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ABSTRACT

The Boise Police Department demonstrates the power of community policing techniques. Significant incidents, like officer-involved shootings and a scandal at City Hall, as well as nation-wide trends, pushed the Boise Police Department to embrace this method of law enforcement. To better understand this significant turning point for the Boise Police Department and its results, oral history interviews documented the stories of individuals involved. Using the oral histories for possible museum exhibitions, this project illustrates how the relationship between the Boise Police Department and the people of Boise improved between 1990 and 2014.
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INTRODUCTION

For more than one hundred years, the Boise Police Department (BPD) has served the citizens and neighborhoods of Boise. Like most cities, Boise law enforcement followed slowly behind the arrival of migrants and immigrants to the burgeoning territory. City marshals administered early law enforcement in Boise. The city paid these marshals measly wages to maintain order. To survive, many took payments from individual travelers and local businesses to assist them and protect their goods. The roles of chief of police, sergeant, and policemen in Boise were not officially established until 1903 when the city issued an ordinance under Mayor James Hawley. At the time, the city employed seven patrolmen. ¹

Much has changed in the last 114 years. The police department has grown exponentially to meet the needs of a growing population. By 2014, the department served a Boise population of more than 215,000.² In 2016, approximately 325 sworn officers and eighty-two civilian staff members worked for the BPD.³ The rising population and the growing physical area of the city of Boise has provided unique challenges to law enforcement officials. Despite the extensive history of the Boise Police Department, the department remains seriously under-researched.

When conducting historical research on the Boise Police Department, researchers quickly find that there are limited resources. In 2000, prominent Idaho historian Arthur Hart conducted oral history interviews to complete his book To Protect and To Serve: A History of the Boise Police Department, 1863-2000. Managed by the Idaho State
Historical Society, these interviews prove to be an important primary source. The interviews focus primarily on the department from the 1960s to the 1990s. The *Idaho Statesman* archive, accessed via the Boise Public Library, is also a significant primary source. Currently, the BPD’s historical records are not available to members of the public. Many of the records are at a third-party storage site that is not accessible for research. When studying the department at City Hall West, a researcher will find only one folder of historical documents. There are, however, thousands of photographs, a few scrapbooks, and a cardboard box of artifacts related to the death of officer Mark Stall.

As far as secondary resources go, Hart’s book *To Protect and To Serve* provides a thorough history of the department since the establishment of Boise. Paid for by the Boise Police Department, *To Protect and To Serve* is a mostly celebratory history of the department and it often lacks any sort of historical analysis. The book is also a product of its time and its author’s historical training, meaning that it lacks the inclusive, or at least more broad nature that many trained historians today practice. A brief history of the department was prepared in the 1970s by two members of the BPD. While interesting, neither of the authors were trained historians. The only copies of this older history project can be found at Boise State’s Albertson’s Library. Beyond this comparatively short list of sources, there is not much information available for any researcher studying the history of Boise Police Department.

The purpose of this project is to explore how the relationship between the Boise Police Department and members of the community changed over the twenty-four-year period from 1990 to 2014 while creating an additional primary resource for future researchers. This period was chosen specifically based on significant changes that
occurred in the city of Boise and critical events that effected the course of the BPD’s history.

Many of the Boise Police Department’s policy and procedural changes between 1990 and 2014 fit perfectly into the wider trends effecting American police departments. The new methods implemented at the BPD represent the latest trend in professional law enforcement: community policing. These techniques directly influence how the relationship between the Boise Police Department and the Boise community changed in the twenty-four-year period selected for this project.
SCOPE OF WORK

This project was completed in an approximately one year period, from the beginning of 2016 to the early months of 2017. Upon endorsement from the Boise Police Department (BPD), the Boise City Department of Arts & History, and the professors of the History Department at Boise State University, research into the history of the Boise Police Department began. Initial research focused on the entire history of the Boise Police Department and the city of Boise in order to get a better understanding of the department in its entirety.

In conjunction with the requirements of Boise State’s Office of Research Compliance the project had to undergo review by the university’s Institution Review Board (IRB). This process required the researcher to complete paperwork and online training, as well as preparing example questions, contact sheets, and informed consent forms for any human participants. The project was approved by the IRB on July 6, 2016.

With the help of the Boise Police Chief’s administrative assistant, Teresa Rogers, individuals were identified to be interviewed in conjunction with the project. This list included some obvious figures, like former police chiefs and mayors, as well as members of the police department’s rank-and-file. Persons of interest were contacted via email or telephone and appointments were arranged with those who responded. Oral history best practices call for the interviewer to meet with the chosen narrator at least one time before the recorded interview. This allows for the two people to get to know one another and for the interviewer to get a better understanding of the narrator’s background in order to
better prepare questions for the interview. Following the first meeting, questions were prepared and emailed to the narrator.

Each oral history interview was recorded in a Wave (.wav) file format, using digital recorders owned by the Boise City Department of Arts & History. Wave files are the audio files most commonly recommended for recording and archival purposes. Unlike MP3 files, the Wave file is uncompressed. When audio files are compressed, the file loses sound quality every time it is modified or encoded. After each of the interviews were completed they were processed at the Boise City Department of Arts & History. This requires that Wave files of the interviews are transferred, saved in multiple places, and burned to CDs. An MP3 copy of each of the interviews is created for transcribing purposes.

The Boise City Department of Arts & History manages an oral history collection of about 200 oral history interviews, counting those in this project. Many of the oral histories have been transcribed and audited by volunteers. After the audit, which checks for grammatical errors, the Department prints transcripts. Transcripts are available for any researcher who visits the Arts & History Department. The interviews of the Boise Police Department collection, together with all the other interviews at the city’s repository, provide a critical primary source for those researching the history of Boise and its citizens.
BACKGROUND ON COMMUNITY POLICING

Graphic images of brutality mar American history, from wars abroad to incidents at home. In the fall of 2016, horrific imagery concerning the use of deadly force by law enforcement frequently found its way to the front of American newspapers and the top of online sources. When stories are not released about officers shooting civilians, news sources instead report on random acts of violence committed against police officers. Questions of safety, both that of the police and civilians, have become a part of everyday conversation. In 2016, questions of police brutality, and specifically law and order, played a significant role in the presidential election, as both presidential and vice presidential candidates answered questions surrounding the issue. The mission and means of American police departments came under question, and the situation has the potential to reach a critical breaking point.

Through all this conversation on police brutality and un-solicited violence toward officers, community policing became a potential solution to the conflicts facing American police departments. After the death of African-American teenager Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri in 2014 and the resulting protests in the years following, the City of Ferguson announced it would turn to community policing to alleviate the tensions in the community. When five officers were shot and killed in July, the nation was especially shocked because of the Dallas Police Department’s implementation of community policing initiatives. Community policing became a buzz-word during the election, mentioned by both Hillary Clinton and her running-mate Tim Kaine. While community
policing has been presented as a solution to the tensions between American officers and the citizens they police, large news outlets and reporters have not stopped to define the term.

The definition of community policing is elusive. Scholars and law enforcement practitioners have struggled to define the concept and its implementation. While community policing will likely never be a simple concept to grasp, it is better understood by exploring its main components, understanding the environment in which American police officers work, and having knowledge of the history of American policing.

**Defining Community Policing**

Every individual, law enforcement official or researcher, and organization, such as a police department or scholarly group, has a different definition of community policing. For example, in their essay “The New Police Order,” John Eck and Dennis P. Rosenbaum provide a lengthy description of community policing including that highlights these main management characteristics, “decentralizing decision making, problem-solving teams, attention to customer needs,” while emphasizing the ways in which community policing is placed into larger social concerns like racial justice and quality of life. 8

Authors of *Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective* define community policing as “not merely a means to addresses community concerns, but it is a philosophy that turns traditional policing on its head by empowering the community rather than dictating to the community.”9 The Lincoln Police Department, of Lincoln, Nebraska, defines community policing as “a value system which permeates a police department, in which the primary organizational goal is working cooperatively with individual citizens,
groups of citizens, and both public and private organizations to identify and resolve
issues which potentially effect[sic] the livability of specific neighborhoods, areas, or the
city as a whole.” These are only a few of the thousands of definitions that exist. The
similarities in the definitions are the most significant, as each definition points to the role
of the community in this method of law enforcement. However, when it comes to the
real-world practice of community policing, the differences, despite how slight they are,
weigh more heavily than the common components that they share.

