officers are tempted to stand around and watch, but presence alone does not work (Kelling *et al*, 1974). Therefore, officers must be motivated to stay busy and seek out problems.

Entertainment-district officers should have above average intelligence, communication skills, patience, and restraint. Intelligence is required because officers must communicate with a wide range of people. Officers need the maturity, patience, and restraint to be able to deal with intoxicated and young crowds without becoming rattled or reacting to comments. Finally, officers must be confident and feel comfortable wading into large crowds.

Many cities staff entertainment districts with officers working overtime on weekend evenings. While this can be effective, it has several drawbacks (Table IV(27)). First, staffing changes every night so it is challenging to maintain a team effort. Officers on overtime have other regular assignments and may not be familiar with the district, its dynamics, merchants, residents, or regular patrons. If the district is not part of an officer's beat, he or she may be less likely to be proactive and resolve situations before they blow up. Overtime officers are not accountable to the merchants on Monday morning and many officers are not accustomed to heavy workloads on overtime.

To assure consistency and productivity, overtime officers need thorough briefings and detailed enforcement guidelines, and are best used to augment, rather than to replace, regular beat officers. In the field, overtime officers require close supervision – approximately one supervisor for every five officers – and this supervisor should be in the district on foot or bicycle. At the end of the night, all officers should submit comprehensive logs detailing enforcement actions and businesses contacted in order to overcome the temptation of falling into the stand-around-and-watch routine.

Patrol
Entertainment-district patrol requires a multi-prong approach with foot patrol, uniformed and plain-clothes officers, bicycles, marked and unmarked vehicles, motorcycles, and possibly horses. Foot patrol is the most personable and friendly, hence encourages the most interaction, and is most able to establish the relationships needed to solve problems (Table V(12)). Foot patrol is most effective for contacting people on the street and for walking through businesses. Officers can go from bar to bar without worrying about watching their bicycles. Foot patrol also has the ability to look into businesses and see things that might be missed by bike patrol. On the other hand, foot patrol has limited mobility, particularly in dense crowds, and, for reasonable response times, is limited to two- or three-block areas. Foot patrol also has low visibility. In a dense crowd they are seen only by the people in the immediate vicinity.

Bicycles are exceptionally mobile and can cut through gridlocked traffic and narrow alleys (Table V(13)). In downtowns with heavy traffic, bikes have the fastest response time. Their silence makes bikes ideal for patrolling parking structures, and provides an element of surprise. Bicycles have enough range to

patrol outlying areas where entertainment-district patrons park and auto burglaries and robberies occur, but not enough range to respond to calls in distant parts of big cities. Citizens like to see officers on bicycles and believe they are effective. Bike officers are more approachable than those in cars, but less approachable than those on foot. Because of their raised stature, bike officers have good visibility and can sometimes see things foot patrol cannot. Every entertainment district needs some foot and bike patrol. The relative numbers depend on the size of the area and the density of the crowd. If the crowd is shoulder-to-shoulder, there is no room for bikes. Bicycles also require some training and fitness, and are less effective in bad weather.

Horses excel at crowd control and proactive policing and represent a significant escalation of force (Roth, 1998). They have a very high visibility and presence and offer good crowd deterrence. No city that uses horses rated them ineffective (Table V(17)). People in a crowd may not see foot or bike patrol, but they certainly see the horses. Some people like horses and perceive horses to be friendly. Horses can have public-relations value if people are allowed to pet them. Other people are afraid of horses and see horses as a threatening, aggressive presence. Given these perceptions, the decision to use horses should be carefully considered. If horses are desired as a force option, their presence can be minimized by keeping them in outlying areas until needed. Other advantages of horses include a high stature that allows mounted officers to see over crowds and direct foot patrol to problem areas. High presence and the ability to see over cars make horses similarly effective in parking lots.

The disadvantages of horses include a low productivity in terms of citations and arrests and high maintenance costs. Mounted officers should be available as a crowd-control resource and not get tied up doing enforcement. Mounted officers cannot transport those in custody or dismount to go into businesses. They need to stay in the saddle because horses can be spooked. Horses have limited traction on pavement, so their response time is slower than bicycles. Even walking a horse through a crowd carries a risk that someone will be bumped or stepped on. Horses are big and need room to maneuver and they cannot work all day. They also need a barn, lots of food, veterinarians, and constant attention.