To understand what community policing is, it helps to grasp the two parts that
make up the concept: community and policing. Community has several definitions. A
community can be a geographical area, like a neighborhood or district, or community can
describe a certain group of people with similar ideas, identity, culture, or religion. In
community policing, both definitions of community are used without realizing it. Police
efforts can focus on physical areas, like neighborhoods or apartment buildings, while
other programs focus on people with common ideas or culture. The definition of
community is used in broad strokes, as a catchall for every neighborhood and
organization. Often, police departments do not question communities prior to the
implementation of community policing, so the police departments are enforcing their own
ideas of what the community is, whether geographic or cultural. The community itself,
whether a physical area or a group of people, can be defined differently by different
individuals and agencies. Often a specific definition for community is not implicitly
stated.

Policing is as difficult to define as community. The goal of the police is to provide
safety and maintain law and order. To do this, police utilize several methods of social
control, including law enforcement and prevention. In their book *Policing in America: A Balance of Forces*, Lawrence F. Travis III and Robert H. Langworthy define enforcement as “the application of the law, generally through arrest.” The enforcement of laws is the number one focus of police departments in America. Traditionally, law enforcement is the driving force for how police success is measured for most American police departments, using arrest rates and the number of tickets or citations handed out by officers. On the other hand, crime prevention includes attempts by police to “reduce the likelihood that crimes will occur.” Crime prevention has taken on a secondary role in American policing (though in other parts of the world it is the main goal of police departments.) Crime prevention is much more difficult to measure than law enforcement, as it is impossible to predict how many crimes a department has prevented. In practice, policing is a complex combination of law enforcement and crime prevention, but citizens and police officers do not necessarily recognize this.

For this project, the definition of community policing has two parts. First, community policing is a philosophy that insists that members of a police department work together with community members to identify and solve problems. These community members, also referred to as stakeholders, include residents, business owners, special interest groups, and cultural organizations. In an ideal situation, relationships between police officers and stakeholders are mutually beneficial and flexible with both sides willing to exchange information and ideas. Secondly, community policing is the various techniques and methods that are implemented to enforce its philosophy. Effectively performing community policing requires different practices at varying levels. It is not only the implementation of new programs, such as foot patrols or creating police
substations, but it also includes the restructuring of a police department to support the mission of the community policing philosophy. This can come in many forms, such as adjustments in the organizational structure of departments or changes in the type of training provided to officers. Full implementation of the community policing philosophy could alter the nature of the traditional American police department.

**The Creation of Community Policing**

The history of policing in America is a story of learning, of making mistakes and trying new tactics. Members of local, state, and federal government and respective law enforcement officers are constantly working to find the right way to police American citizens. The nature of law enforcement is especially difficult in America since the country was founded on beliefs of individual authority and personal freedom. Policing the behavior of individuals, while maintaining unalienable rights, has proven to be a challenge. The difficulty of policing Americans heightened by the many agencies granted authority over individuals. Citizens are not only under the jurisdiction of their local municipal police force, but also the county’s police, the state’s police, and the federal police. England and other Western countries greatly influenced early American policing, but it has a history of its own. The story is complicated and will not be explored in depth here. However, to understand why the movement toward community policing began, it is vital to know the policing methods that proceeded it.

The history of policing in America extends to the experiences of the first European settlers in the “New World.” The earliest semblances of law enforcement in the United States echoed techniques long utilized by the English. Community members voluntarily policed small towns and villages in which they lived. The responsibility often
rotated between male citizens, each taking their turn to protect the area and maintain order for a set amount of time. Though it was required, protecting one’s village was not a fun or rewarding task, so often more fortunate individuals could pay someone else to take their place.

As cities in the New World grew, policing became more formal. Official positions and departments were established to protect growing urban areas. Since fewer men were volunteering for law enforcement positions, many growing areas created paid employment for the men. This placed new police officers into the bureaucratic systems in which they still function today. Though the departments were more formal, they were still often based on community relationships and the size of a man’s pocketbook.

Unlike other elected city officials, mayors often appointed heads of police departments, making them accountable only to the mayor. For decades, the informal relationships between politicians determined who lead police departments. This frequently resulted in corruption, as police chiefs were more interested in furthering their own interests than protecting citizens.

Efforts against such corruption began as early as the 1880s. The Pendleton Act of 1883, for example, required that applicants to federal jobs complete written exams and be hired based upon their competency, rather than who they knew in the office. Despite early efforts, however, corruption in police departments soared with the passing of Prohibition. As stories of officers involved in illegal alcohol sales spread across the nation, confidence in police departments increasingly faltered.

As a result policing in America underwent wide reforms that steered it towards professionalism in the 1930s. This included crafting law enforcement into a practiced
profession. Departments no longer wanted to hire inexperienced individuals simply because of their size or political leanings. Instead, departments sought to hire officers who had higher education and, ideally, some police experience. Law enforcement turned to technology and scientific methods that could help them be more effective. Police focused their mission on professional crime-fighters, who could quickly respond to crime in their communities. Following years of accusations of political corruption, departments turned their focus inward, seeking to cleanse their departments of such allegations and to create neutral experts in the field.14

With this new inward focus, departments abandoned a wide array of social services and the emphasis on close relationships with members of the community.15 For example, the work of the first female police officers, which is now equated to social work, was largely discontinued. Police began measuring their success by how well they could control crime, using statistics to prove change. To improve their efficiency, which was now a main concern, police departments welcomed new technologies, such as automobiles, telephones, and radio systems. Policing’s turn to professionalism isolated American police departments from their communities, creating a new tension between the officers and their neighbors.

During the Civil Rights Movement and the Vietnam War, tensions between American police departments and citizens were at an all-time high. Violent interactions between protestors and police became common, widely publicized events. American police became infamous for their aggressive physical behavior as images surfaced of African Americans being attacked with police dogs in Birmingham and stories circulated about brutality under the notorious Philadelphia police chief Frank Rizzo. When such
extreme incidents grabbed the attention of the world, it was apparent that policing methods across the nation were flawed. Most glaring were the disparities between how minority populations, such as African Americans or Hispanics, were treated by police departments with mostly white officers. As a result of these confrontations, scholars began studying the mistrust and misunderstanding between police and citizens.

Beginning in the 1970s, scholars in the criminal justice field explored options for reforming American police. In *American Law Enforcement*, published in 1973, Vern Folley advocated for the creation of community relations units to improve the relationships between community members and police. Though he did not specifically name members of any minority group, he stated that these community relations units would be most helpful in dealing with citizens living in the “ghetto.”16 It is clear that “ghetto,” meant minority citizens. Folley argued that police needed to resolve the “citizen hostility toward police” present in ghetto neighborhoods, explicitly placing the blame on the citizens. 17 Until this issue was tackled, police would not consider residents in these communities as true citizens and would not provide them with adequate protection. In his analysis of the strained relationships between communities and police, Folley blamed insufficient police trust and protection on members of marginalized communities rather than on any problems with the police culture. The failure to admit that fault might exist on the side of the police departments proved to be a significant hurdle for departments to overcome.

Significant forays into community policing during the 1970s were not defined as such, since the concept of “community policing” did not yet have that name. Efforts that fit into this definition, however, began to be implemented in certain locations. Examples
include the New York City Housing Authority Police Department (HAPD) and the
Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program (NFPP) in Flint, Michigan in 1979. For at least ten
years, the HAPD policed New York’s housing projects, with the support and affection of
its residents. Members of the housing authority police department had substations at the
projects, spent time with the residents and their children, and enforced strict quality-of-
life guidelines. These guidelines focused on the appearance of the housing projects and
forbid residents from hanging laundry on their porches and leaving shoes outside their
front doors. For decades, the members of the housing authority police department were so
well received that residents of the projects referred to them as “their police.”

The NFPP, administered from January 1979 to January 1982, became one of community policing’s
most significant experiments. Through the program, the Flint Police Department
encouraged officers to leave their automobiles and survey their “beats” or assigned areas
by foot instead of in their automobiles. Interviews with residents and officers following
the initiation of the program found that most believed the foot patrol officers to be more
successful at policing than those in automobiles. According to Robert C. Trojanowicz,
who worked for the University of Michigan nearby, the Neighborhood Foot Patrol
Program reduced crime rates and the number of calls for service. With these, and other
experiments, the 1970s introduced American police forces to the most basic concepts of
community policing, such as getting out of automobiles, walking around, talking to
citizens, and creating relationships with the people in their jurisdiction.

In hindsight, it is obvious that problems existed with the most popular methods of
policing, such as the huge dependency on the automobile. Departments did not
immediately accept that they might be responsible for undesirable conditions.
Nevertheless, departments slowly began to make changes. Overall, the 1970s was a time of exploration of ideas on which community policing is based, such as the viability and usefulness of relationships between officers and community members.

By the 1980s, new theories based on the recognition of policing problems guided police departments and scholars in their exploration of new best practices. They still questioned if these new methods of policing were effective, and if they were necessary. Unlike the authors of the 1970s, these authors discussed new concepts and methods of policing with terms recognized today. Among these are community policing, problem-oriented policing introduced by Herman Goldstein in 1979, and broken-windows policing first explained by James Q. Wilson in 1982. When exploring these methods, authors were unsure of the validity of new policing techniques by themselves and often discussed their implementation in combination with other newly created concepts of policing. Authors such as Peter Manning, who is included in *Critical Issues in Policing: Contemporary Readings* (1989), made their distrust of the community policing movement apparent.

Manning argued that community policing was simply a ploy for public relations by police departments. He stated that the concept of community policing was based on false assumptions, including that citizens were dissatisfied with contemporary policing methods and that a “single public mood” existed on what was best for the community. Manning cited early projects in community policing and argued that they proved no consistent or tangible results. For example, in the Newark foot patrol study, though residents reported a decrease in their fear of crime due to the increased presence of police officers, business owners and operators in the same area reported no change, and in fact stated that they saw officers less often than they had before. The tendency for community
policing to produce results not easily measured by police department statistics strained the ability of practitioners and scholars to recognize its successes.

To combat their discomfort with a lack of easily measurable results, other authors, including Roger Dunham and Geoffrey P. Alpert, explored community policing differently. Rather than directly advocating for its use, they conducted a survey to explore what both officers and citizens expected from police. They attempted to quantify the expectations of citizens in five different neighborhoods in Dade County, Florida, by asking residents to rate what qualities they believed police supervisors should emphasize when evaluating officers. Using the same quality rating systems, they also measured how police officers thought the qualities should rank and how they believed their supervisors would rate them. In their experiment, Dunham and Alpert were careful to consider the diversity of the neighborhoods which they surveyed, an important nod to the racial tensions that sparked community policing efforts in the first place. In the end, Alpert and Dunham found that different communities ranked different qualities among the most important. For example, one neighborhood rated appearance as the most important and another chose knowledge. Though this, and other similar efforts, produced statistical results, such information was difficult to translate into new policies and techniques to be utilized by American police forces.

As more scholars and law enforcement practitioners began to sign on to the concept of community policing, there were more experiments. Several significant community policing efforts began in the 1980s. Among them was the creation of the Experimental Police District (EPD) in Madison, Wisconsin, and the Newark Foot Patrol Experiment. The Experimental Police District formed after years of Wisconsin Police
Department investigation into new leadership styles. The implementation of community policing at the Experimental Police District was significant because the effort was one of the first experiments initiated after the entire police department underwent structural reform in its administrative division. This reform was most apparent in the selection required for its members. First, patrol officers applied for the limited roles at the EPD. Once patrol officers were selected, they chose their supervisors. The lieutenant and sergeant that were to be in charge of the Experimental Police District had to apply to the front-line officers, interview with them, and ultimately be selected by popular vote. The Newark Foot Patrol experiment was just one of several such projects in Newark, New Jersey. The city continued to be a site for community policing experiments, hosting efforts in 1986 and 1991. It is unclear if repeated experimentation in Newark occurred for a single reason, or if the experiments had any effects on one another. Through the experiences in Madison, Newark, and other locations around the country, police practitioners began to understand how community policing looked in practice and what administrative changes would be required for a department to institute it successfully.

In the 1990s, criminal justice scholars sought to clarify community policing’s definition and outline its methods based on the decades of previous experiences. Through experiments in community policing, law enforcement practitioners and scholars learned that while community policing was a blanket term that applied to a variety of techniques, the same techniques were not always effective in different neighborhoods. The complicated definition of a community plagued the application of community policing. Scholars in this period learned that community policing must be uniquely catered to each location. But, finding what method of community policing worked best for each
community could only be found by trying, so departments continued to implement many of the same techniques. By the 1990s, many of the earliest projects were completed. These included two similar fear of crime programs in Newark and Houston that sought to weigh the perceived fear of crime against actual crime rates and a problem-oriented policing experiment in Newport News, Virginia. Scholars and law enforcement officers constantly explored the results of these tests to understand what worked best and why.

Though the concept of community policing was meant to bring people together, experiments proved that its application changed the relationships between police officers who practiced community policing and those that kept more traditional policing responsibilities. Several projects created specific divisions for community policing, thus separating the police officers into different roles and straining the relationships between the different members of the participating police departments. In several experiments, such as the Community Patrol Officer Program in New York City, tensions surfaced between the officers assigned to the new community policing roles and those left doing “traditional” police work, including patrol units that reacted to calls by the public for assistance. The officers who maintained their original roles often considered community policing to be “too soft” or did not think of it as “real policing.” Because of this, many officers who retained their original responsibilities felt that the community policing officers were not required to work as hard. As they were many officers that were given community policing responsibilities were no longer required to answer emergency calls for service. Instead, community policing officers were given this time to work on long-term issues and map out long-term solutions. So, many officers left in traditional roles believed that the new community policing officers were given too much free time and
that they were likely to waste it being unproductive. These experiments made it apparent that for community policing to succeed, it must be implemented as a department-wide initiative. This is where the philosophical side of community policing comes into play. In order for community policing to be accepted and endorsed by all members of a police department, it cannot just be the assigned task of a few chosen individuals.

Community policing requires a partnership between the local police department and the community itself. For the project to succeed, both the police department and the community must be willing to invest themselves in the community policing philosophy and its implementation. When one of these groups fails to “buy-in,” or support community policing, the concept is unlikely to succeed, a result that has been repeatedly proven through community policing experiments across the nation. One example of this is the Weed and Seed program in Seattle. In Steve Herbert’s book, *Citizens, Cops, and Power*, he detailed the efforts of the Seattle Police Department to institute a specific method of community policing. Weed and Seed includes the weeding out of problem citizens, such as drug dealers, and seeding, or creating, relationships of trust between members of the community and the police with the hope that citizens will report any incidents or serve as confidant of information. Herbert argues that the Weed and Seed program in Seattle is unsuccessful because the community failed to unite to promote the work of the Seattle police department.21

While both groups can benefit from embracing community policing, with lower crime rates and a safer community, they each have different motives for entering and ensuring the success of community policing. Police, for example, are doing a job and getting a paycheck. Police officers work for the city or municipal area and are most often
funded by the tax payers of the community. Though many police officers hate to admit it, approval of their work is necessary to be successful. If the police earn the support of the community, they will have countless advocates to argue for the resources that they need. Since the citizens are the ones who elect the political officials that oversee the police department, the sense of accountability that police might relate to the citizens in this manner is quite apparent. However, policing is a professional occupation, with standards and best practices. Police officers often pride themselves on their professionalism. Since the 1930s, this professionalism has come to be defined as the utilization of the newest technologies, as well as time tested methods, for effective results. Police professionalism is influenced by an ever-growing field of experienced law enforcement officers and criminal justice scholars who write in journals, conduct experiments, and participate in national and international conferences. This means that police, informed by well-backed and time tested research, do not always consider the input of civilians, or community members, to be helpful advice. American police are notorious for their inability to accept changes in the work that they do. This, coupled with the feeling that outsiders have invaded their work, can cause members of police departments to hesitate and resist when it comes to accepting the concept of community policing. Community policing requires a shift in such attitudes. The philosophy of community policing needs police officers to accept or be open to the information that citizens can bring to the equation. However, reaching a mutually beneficial relationship with citizens in a police department’s jurisdiction is easier said than done. It takes time and the completion of real world projects to prove that the community can help the police department.
Community members have their own reasons and problems when it comes to investing in community policing projects. Community members who engage in such projects often want the police to function in a specific way and to further their individual interests, whether they are in residential or commercial neighborhoods. Community residents might choose to participate depending on what it is they expect from the police department in return. As a result, police departments have to advertise their community policing efforts to the community carefully, so that community members will understand how it will benefit them. Even when the intentions of police departments are clearly presented, most community residents do not have a complete understanding of the work that police officers do. Some community members may think the officers do little to nothing, and treat them in a negative manner. Others, in their lack of understanding, may shy away from the police out of intimidation or fear. Either of these attitudes can prevent community assistance to police departments. Without the support of the community, community policing cannot be effective.