Motorcycles are used primarily for traffic enforcement and patrolling parking structures. When sidewalks overflow with people exiting movie theaters, bars, and nightclubs, motorcycles are effective for keeping people out of the streets (Table V(14)). While foot and bike patrol have difficulties keeping roadways clear, motorcycles can go down bicycle lanes and people get out of the way. In gridlocked traffic, however, they have less mobility than bicycles.

Patrol cars have good presence, particularly if parked in high visibility locations and used with lots of lights (Table V(15)). However, in congested, pedestrian-oriented entertainment districts cars are used mostly as transport units. Response times are too slow and officers have no interaction with the crowd. Unmarked vehicles allow officers to roll up on alcohol violations (minors in bars) and gang, narcotics, and nuisance (panhandling, public

drinking, public urination) activities unnoticed (Table V(16)). Patrol lieutenants can use unmarked cars to visit the field without creating a public expectation of routine police service.

Patrol support
Private security can be effective, even on public streets, as a presence and deterrent, as a means of urging voluntary compliance, and as a first stage in an escalation (Table V(23)). If they cannot gain voluntary compliance, they simply call the police. For example, Downtown Tempe Community, Inc. uses private security (TEAM) to serve as eyes and ears for the police department and to provide a low-contact variety of security. TEAM guards are young, mostly untrained, and unarmed, but effective nonetheless. On Friday and Saturday nights, TEAM makes 60 per cent of all calls to the police department from the downtown area (Ringo, 1998). When bicycle officers arrive to trouble spots, TEAM watches the bicycles. Similarly, on the Hollywood Boulevard Walk of Fame, the Hollywood Boulevard Business Improvement District hired private security to target aggressive panhandling, trespassing, auto burglaries, narcotics, and assaults. These security guards, many retired or off-duty police officers, patrol six blocks of Hollywood Boulevard, make citizen's arrests, transport arrests to the Hollywood Division LAPD station, and are credited with reducing crime in the improvement district by 50 per cent (Hanania, 1997). The effectiveness of private security is furthered by police efforts to build communications and relations and incorporate private security into community policing.

If private security is unavailable, the police department must develop its own surveillance. For instance, Santa Monica uses non-sworn community service officers in its Third Street Promenade parking structures to monitor, provide a uniformed presence, and enhance perceived safety (Table V(22)). Along the promenade itself, officers have developed a series of informants including business owners, street performers, and the homeless. The homeless point out the drug dealers and the street performers identify competitors who break the rules. Along Beale Street on busy weekends, Memphis uses officers on rooftops and video cameras to alert foot patrol to trouble.

Patrol officers need support from a large number of specialized units and other departments. Undercover officers are used to infiltrate crowds, gather intelligence, and check alcohol and narcotics violations, pickpocketing, illegal vending, and people preying on tourists (Table V(19)). Opportunists may attempt to sell parking on someone else's vacant lot or tourist guidebooks that are otherwise distributed for free (Harvey, 1998). The disadvantage of undercover is that it has no presence and no one sees the effort. If nightclubs and bars begin producing large numbers of fights, undercover officers are needed to investigate over-serving. Additional undercover support can be obtained from the state Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC). ABC officers possess specialized equipment (e.g. miniature cameras) and language skills to go into non-English speaking locations.

The most effective bar checks are done by teams (Table V(30)). In addition to alcohol, the common violations are overcrowding, noise, and use-permit condition violations, some of which may not be within the jurisdiction of the police department. Patrol officers can call the fire department, health department (noise abatement), and code enforcement, but if they do not arrive until the next day, the problems will be gone.

Gang units work in entertainment districts because that is where the gangs are. Gang units recognize gang members, are effective in discouraging gang behavior, and their jackets and uniforms alone are an effective deterrent (Table V(20)). Universal CityWalk arranges to have county probation officers on the street for special events. These officers are familiar with probation terms and conditions and can quickly identify and process those in violation (Table V(21)).

People go to entertainment districts for entertainment and sometimes the police department provides the best show. Arrests draw large crowds and the longer those in custody remain in public view, the larger the crowd. Friends of the arrestee always have comments and questions, and if the crowd perceives unfair or rough treatment, it can turn against the officers. Transport units are needed to quickly remove arrestees from the street and to minimize spectacles. Santa Barbara parks its jail van right on State Street in Old Town for fast response and deterrent effect (Table V(18)). For noncombative inebriates, detoxification centers offer advantages on both sides of the equation (Table V(24)). The inebriate is not booked and the officer is quickly back on the street.