Funding is a significant factor for police departments that want to implement community policing. Practicing community policing requires police officers to be moved away from their traditional, responsive, roles to focus on creating community relationships and solving problems. For a department to be able to do this, it likely has to fund overtime for some officers or hire new officers to replace the patrol officers that move their focus to community policing. When departments received temporary funding, like they often did from organizations like the Police Foundation, they were able to conduct short-term community policing experiments. However, when the funding ran out, the officers returned to their original roles. When one police department in Alabama
began practicing community policing, they had long-term goals for its success. However, when funding was needed for another section of the department, community policing was the first expense to be cut. It is likely that this was not an isolated event, as officers and police administration probably preferred to stick to the work that they knew, rather than investing their time and money in new and experimental practices. The infusion of federal funds during the 1990s helped to create community policing departments and divisions for the long-haul. For example, when the Boise Police Department was awarded federal funds in 1994 for a community policing unit, the grant required that after three years, the department pay the salary and maintain the positions that were added by the federal money. This meant that the Boise Police Department could not make temporary positions, they had to plan for permanent ones. While the concept of community policing might seem inspiring to law enforcement practitioners and scholars, it is not going to get very far if no one is willing to invest money in it.

The 1990s was significant for the surge in funding that was provided to community policing efforts. Under President Bill Clinton, the Department of Justice funded many unity policing projects and experiments throughout the United States. This allowed further research into the methods, benefits, and limitations of community policing. One example of federally funding community policing was the work of the Seattle Police Department, which started its Weed and Seed program in 1992. During this project, emphasis patrols were created to focus on specific areas that were known for crime. Partnerships were also formed between the police department and other community organizations. One of these partnerships included a program that sought to work with previous offenders, to help them break the cycle and prevent the likelihood
that they would reenter prison. Endorsement by the federal government of community policing efforts solidified the concept as viable for American police departments. Instead of being something that a few departments across the nation experimented in, community policing became the expectation for American police. Despite this shift toward acceptance, however, by the end of the 1990s, the definition of community policing continued to be vague.

By the 2000s, community policing was a widely-accepted concept with tangible techniques. It had largely been endorsed by criminal justice and law enforcement authorities as the next generation of policing. Questions still circulated on community policing’s exact definition and whether it was a philosophy to be wholly embraced by departments or a method of policing that can be practiced in conjunction with other techniques. Scholarship on community policing produced in the 2000s included it among other, more traditional models of policing. In the 2008 textbook *Policing in America: A Balance of Forces*, Lawrence F. Travis III and Robert H. Langworthy focused much of their attention on the unique nature of communities, departments, and individual police officers. The authors described how the attitude of each affects the implementation of community policing. Their chapter on community policing describes the mindset of the individual officer and how this effects community policing.

When departments engaged in community policing in the 2000s, it was no longer an experiment. Police departments were almost expected to have some sort of community policing programs as it was quickly becoming the norm internationally. Due to law enforcement cultures’ strong resistance to change, however, most police departments embraced community policing gradually. This included starting community policing
teams instead of department wide initiatives, despite negative results from experiments that proved isolated teams caused problems.

The future of community policing is unclear. Though it has been widely embraced as the new, nation-wide method of policing, there continues to be consistent issues with American law enforcement. During the so-called War on Drugs, police departments received military-grade weapons from the federal government. This means that the arming of municipal police departments coincided directly with the development of community policing. When looking at news stories in 2016, the armament of police departments is more obvious than the community relationships that officers have created and any crime that might have been prevented with community policing tactics. The problems of measuring the results of community policing plague departments. Though employee evaluations continue to be an issue, many police departments across the United States have realized that in order for community policing to be celebrated for its successes, the traditional systems that measure effectiveness and results must be changed. This took a long time to learn, however. The future of community policing is dependent on the willingness of officers and citizens to adapt to its special requirements and to be understanding of one another. If this most basic component of community policing can successfully rise above the multitudes of misunderstandings remains to be seen.


Langworthy and Travis, Policing in America, 317.


Folley, American Law Enforcement, 128.


GUIDE TO THE COLLECTION

The following section, a guide to the Boise Police Department oral history collection, is meant to stand alone. For this reason, some information provided in the guide may be a repeat of information included in other sections of this document. The guide was prepared under the supervision of the History Programs Manager, Brandi Burns, and Archivist, Stephanie Milne-Lane, at the Boise City Department of Arts & History.
Guide to the Boise Police Department Oral History Collection, 1990 -2014

Overview of the Collection

Creator: Boise City Department of Arts & History
Title: Boise Police Department Oral History Collection
Dates: 1970s-2016 (inclusive)
1990s-2014 (bulk)
Quantity: 25 oral history interviews, 34 digital audio files, 598 pp of transcripts, and other paper and digital file documentation
Collection Number: BPD0001-Boise Police Department Project
Summary: The Boise Police Department oral history project is a collection of interviews conducted by Boise State University Historian Fellow Chelsee Boehm in 2016 and 2017 for the Boise City Department of Arts & History and to fulfill degree requirements at Boise State University. Former Boise Police Chiefs, former and current captains and officers, as well as former Boise City Council members, local newspaper reporters, and other community members describe events that effected the Boise Police Department between 1990 and 2014.
Repository: Boise City Department of Arts & History. Boise City Archive
Boise City Hall
150 N. Capitol Boulevard
Boise, ID 83702
208-608-7050
boiseartsandhistory.org
Languages: English
Sponsor: Project was completed with the help of the Boise City Department of Arts & History staff, as well as members of the History Department at Boise State University.
Historical Note

The 1990s mark the beginning of a significant era of change for the Boise Police Department and for law enforcement nationwide. The concept of community policing was slowly becoming the reigning philosophy for police departments. To encourage such techniques, the federal government was busy studying community policing and issuing money to local departments to initiate its practice.

Community policing is a difficult concept to define. To some law enforcement researchers and practitioners, community policing is a philosophy that puts the relationship between the police department and their community at the forefront. Community policing encourages departments to accept willingly the input of citizens and to make and enforce changes from their citizens’ input. Other law enforcement practitioners and specialists see community policing as certain tactics or methods for practicing typical policing. For the Boise Police Department, the turn toward community policing included a renewed focus on strengthening the relationship between the department and the citizens of Boise.

With this new push to focus on community relations, the Boise Police Department created a group of Neighborhood Contact Officers and small substations to better serve the residents of the city. In the late 1990s, the department faced a string of officer-involved shootings, including one that resulted in the first loss of an officer in the line of duty. Following the alarming number of incidents, the City of Boise created the position of Community Ombudsman to review officer-involved shootings and other “critical incidents.” Between 1999 and 2014, the ombudsman served the city while the Police Department worked to better the department and open lines of communication with all members of the community.

The oral histories in this collection include a variety of perspectives on the Boise Police Department from the 1990s to about 2014. Current and former members of the Police Department recall a stressful time with an outpouring of citizen support and opposition. Former Community Ombudsman Pierce Murphy describes the difficulty of building the ombudsman office from the ground up, while local reporters recall the inherent tension between Murphy’s office and the Boise Police Department.

Content Description

The Arts & History Boise Police Department Oral History collection consists of digitally recorded interviews, transcripts, summaries, signed release forms, and biographical information surrounding interviews with twenty-five individuals involved with the Boise Police Department between 1990 and 2014.
Use of the Collection

Restrictions on Access:
Collection is open for research.

Acquisition Information:
The collection was acquired in 2016 and 2017, processing of the collection took place during those years.

Related Materials:
The Arts & History Department has material related to the historical research conducted in tandem with this project.

Other research material can be found by referring to the “further reading” section of this guide.

Contents of the Collection
Interviews are organized per the format below;

OH000 (number of oral history): (name of narrator)   (date of interview)
(file type) (time of interview or interviews in minutes)
(length of transcribed interview)

Please see the detailed descriptions of the contents later in this guide for more information.
All interviews conducted by Chelsee Boehm under the direction of the History Programs Manager, Brandi Burns, of the Boise City Department of Arts & History.

OH030: Andrew Giacomazzi Interview     2016 Oct. 26
1 MP3 File (57:26)
Transcript 20 pages

OH037: Brad Hem Interview       2016 Nov. 30
1 MP3 File (36:20)
Transcript 15 pages

OH032: Charles Albanese Interview      2016 Nov. 2
2 MP3 Files (1:04:27)
Transcript 22 pages

OH029: Craig Quintana Interview      2016 Oct. 20
1 MP3 File (39:51)
Transcript 17 pages
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OH038: Daniel Fink Interview</th>
<th>2016 Dec. 05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 MP3 File (45:37)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript 14 pages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OH035: David Eberle Interview</th>
<th>2016 Nov. 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 MP3 File (42:57)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript 17 pages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OH039: David Frazier Interview</th>
<th>2017 Jan 31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 MP3 File (38:22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript 15 pages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OH016: Donald Pierce Interview</th>
<th>2016 Aug. 08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 MP3 Files (56:35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript 20 pages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OH026: Dustin Robinson Interview</th>
<th>2016 Oct. 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 MP3 File (43:28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript 15 pages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OH034: George Prentice Interview</th>
<th>2016 Nov. 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 MP3 File (1:47:22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript 32 pages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OH021: Guy Bourgeau Interview</th>
<th>2016 Sept. 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 MP3 Files (1:02:55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript 29 pages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OH018: James Kerns Interview</th>
<th>2016 Aug. 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 MP3 Files (1:30:11)</td>
<td>and Sept. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcripts 37 pages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OH019: James Montgomery Interview</th>
<th>2016 Sept. 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 MP3 Files (1:19:45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript 30 pages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OH027: Jim Tibbs Interview</th>
<th>2016 Oct. 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 MP3 File (1:08:01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript 22 pages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OH017: Larry Paulson Interview</th>
<th>2016 Aug. 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 MP3 File (57:59)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript 18 pages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OH020: Michael Masterson Interview</th>
<th>2016 Sept. 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 MP3 Files (1:26:23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript 29 pages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OH031: Mike Wetherell Interview
1 MP3 File (1:06:18)
Transcript 16 pages

OH024: Patrick Orr Interview
1 MP3 File (1:04:11)
Transcript 30 pages

OH023: Pete Ritter Interview
2 MP3 Files (1:18:02)
Transcript 31 pages

OH015: Pierce Murphy Interview
1 MP3 File (1:05:12)
Transcript 21 pages

OH036: Phillip Thompson Interview
1 MP3 File (30:02)
Transcript 14 pages

OH025: Richard Schnebly Interview
2 MP3 Files (1:37:11)
Transcript 31 pages

OH022: Ron Winegar Interviews
2 MP3 Files (1:50:03)
Transcripts 41 pages

OH028: Shelli Sonnenberg-Wardle Interview
1 MP3 File (1:38:43)
Transcript 32 pages

OH033: Stanton Niccolls Interview
1 MP3 File (1:02:44)
Transcript 30 pages

2016 Oct. 26
2016 Sept. 29
2016 Sept. 28
2016 Aug. 5
2016 Nov. 18
2016 Oct. 3
2016 Sept. 22 and Oct. 12
2016 Oct. 12
2016 Nov. 9
Biographical information: Andrew Giacomazzi is a professor, advisor, and Associate Dean of the School of Public Service at Boise State University. Giacomazzi earned his M.A. in criminal justice at the Washington State University after conducting research on the Seattle Police Department and their community policing methods. When Giacomazzi arrived in Boise in 1999, he and Dr. Elizabeth Fredericksen (of the Boise State Department of Public Policy & Administration) worked with members of the BPD to create a strategic plan with the department. Since then, Giacomazzi has sat on hiring boards for the police department and often involves an upper division class in work with the Boise Police Department.

Interview Summary: The interview focuses on Giacomazzi’s involvement with the Boise Police Department as a community policing expert since 1999. Topics include community policing; department chiefs Larry Paulson, Donald Pierce, Mike Masterson, and Bill Bones; Interim chief Jim Tibbs; Community ombudsman; Pierce Murphy; Civilian oversight; Shooting of Matthew Jones

Biographical Information: Brad Hem is a professionally trained journalist who began working at the Idaho Statesman in 2002. For four years, Hem was the City Hall reporter for the newspaper. Hem reported primarily on the dealings of the city government, though sometimes reported on police budgets and other relevant issues. Hem now works for a communications studio in Houston, Texas.
Interview Summary: Interview focuses on Hem’s time at the Idaho Statesman. Topics include City of Boise; local government; Boise City Council; Mayors H. Brent Coles, Carolyn Terteling-Payne, and David Bieter; Boise City Hall; City budgets; Media relations; Reporting; Idaho Statesman; Department chiefs Donald Pierce and Mike Masterson; Interim chief Jim Tibbs; Shooting of Matthew Jones

Biographical Information: Before moving to Boise, Charles Albanese was an officer for the Beverly Hills Police Department for fifteen years. After moving to Boise in 1994, Albanese later became one of four original members of the Department’s first official community policing team in 1995. Albanese worked for the Boise Police Department for twenty-two years before he retired in May 2016. He has also worked as a lecturer at Boise State University.

Interview Summary: Interview focuses on Albanese’s time at the Boise Police Department. Topics include community policing; officer-involved shootings; department chiefs Larry Paulson, Donald Pierce, Mike Masterson, and Bill Bones; Community ombudsman; Pierce Murphy; Civilian oversight; Supervisor Richard Schnebly; Capitol City Development Corp; Officer Mark Stall; Interim chief Jim Tibbs; SRO Program

Biographical Information: Craig Quintana currently works as the Chief Information Officer for the Ada County Highway District. Prior to that, Quintana was City Reporter for the Idaho Statesman from 1999 until 2002. Quintana is a trained journalist who worked for ten years at the Orlando Sentinel in Florida for ten years prior to moving to Boise.
Interview Summary: Interview focuses on Quintana’s time as an Idaho Statesman reporter. Topics include reporting; Media relations; Idaho Statesman; Officer-involved shootings; Department chiefs Larry Paulson and Donald Pierce; Officer Lance Nickerson; Shooting at Boise Zoo

OH038: Daniel Fink Interview 2016 Dec. 05
1 MP3 File (45:37)
Transcript 14 pages

Biographical Information: Daniel Fink has been Rabbi for the Congregation Ahavath Beth since 1994. Prior to that, Rabbi Fink was ordained in Cincinnati in 1988 and then served as a rabbi for four years in Virginia and two years in Nebraska. Since moving to Boise, Rabbi Fink has had a relationship with the Boise Police Department as the leader of the Boise’s Jewish community.

Interview Summary: Interview focuses on Rabbi Fink’s relationship with the Boise Police Department. Topics include community policing; Community relations; Anti-Semitism in Boise; department chiefs Larry Paulson, Donald Pierce, Mike Masterson, and Bill Bones; Community ombudsman; Pierce Murphy; Mayors H. Brent Coles and David Bieter; Interim chief Jim Tibbs; Shooting of Matthew Jones; Add the Words Idaho; Boise Islamic Center

OH035: David Eberle Interview 2016 Nov. 17
1 MP3 File (42:57)
Transcript 17 pages

Biographical Information: A Boise native, David Eberle is a professional economist, professor at Boise State University, and a former member of Boise City Council. First elected in 2003, Eberle served on City Council until 2014. During that time, he served as a liaison for the Boise Police Department.

Interview Summary: Interview focuses on Eberle’s time as a member of the Boise City Council as it specifically relates to the Boise Police Department. Topics include Boise
City Council; Officer-involved shootings; Mike Wetherell; Mayors H. Brent Coles and David Bieter; department chiefs Donald Pierce and Mike Masterson; Community policing; Community ombudsman; Pierce Murphy; Shooting of Matthew Jones; Boise Police Union; veteran George Nickel

OH039: David Frazier Interview
1 MP3 File (38:22) 2017 Jan 31
Transcript 15 pages
Biographical Information: David Frazier is a professional photographer and the editor of the Boise Guardian since 2005. In the 1960s, Frazier was a photographer for the Idaho Statesman and then an officer with the Garden City Police Department. Since that time, Frazier has kept close tabs on Boise’s government. Frazier is locally known as a “government watchdog” and has gone to trial against the City of Boise on several occasions.

Interview Summary: Interview focuses on Frazier’s involvement with city government and the City of Boise since the 1970s. Topics include construction of City Hall West; Department chiefs John Church, James Carvino, Larry Paulson, Donald Pierce, and Mike Masterson; Idaho Statesman; reporting; Officer-involved shootings; Mayor H. Brent Coles; Boise City Council; Paula Forney; Community ombudsman; Pierce Murphy; Shooting at Boise Zoo; The Boise Guardian; Shooting of Matthew Jones; Boise auditorium district

OH016: Donald Pierce Interview
2 MP3 Files (56:35) 2016 Aug. 08
Transcript 20 pages
Biographical Information: Donald Pierce was chief of the Boise Police Department from 2000 until 2004. Pierce began his career in policing in Pullman, Washington. He has extensive experience and has even taught as a professor. Since leaving Boise, he served as director
of Big Brothers, Big Sisters for Southwest Idaho and the head of the chiefs and sheriffs association in the state of Washington.