Deployment

There is no way to directly deny admission to an entertainment district and keep potential troublemakers out of the area. However, undesirables can be contacted and discouraged long before they reach core entertainment areas. For example, the Venice Beach strand (boardwalk) attracts nearly 200,000 people on Sunday afternoons in the summer, and gangs from all over Los Angeles. The LAPD uses concentric circles of enforcement to stop people with weapons. When gang members exit the 405 freeway and head west on Venice Boulevard they are first greeted by a road-block check point operated by the California Highway Patrol. The CHP looks for illegal equipment and checks drivers' licenses, license plates, registration, insurance, and seat belts. Finding violations is easy and many cars are impounded. If there is probable cause, cars can be searched for weapons and open containers. Passengers can be checked for warrants, probation and parole conditions, and injunctions that prevent gang members from driving or appearing together.

Cars that make it west of the check point are then picked up by LAPD motor officers who look for traffic violations, noise, and the same things covered at the check point. Finally, as gang members and other obvious troublemakers walk to the beach, they are contacted by two to four officers stationed at the intersection of the strand and each street with beach access. CRASH (Community Resources Against Street Hoodlums) officers are useful here to

recognize opposing gang members so that safe distances between them can be maintained.

In large entertainment districts, foot patrol should be broken up into sectors, and officers instructed to maintain sector integrity so that someone is always available. Trouble spots might warrant fixed posts. For example, Memphis stations officers where Beale Street (a pedestrian promenade on weekends) intersects busy cross streets in order to keep lackadaisical pedestrians out of traffic. San Diego uses large bike-patrol teams, with as many as five officers, for impact in the Gaslamp District. When such teams arrive to a location the citizen perception is, "There must be hundreds of them [in the district]" (Maheu, 1998). In reality, the five officers might be the entire bike patrol. Hermosa Beach deploys its foot patrol at 3.00 p.m. (to 3.00 a.m.) to check on the evening's entertainment and drink specials.

Helpful tactics, tools, and ordinances

One of Santa Barbara's most effective tools is a full-time beat co-ordinator who serves as liaison for Old Town (Table V(11)). The liaison co-ordinates alcohol-server and security-personnel training, serves as business owners' personal contact, and facilitates communication among residents, businesses, the police department, city and state agencies, and public officials. While on duty in Old Town, the beat co-ordinator serves as an information resource for other officers and supervisors, provides assistance in conflict resolution, and helps set an example of appropriate enforcement priorities.

Santa Barbara also found that intermittent traffic diversions, on State Street through Old Town, are effective when cruising becomes too heavy (Table V(26)). Barricades, cones, straddle flashers, and directional signs are pre-delivered to the area by Public Works. Once the area supervisor determines that gridlock exists, an officer on each end of a six-block area sets up the signs and diverts traffic. The barricades remain up for 15 to 30 minutes and during this time the officers assigned to the closures are free to patrol the area. Cross streets are not blocked so that cars may turn onto State Street. Thus, determined customers can reach any business and the presence of some traffic assures a vital image and prevents the crowd from taking over the street. State Street is then reopened for a period of 45 to 60 minutes until it becomes necessary to divert traffic again.

Cruising ordinances are a lower-impact, but more labor intensive, alternative used successfully in a few cities (Table V(32)). Cars passing the same point some number of times per time period are cited.

Santa Monica uses a street-performer ordinance on Third Street Promenade that established performance zones and requires performer licensing and periodic rotations (Table V(34)). The performance zones are located in the street (promenade) and away from street intersections, business entrances, and architectural features that bottleneck pedestrian flow. The annoying homeless people with no talent and little income potential do not pay the fee and no longer perform. Performers must move every two hours to avoid aggravating

sidewalk diners. On the Venice Beach strand the problem is sidewalk vendors who fight over spots they have occupied for years. Santa Barbara avoids this problem by issuing annual permits for sidewalk locations at its Sunday Arts and Crafts Show on Cabrillo Boulevard.

To simplify noise regulation, the city of Irvine required the Irvine Amphitheater to install a permanent noise-monitoring station. When the noise level reaches a certain limit, the Amphitheater must turn down the volume. Boom-box ordinances are effective for controlling noise on the street (Table V(35)). Santa Barbara uses music, specifically Lawrence Welk type "muzak" piped into its Old Town parking structures, to its advantage – the polka music discourages the lingering of closing-hour crowds.