Interview Summary: Interview focuses on Pierce’s time as Boise Police Chief. Topics include community policing; diversity; Critical Incident Task Force; Jim Tibbs; Community ombudsman; Pierce Murphy; Mayors H. Brent Coles, Carolyn Terteling-Payne, and David Bieter; Boise City Council; Mike Wetherell; resignation

OH026: Dustin Robinson Interview
1 MP3 File (43:28)
Transcript 15 pages

Biographical Information: Dustin Robinson is currently the Refugee Liaison for the Boise Police Department. Before working for the Boise Police Department Robinson was an officer for the Boise County Sheriff’s Office. As Refugee Liaison, Robinson works to inform newly arrived refugees in Boise on American laws and he often assists in the resettlement process.

Interview Summary: Interview focuses on Robinson’s role as Refugee Liaison. Topics include refugee resettlement; American laws; American culture; language barriers; translators in Boise; resettlement process in Boise; Refugee community in Boise; immigration politics

OH034: George Prentice Interview
1 MP3 File (1:47:22)
Transcript 32 pages

Biographical Information: George Prentice is the news editor for Boise Weekly and a member of Boise State’s NPR station. Prior to moving to Boise in 2000, Prentice had years of journalistic experience, including working for several papers in Buffalo, New York and serving as a segment producer for “Good Morning America.”
Interview Summary: Interview focuses on Prentice’s time at Boise Weekly. Topics include news reporting; Love Canal incident; Officer-involved shootings; Department heads Mike Masterson and Bill Bones; Shooting of Matthew Jones; Community ombudsman; Pierce Murphy; Mark Seeley; veteran George Nickel; homeless population in Boise; Cooper Court; Mayor David Bieter; community policing

OH021: Guy Bourgeau Interview 2016 Sept. 8
2 MP3 Files (1:02:55)
Transcript 29 pages

Biographical Interview: Formerly a police officer in Syracuse, New York, Guy Bourgeau was hired by the Boise Police Department in 2000. Bourgeau is now a Neighborhood Contact Officer (NCO) for the Boise Police Department. For twelve years, Bourgeau also served on the leadership of the Boise Police Union.

Interview Summary: Interview focuses on Bourgeau’s time at the Boise Police Department and his experiences with the police union. Topics include community policing; neighborhood policing; Community ombudsman; Pierce Murphy; Mayor H. Brent Coles; Department heads Larry Paulson, Donald Pierce, and Mike Masterson; Interim chief Jim Tibbs; veteran George Nickel; Boise Fire and Police Trust

OH018: James Kerns Interview 2016 Aug. 30 and Sept. 7
2 MP3 Files (1:30:11)
Transcripts 37 pages

Biographical Information: James “Jim” Kerns worked for the Boise Police Department for twenty-nine years before retiring in 2011 as a Deputy Chief. Kerns played a significant role in the Boise River Float program conducted by the Department and helped to lead the creation of the Community Outreach Division of the BPD. Kerns now works as a professor in criminal justice at Boise State University.
Interview Summary: Interview focuses on Kern’s experiences at the Boise Police Department. Topics include community policing; Problem-solving policing; Department chiefs John Church, James Montgomery, James Carvino, Larry Paulson, Donald Pierce, and Mike Masterson; Boise Airport; SRO Program; officer-involved shootings; Officer Mark Stall; Community ombudsman; Pierce Murphy; Neighborhood Watch program; SARA model; Downtown “Cruising”; Boise River Float; Mayor David Bieter; Field Training Program; veteran George Nickel; Community Outreach Division

OH019: James Montgomery Interview  2016 Sept. 2
2 MP3 Files (1:19:45)
Transcript 30 pages

Biographical Information: James Montgomery was chief of the Boise Police Department from 1983 until 1988. Prior to that, Montgomery worked as a police officer in Louisville, Kentucky. After leaving the Boise Police Department, Montgomery served as the Sheriff of King County, Washington.

Interview Summary: Interview focuses on Montgomery’s experiences as Boise Police chief. Topics include department heads John Church, James Carvino, and Mike Masterson; Boise City Council; Mayor Richard Eardley; SRO Program; media relations; Idaho Statesman; Mounted patrol; Martin Luther King, Jr.

OH027: Jim Tibbs Interview  2016 Oct. 7
1 MP3 File (1:08:01)
Transcript 22 pages

Biographical Information: James “Jim” Tibbs is currently an Ada County Commissioner. He served on the Boise City Council for seven years between 2005 and 2012. Prior to that, Tibbs was a member of the Boise Police Department for thirty-four years. He served briefly as interim chief in 2004. During his tenure at the BPD, Tibbs served as the Chief Information Division.
Interview Summary:

Interview focuses on Tibbs’ time at the Boise Police Department. Topics include department heads John Church, James Carvino, Larry Paulson, and Donald Pierce, and Mike Masterson; problem-oriented policing; SRO Program; Mayor H. Brent Coles; officer-involved shootings; Community ombudsman; officer Mark Stall; Pierce Murphy; Community Outreach Division; Derek Whipps; shooting of Matthew Jones; Boise City Council; Drug Czar of Idaho

OH017: Larry Paulson Interview
1 MP3 File (57:59)
Transcript 18 pages

Biographical Information:
Larry Paulson worked for the Boise Police Department for twenty-five years. From 1993 until 1999, Paulson acted as the Chief of Police, ushering the department through a string of critical incidents and the department’s first loss of an officer in the line of duty. Paulson is spoken of fondly by his former employees.

Interview Summary:
Interview focuses on Paulson’s time as at the Boise Police Department and specifically his years as chief of police. Topics include department heads John Church, James Montgomery, James Carvino, Donald Pierce, and Mike Masterson; Officer Mark Stall; community ombudsman; media relations; Idaho Statesman; officer-involved shootings community policing; SRO program; Neighborhood Watch; Jim Tibbs

OH020: Michael Masterson Interview
2 MP3 Files (1:26:23)
Transcript 29 pages

Biographical Information:
Michael “Mike” Masterson was the chief of the Boise Police Department from 2004 until his retirement in 2014. Prior to moving to Boise, Masterson was a member of the Madison Police
Department under well-known chief David Couper. Under his tenure, the Boise Police Department tightened their focus on community policing, expanded officer training, and began to focus on more diverse hiring.

**Interview Summary:**

Interview focuses on Masterson’s experience with community policing in Madison and his time as chief in Boise. Topics include Madison Police Department; community policing; Interim chief Jim Tibbs; Mayor David Bieter; officer-involved shootings; Shooting of Matthew Jones; community ombudsman; Pierce Murphy; Sheriff Gary Raney; problem-solving policing; Boise River Float project; Retail Crime Interdiction Program; veteran George Nickel; refugee liaison position; department head Bill Bones

**OH031: Mike Wetherell Interview**

2016 Oct. 26

1 MP3 File (1:06:18)

Transcript 16 pages

**Biographical Information:** Mike Wetherell is a retired district court judge for the state of Idaho. Prior to becoming a judge in 2003. Wetherell served as a member of the Boise City Council for seventeen years. Wetherell is a trained and practiced attorney.

**Interview Summary:** Interview focuses on Wetherell’s time on Boise City Council as it specifically relates to the Boise Police Department. Topics include Senator Frank Church; Boise City Council; department heads James Montgomery, James Carvino, Larry Paulson, and Donald Pierce; officer-involved shootings; Officer Mark Stall; community ombudsman; Pierce Murphy; Vern Blisterfedlt; community policing

**OH024: Patrick Orr Interview**

2016 Sept. 29

1 MP3 File (1:04:11)

Transcript 30 pages

**Biographical Information:** Patrick Orr is a Public Information Officer (PIO) for the Ada County Sheriff’s Office. Before accepting that role, Orr was a reporter for the *Idaho Statesman*
Interview Summary:

Interview focuses on Orr’s time at the Idaho Statesman. Topics include reporting; officer-involved shootings; media relations; Former reporter Thomas Clouse; Department heads Larry Paulson, Donald Pierce, and Mike Masterson; Mayors H. Brent Coles, Carolyn Terteling-Payne and David Bieter; Community ombudsman; Pierce Murphy; Murder of Lynn Henneman; Murder of Samantha Maher; Greenbelt patrol; Murder of Angie Abdullah; Boise City Council; interim chief Jim Tibbs; shooting of Matthew Jones; Critical Incident Task Force; shooting at Boise Zoo.
Biographical Information: Pierce Murphy served for fourteen years as Boise’s first Community Ombudsman. Prior to that, Murphy worked in HR for Boise Cascade and served as a reserve law enforcement officer. Murphy built the Community Ombudsman office from scratch and conducted official investigations into the Boise Police Department.