Curfew ordinances are helpful for several reasons (Table V(33)). First, after 11.00 p.m. when most businesses open to teens close, there is no reason for teens to be there. Second, exuberant teens do not mix well with intoxicated adults. Finally, curfew can be used to thin crowds before bars release their closing-hour crowds. The Tempe Police Department has control over lighting levels on Mill Avenue. With one switch, officers can turn up the lights to signal the end of the night or the beginning of curfew sweeps. The locals know when the lights go up, it is time to go home.

Proactive policing

Proactive policing refers to actions taken to prevent problems from developing, as opposed to crowd control, which is used to resolve problems. Proactive policing at the operator level begins with periodic visits or walk-throughs (Table V(29)). It is tempting to focus on the problem businesses, but all should be checked. Often visits to a business's neighbors are more informative than visits to the business itself – the neighbors know how a business is doing. Frequent visits to problem businesses will be call-driven anyway.

When uniformed officers walk through bars, they attract attention and can be perceived as an oppressive presence. In Santa Barbara, foot-patrol teams radio in bar checks to alert other foot-patrol teams so that one bar is not checked too frequently while others are checked too infrequently. Foot-patrol officers also maintain daily logs that indicate when bars are checked, actions taken, and conditions observed. These logs and the computer-aided dispatch compilation of radio calls are used to monitor bar-check frequencies. The impact of bar checks can be mitigated through friendly officer demeanor and good relationships with bar staff. Officers should convey the impression that they are there to assist with crowd management, as well as enforce laws.

Many officers do not enjoy squeezing through dense nightclub crowds and having people rub up against their guns. However, mere presence demonstrates lack of fear and communion with the crowd. Patrons approach discreetly and point out troublemakers so that problems can be diffused. At a minimum, bar checks assure that clubs have their worst customers out before officers arrive.

Santa Barbara encourages bars and nightclubs to make pre-emptive calls: customers may be acting up and a proactive bar check, customer contact, and

police presence can head off problems. Pre-emptive calls, however, occur only where cities have established relationships of trust and sophisticated performance measures. Too many cities evaluate nightclub and bar performance through a simple count of police calls. When the number of calls becomes too great, disciplinary action is threatened. Cities must separate the good calls (pre-emptive) from the bad calls and adjust for occupancy capacity.

Proactive policing at the patron level begins by identifying potential troublemakers, ideally before they reach the core area. Troublemakers are loud and boisterous to draw attention, and they bump into other people to provoke a response. Troublemakers expect trouble and dress accordingly, while those in fine clothes tend not to fight. Finally, troublemakers are insecure, so they always look around, travel in groups for support, and require lots of physical space.

Potential troublemakers should be contacted by police officers (Table V(31)). A few friendly questions are usually sufficient to identify intentions, and engaging people in conversation is always constitutional. An angry response or no response is a bad sign. Given probable cause, potential troublemakers can be checked for curfew violations and intoxication while searches are done for warrants, probation and parole conditions. Bad guys can be marked for surveillance or shadowed.

Preventing large congregations is also part of proactive policing (Table V(27)). Years ago, every Friday and Saturday night, 400 to 500 teens congregated at the Jack-in-the-Box on Mill Avenue. Inevitably, fights broke out and officers had to wade into the crowd, arrest a few, and chase the rest away. Tempe responded with temporary lighting and horses. Today, Tempe deploys two or four horses (on the relatively wide Mill Avenue sidewalks) on weekend evenings to subtly discourage congregations and crowds that block sidewalks. Mounted officers gently ride through congregations, with a mere "Excuse me," to get people moving, and find that people, once moving, tend to disperse. Alternatively, mounted officers remain in hot spots and find that people do not want to be near horses and leave. Horses are used similarly on the Venice Beach strand. Gangs like to congregate at the strand's bottleneck. Mounted officers ride up and down the strand to clear the area.

Proactive policing on Venice Beach also includes extinguishing gang activity. Gang members are isolated into groups of two or three, so they feel less brave, and are not permitted to stand in areas (establish territories) or engage in any gang behaviors (intimidation, taunting, flashing signs). In Old Pasadena, officers spend most of their time contacting people who are blocking sidewalks, walking five abreast, or looking menacing. These are the people who, if left unattended, eventually end up in fights.

Crowd control

Large crowds are formed when nightclubs and bars close and when movies and special events end. The crowd-control objective is just to move these crowds home without creating a catalyst for collective behavior, rioting, or looting.

Since the objective is always the same, tactical plans should be formulated and positions assigned in advance. If officers are properly trained and supported with the equipment necessary to make mass arrests (e.g. jail vans), they will act in a confident, professional manner. Entertainment-district crowds are diverse and not driven by particular issues, hence are not very cohesive. On the other hand, bar crowds have been drinking so that inhibitions are lowered by both alcohol and anonymity. Crowd control is difficult because crowds are different each night and the wrong move can, and often does, turn the whole crowd against the police department.

The best approach depends on available resources because an ineffective response can exacerbate a situation. Generally, sending uniformed and undercover officers to mingle in a crowd is a good strategy. The uniformed officers provide a presence, reduce anonymity, and cool down hot spots. Crowd members hear the radios squelching even if officers are unseen. Undercover officers are helpful for reading the mood of the crowd. Assuring the crowd an adequate exit route is always a good strategy. If the crowd has somewhere to go it should be kept moving. If resources are limited, this can be done by sending officers into the crowd to urge people home. Lines can be formed if sufficient officers or horses are available. For example, when the Chicago Bulls won the NBA championship in June, 1998, and the city celebrated on Rush and Division Streets (Division Street was closed to vehicular traffic), Chicago slowly marched a line of horses down Division Street to usher the closing-hour crowd home.

Crowd agitators, fights, and those injured must be immediately removed from crowds. The objective is to cut these people out before the rest of the crowd knows what happened. Otherwise, agitators and fights can start a chain reaction that leads to rioting or, if the removal team is too slow, the crowd could be threatened by the penetration and turn against the officers.

Horses are often a key to crowd control. For example, New Orleans uses 35 to 40 horses on Bourbon Street during Mardi Gras. If someone is hurt and an ambulance is needed, the horses can quickly clear a block and not hurt anyone in the process (Powell, 1996). Tempe found that mounted officers are able to spot agitators, split crowds for extraction teams, then create space for officers around problems. Without horses, crowds close in on problems (entertainment) and friends and relatives render assistance, so that officers may find three or four people on their back (Ringo, 1998).

Poor strategies for controlling entertainment-district crowds include making non-essential arrests and closing nightclubs for overcrowding. Each arrest ties up one or two officers, quickly depletes crowd-control capability, and potentially incites the crowd. Closing nightclubs for overcrowding, or forcing patrons out one-by-one to be counted, creates a large intoxicated crowd with a grudge against officers and no desire to go home. Finally, any time officers attempt to move diverse crowds, they need to be careful. Innocent crowd members may be pushed and knocked down.

Police-service quality control

The first and last steps of entertainment-district policing are conducting periodic surveys to assess citizen perceptions and expectations (Table V(9)). This information serves as the basis for all strategic planning and quality control: police resources are directed to the perceived (safety) problems and corrective action is taken where department performance does not meet expectations. Ideally, survey instruments are prepared and financed by community police advisory boards and merchant associations, then administered to a random sample from the entire community – those who perceive safety problems and who are not district patrons may provide the most information.

Conclusions

Effective entertainment-district policing begins at the district planning and design stage by engineering out features that create demands for police resources. Concentrations of nightclubs and bars, and inadequate street, parking, and sidewalk capacities are the main problems. During the day, entertainment-district policing consists of training and educating business operators and their alcohol servers and security personnel. At night, patrol requires a multi-prong approach with foot patrol, uniformed and plain-clothes officers, bicycles, marked and unmarked vehicles, motorcycles, and possibly horses. The main objectives are assuring public safety, setting a tone, maintaining high visibility to create a perception of safety, crowd and traffic control. Identifying potential troublemakers, making proactive bar checks, preventing congregations, cooling hot spots, assuring pedestrian flow, and stopping gang activity are the main forms of proactive policing. Problems are quickly removed so that no entertainment is created for the crowd.

References

Anonymous (1998), "130 arrested during riot after Reno celebration", *Los Angeles Times*, 10 August, p. A17.

Bratton, W. and Knobler, P. (1998), *Turnaround: How America's Top Cop Reversed the Crime Epidemic*, Random House, New York, NY.

Crowe, T.D. (1991), *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design: Application of Architectural Design and Space Management Concepts*, Butterworth-Heinemann, Boston, MA.

Dial, C.M. (1998), Hollywood Division Station Commander, Los Angeles Police Department, personal interview.