Interview Summary: Interview focuses on the creation of the Community Ombudsman office in Boise. (This interview was originally intended to be the first in a series.) Topics include; civilian oversight; community ombudsman; officer-involved shootings; Boise City Council; Mayor H. Brent Coles; community relations; Jerome Mapp; Ada County Human Rights Task Force; department head Larry Paulson

Biographical Information: Phillip Thompson is the director of the Idaho Black History Museum in Julia Davis Park. A Boise native, Thompson was attending high school during the string of officer-involved shootings in 1996-1997. In his role as museum director, Thompson has a close relationship with the Boise Police Department.

Interview Summary: Interview focuses on Thompson’s role as director of the Idaho Black History Museum and growing up in Boise as an African-American. Topics include officer-involved shootings; diversity; department heads Mike Masterson and Bill Bones; Muslim community in Boise; refugee liaison program

Biographical Information: Richard Schnebly is the founder and publisher of the Idaho Black History Magazine. Schnebly has been a prominent voice in the Idaho Black community for over four decades. He has been involved in numerous civil rights and community organizations.

Interview Summary: Interview focuses on Schnebly’s work in the Idaho Black community and his experiences as a civil rights leader. Topics include civil rights activism; Idaho Black History; community relations; and leadership in the Idaho Black community.
Biographical Information: Richard Schnebly was a member of the Boise Police Department for about thirty years. Schnebly was the sergeant in charge of the first community-policing team in 1994.

Interview Summary: Interview focuses on Schnebly’s time at the Boise Police Department. Topics include department heads John Church, James Montgomery, James Carvino, Larry Paulson, Donald Pierce, and Mike Masterson; Boise City Council; community policing; problem-oriented policing; police substations; downtown “cruising”; refugees in Boise; officer-involved shootings; media relations; Idaho Statesman; Mayor H. Brent Coles;

OH022: Ron Winegar Interviews 2016 Sept. 22
2 MP3 Files (1:50:03) and Oct. 12
Transcripts 41 pages

Biographical Information: Ron Winegar is currently the captain of the Community Outreach Division of the Boise Police Department. Winegar has been employed by the BPD since 1993. Winegar was injured during the shootout that killed officer Mark Stall in 1997. Winegar was also a member of the Boise Police Department’s rock band jonny Law for almost a decade.

Interview Summary: First interview primarily focuses on Winegar’s presence at the shootout on September 27, 1997; Second interview focuses on Winegar’s other experiences with the Boise Police Department. Topics include department heads Larry Paulson, Donald Pierce, and Mike Masterson; SRO program; Boise Police Department rock band; interim chief Jim Tibbs; community ombudsman; Pierce Murphy; Mayor H. Brent Coles; Community Outreach division; Richard Schnebly; refugee liaison program; Organized Crime Retail Theft Unit; community policing

OH028: Shelli Sonnenberg-Wardle Interview 2016 Oct. 12
1 MP3 File (1:38:43)
Transcript 32 pages
Biographical Information: Shelli Sonnenberg is a detective for the Boise Police Department. Hired by the BPD in 1999 Sonnenberg was a Neighborhood Contact Officer when she established the Refugee Liaison Officer position in 2006. Sonnenberg served as the Refugee Liaison for five years before Officer Dustin Robinson took over the position.

Interview Summary: Interview focuses on Sonnerberg’s time at the Boise Police Department and the creation of the Refugee Liaison Officer position. Topics include Neighborhood Contact Officers (NCO); refugee community in Boise; refugee resettlement in Boise; different cultures in Boise; language barriers; interpreters in Boise; Kids’ Corner program; community policing; domestic violence; relationships with refugees; immigration politics

OH033: Stanton Niccolls Interview 2016 Nov. 9
1 MP3 File (1:02:44)
Transcript 30 pages

Biographical Information: Stanton “Stan” Niccolls is a Patrol Watch Commander at the Boise Police Department. Before coming to Boise in 1993, Niccolls worked for the Richmond Police Department in California. Niccolls was a member of the original community policing team created by BPD in 1994.

Interview Summary: Interview focuses on Niccoll’s career at the Boise Police Department; Topics include department heads Larry Paulson, Donald Pierce, Mike Masterson, and Bill Bones; community policing; Boise’s homeless population; Boise’s transient population; homelessness in Boise; Cooper Court; officer-involved shootings; Officer Mark Stall; Ron Winegar; Mayor H. Brent Coles; community ombudsman; Pierce Murphy; Boise Police Union; interim chief Jim Tibbs; shooting of Matthew Jones; bomb squads
Further Readings:


This is the most comprehensive historical account of the Boise Police Department. Researched and written by historian Arthur Hart, *To Protect and To Serve* was paid for by the Police Department, so while it is detailed, it lacks any critical analysis of the BPD.


This book is a first-hand account from an eighteen-year veteran of the Boise Police Department. Rogers, who was present at the shooting of officer Mark Stall, details that and other significant incidents. While it provides a useful insight, it should be noted that this book is written from a single person’s perspective and is dominated by his own opinions.


Written by the father-in-law of officer Mark Stall, this book is an account of the officer’s last day, the shootout that took his life, and the aftermath of his death. This book is a heartfelt account of the struggle experienced by Stall’s family and other members of the city, but it does not say much about the history of the BPD. In addition to being Stall’s father-in-law, Rubey is a pastor, so there are many religious anecdotes in the book.

Steiner, Dan and Larry A. Paulson. “The history of the Boise Police Department.” [Place of publication not identified]: [Publisher not identified], [197?].

This short history was prepared in the 1970s by two members of the Boise Police Department as “part of the requirements for the rank of Specialist.” The report discusses law enforcement in the city beginning in the 1860s and ends with the appointment of long-time chief John Church. This history can only be found at the Albertson’s Library at Boise State University.
Other Resources:

Boise Police Department Annual Reports
Boise Public Library

The main branch of the Boise Public Library has copies of the department’s annual report for the following years; 1968, 1981-1991, 1993, 2001, and 2005. The BPD no longer prepares annual reports. These reports are a part of the Library’s Idaho Room Collection and are non-circulating. The Boise Police Department also retains copies of these reports.

Boise Police Department Oral History Project, 2000
Idaho State Historical Society

The Idaho State Archives (ISA) has a collection of oral history interviews conducted by historian Arthur Hart in 2000. These interviews can be accessed by visiting the Idaho History Center. Narrators include; Larry Paulson, James “Jim” Tibbs, former Mayor Richard Eardley, Vern Blisterfeldt, and others.

General Management and Operations Analysis and Operations Analysis and Contingency Planning for the Boise Police Department, 1990
Boise Public Library

This report was prepared for the Boise Police Department by the Institute for Law and Justice. The report explores each division, project, and assignment of the Boise Police Department as of 1990. This source is helpful for understanding the scope of the Boise Police Department’s work, its limitations, and professional recommendations that were made for its future.

Idaho Statesman Articles, 1864-1976 & 1999-present
Boise Public Library

The Idaho Statesman digital archive can be searched by keyword for related newspaper articles.

Mayors and City Council Oral History collection,
Boise City Department of Arts & History

The Department of Arts and History has a large collection of interviews with former Boise City Mayors and Council Members. Though these interviews do not focus specifically on the Police Department, they provide important details on the city’s economic, political, and social climate. Interview subjects include former City Council members Mike Wetherell, Vern Blisterfeldt, Jerome Mapp, and Sara Baker.
Subjects:

This collection will be indexed under the following headings. Researchers desiring materials about related topics, persons, or places should search the catalog using these headings.