Goldstein, H. (1990), *Problem-Oriented Policing*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.

Greene, J.A. (1999), "Zero tolerance: a case study of police policies and practices in New York City", *Crime & Delinquency*, Vol. 45 No. 2, pp. 171-87.

Hanania, J. (1997), "Crime plunges 50% in Hollywood Target Area", *Los Angeles Times*, 19 July, p. B3.

Harvey, S.N. (1998), Captain, Memphis Police Department, personal interview.

Jesilow, P., Meyer, J., Parsons, D. and Tegeler, W. (1998), "Evaluating problem-oriented policing: a quasi-experiment", *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, Vol. 21 No. 3, pp. 449-64.

Kelling, G.L. and Coles, C. (1997), *Fixing Broken Windows*, Touchstone, New York, NY.

Kelling, G.L., Pate, A.M., Dieckman, D. and Brown, C.E. (1974), *The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment: A Summary Report*, Police Foundation, Washington, DC.

Kelso, I. (1995), "Pennington clears up details", *The Times-Picayune*, 19 January, p. B7.

Kerstein, A.B. (1998), Commander, Los Angeles Police Department, personal interview.

Maheu, W.A. (1998), Deputy Chief, San Diego Police Department, personal interview.

McDermott, M. (1998), Detective Sergeant, Newport Beach Police Department, personal interview.

Novak, K.J., Hartman, J.L., Holsinger, A.M. and Turner, M.G. (1999), "The effects of aggressive policing of disorder on serious crime", *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp. 171-90.

Odenthal, R.E. (1998), West Hollywood Station Commander, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, personal interview.

Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (1998), *Problem-Solving Tips*, US Department of Justice, Washington, DC.

Parks, R.B., Mastrofski, S.D., DeJong, C. and Gray, M.K. (1999), "How officers spend their time with the community", *Justice Quarterly*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 483-518.

Peak, K.J. and Glensor, R.W. (1996), *Community Policing and Problem Solving: Strategies and Practices*, Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Powell, T. (1996), "La. Police officer points to Mardi Gras for tips on crowd control, safety", *Amusement Business*, Vol. 108 No. 22, 27 May, pp. 49-50.

Ringo, M. (1998), Lieutenant, Tempe Police Department, personal interview.

Robinson, M.B. (1998), "High aesthetics/low incivilities: criminal victimizations and perceptions of risk in a downtown environment", *Journal of Security Administration*, Vol. 21 No. 2, pp. 19-32.

Roth, M. (1998), "Mounted police forces: a comparative history", *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 707-19.

Rubin, M.S., Gorman, R.J. and Lawry, M.H. (1994), "Entertainment returns to Gotham", *Urban Land*, Vol. 53 No. 8, pp. 59-65.

Tatreau, T. (1998), Captain, Los Angeles Police Department, personal interview.

Thompson, G.J. and Jenkins, J.B. (1993), *Verbal Judo: The Gentle Art of Persuasion*, William Morrow, New York, NY.

Wilson, J.Q. and Kelling, G.L. (1982), "Broken windows: the police and neighborhood safety", *The Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. 249 No. 3, pp. 29-38.

Appendix
The following questions were included in all interviews:

(1) What are the primary challenges in policing an entertainment district?

(2) Characterize the types of businesses that cause problems and generate demands for police resources.

(3) What combinations or mixes of businesses prove problematic?

(4) What physical features of the entertainment district (e.g. district layout, mix and intensities of different types of business, presence or absence of vehicular traffic, infrastructure) create policing problems, challenges, or demands for police resources?

(5) How is the police department involved in training business staff in security, crime prevention, or alcohol service?

(6)   How are police and private security efforts co-ordinated at the boundary (e.g. outside on the sidewalk)?

(7)   How does the police department work with individual business operators to resolve recurrent problems?

(8)   What type of person makes the best entertainment-district patrol officer?

(9)   What are some of the tradeoffs that must be managed when policing an entertainment district?

(10)   What are the most effective strategies and tactics for policing entertainment districts?

(11)   What are the strengths and weaknesses of foot patrols, bicycle patrols, motorcycles, automobiles, horses, and undercover officers?

(12)   If a potential problem or troublemaker was identified, what forms of proactive policing would be used?

(13)   What are the most effective means of controlling an entertainment-district crowd?

(14)   If more funding became available for policing your entertainment district, how would you use those additional funds?