Geographical Names:
- Boise (Idaho)
- Boise River (Idaho)

Subject Terms:
- Boise (Idaho). Community Ombudsman
- Boise (Idaho)--History--20th Century
- Boise (Idaho)--History, Local
- Boise (Idaho). Office of the Community Ombudsman
- Boise (Idaho). Police Dept.
- Boise (Idaho). Police Department
- Boise State University
- Community policing--United States
- Community policing--United States--History
- Police--20th Century
- Police--21st Century
- Law enforcement--Idaho
ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW EXAMPLES

The following excerpts were selected to show the range of the oral history interviews conducted in relation to this project. The formatting of these selections has been maintained to represent Arts & History Department standards. The first excerpt is from an interview with former Boise Police chief Mike Masterson. The second selection is from the interview with former community ombudsman Pierce Murphy. The last passage is part of the first interview with Ron Winegar, currently the captain of the Community Outreach Unit at the Boise Police Department. In their entirety, the transcripts of each of these three interviews is approximately twenty to thirty pages. All of the oral histories related to this project have been transcribed with the assistance of volunteer Marlene Fritz and transcripts are available at the Boise City Department of Arts & History.
CB: My name is Chelsee and I’m here with Mike Masterson, formerly of the Boise Police Department. Today is September 7th, 2016, and we are at the Boise Public Library. So, to begin, can you tell me a little bit about yourself and how you got into the field of policing?

MM: Sure. I grew up as the son of a police chief. Most of my early childhood memories and throughout high school were positive images of my father as he went around policing this small New Jersey community of about five thousand. I, you know, remember him coming home numerous times. He always had time for dinner. I remember that he never took his home with him and his frustrations and got to see the positive aspects of the work that he did. So, after I graduated from high school in 1972, I went out to Ottawa, Kansas, to Ottawa University, where I spent the next four years studying with an emphasis on criminal justice administration.

And then, having the educational background, I ended up getting married in 1976, and my wife at the time was in a financial executive development program with a major company at the time called General Telephone and Electronics, and so I moved with her for a couple of assignments and then finally, when the program had ended, she was offered a number of different positions around the country, including in the state of Washington, Connecticut, and other places. We ended up choosing Madison, Wisconsin. We thought that, at the time, that it wasn’t as far as the West Coast. We both had family back in New Jersey. And at the time we thought, well, maybe the West Coast is a little too far. We didn’t like the East Coast in terms of Stamford, Connecticut, and places like that because of the traffic and the congestion, so we ultimately chose Madison,
Wisconsin, and I was a house-husband for about six months, which I think worked favorably towards my selection as a police officer in Madison. But when the job opportunity came around, I submitted an application for the Madison Police Department and was ultimately hired in December of 1977.

CB: Okay. And so you worked for the Madison Police Department for a while, correct?
MM: I did.

CB: Can you tell me a little bit about your experiences there?

MM: Well, sure. I was there for twenty-eight years, from 1977 through the end of 2004. I started as a police officer. The training for the Madison Police Department was rigorous. You had to complete a nine-month training academy, not only where you learned what the Madison Police Department’s culture was towards customer focus policing, etcetera, but you learned a lot about Constitutional law, and it wasn’t just the superficial, you know, stuff that, material that police get, in terms of arrests. This went everything from arrests to policing public protest to citizens having the right to express their dissatisfaction with your services and, you know, it was very thorough.

I was a police officer from 1978 until 1987, and at the time, you know, I had to work the standard shifts-- patrol, patrol evenings—since my wife also worked outside the home. I would go to work at eleven o’clock at night and come home at seven. She would leave at seven and come home at four and at least we’d have the overlap hours in the evening for dinner and other things. And then I had an opportunity to go into a part of the department called Special Operations. And Special Operations would go out and handle the policing of the public events. I actually, at the time, there was an event up on the capitol square—Madison was also the capital, too, of Wisconsin. And it was a fundraising event for, at the time—now I know it’s politically incorrect now but it was the Madison Area Retardation Council. And people were coming up in costume and then roller-skating for various lengths to collect money. And, so, our sergeant had us in our full military uniforms, which is what you usually see an officer out in a squad car, but we went up and policed the event like the people were participating in. We
actually wore roller skates and roller-skated with the crowd. And it was a kind of fun event. I can remember that my partner and I found these two guys that were dressed as devils [laughs] and they wanted pictures taken, and so we had pictures taken where we were arresting the devils and it was kind of funny.

But there was also a serious side. There were, you know, attacks in public parks, there were thefts from meters, but in the downtime in the Special Operations section, it afforded one the opportunity to do their own research into emerging best practices of policing. So, I found this program in the early 1980s that was coming out of Albuquerque, New Mexico, by a detective by the name of Greg MacAleese, called Crime Stoppers, and, so, in about 1982, I made a pitch to the department administration to begin a Crime Stopper program. I thought that it was in line with our community policing, with sharing information, with involving citizens and the payment of rewards and other things like that. It was a tough row to kind of make within the Madison Police Department because, in order to get the unsolved cases that I needed, I had to go to the detectives. And the detective philosophy back then was not one of teamwork, was not one of openly sharing information. And, so, it was, you know, really tough to cultivate those relationships with the detectives to the point where they felt comfortable coming in and giving me the information and working with me. By the end of the program, those relationships had developed into the fact that I no longer had to go to them: they were coming to me. And Crime Stoppers remained a very viable program, just as it has here in Boise, for decades.

And, so, after that, I served as the executive expediter, which is basically the chief’s assistant to handle correspondence and media relations, learned a great deal from working with the chief directly—his name was David Couper—and what his expectations were and the responses back to citizens. You know, he was the one who kind of left me with this old maxim that the citizen is not always right, but there’s no profit or sense in proving him wrong. And, so, I always took that attitude into my relationship with citizens: they have the right to express themselves and, you know, we weren’t in argument with them. We listened and if we could change, we changed; if not, we didn’t.
So, after that, in the executive expediter section, I decided to write for promotion, became a sergeant, and was assigned—because I think the lack of no one else wanted it—to what we called the Neighborhood Service Bureau. And the Neighborhood Service Bureau, in 1986, took six to seven police officers who were willing to kind of change the paradigm from being in a patrol car handling calls to being responsible for a small geographic area of the city—often a troubled neighborhood or the business district with thousands of people and a number of issues—and then become kind of the mini police chiefs in those sections. I found that, back then in 1986, because it was new, because people were uncertain of what the expectations were, that change was very threatening to people, that the first seven officers who put in for that assignment were women and minorities. They were willing to take the risk. So, we ended up being very successful and why not? The community gets to meet their police officers and greet them by name and understand them and you build that trust relationship, instead of driving around in a car and not communicating, not conversing with the people that you serve. Very successful, to the point where, in 1987, I wrote for promotion to lieutenant, and spent a little time in the Neighborhood Service Bureau as a lieutenant.

But, then, our chief at the time, David Couper, decided that there needed to be a significant change in the way in which we led the men and women of the department. And in 19—you know, the class before me, 1975, really became the first time that the Madison Police Department began hiring women—other than, in the past, they would hire them in traditional roles, as a police matron, you know, for youth aide services sections and like that. I’m proud to say, today, that over those last, you know, forty years, that the Madison Police Department now counts women—and I’m talking about officers who carry guns—to be about thirty-five percent of their workforce, which, you know, the chief certainly had the vision at the time that police departments need to reflect the communities that they serve.

So, this chief, David Couper, began to become a follower of the movement that was going on in the early ‘80s called total quality management. He
actually went out and met and was trained by W. Edwards Deming, and Deming
had a different way of looking at business and government and, of course, his
renown came from the fact that he worked with the Japanese after World War
Two and reinvented, kind of, their culture and image in the world. A lot of people
remember the stuff that was coming out of Japan in terms of technology, you
know, trinkets and, you know, cheap gadgets and stuff, and Deming came in and
really had that reputation evolve into—I think what it still stands today is that
Japanese continue to make high quality technology products. And, so, Couper had
a vision that he could take that same tenets that Deming was pushing, the Deming
principles, and bring them into government. So, he got the mayor involved; the
mayor at the time was Joe Sensenbrenner. And we began the kind of long journey
into bringing total quality management into the Madison Police Department.

The first step was the development of twelve principles of quality
leadership; they were unique to the Madison Police Department. They were
unique to policing. In fact, most of policing rejected them because it felt that they
were too soft and too squishy-feeling to bring to what was, you know, a pretty
authoritarian profession. And, so, the principles were like, you know, remember
that the best way to improve the quality of the worker service that you perform is
to ask the people who are delivering the service or those receiving it. I mean, I
mean, it’s not rocket scientist. It’s pretty standard thinking. You know, and
another thing was very radical in terms of how we treated the inside of the
organization, but you come to work with an attitude that, as a leader, you’re there
to serve the ninety-five percent of the people who come to work and want to do a
good job and need your support. And then you deal with the five percent fairly
and firmly. Well, you know, most police departments at the time would have
issues internally with officers who would make mistakes either intentionally or by
omission, and, of course, we would deal with large policy manuals, create large
policy manuals for that. We would focus on dealing with the five percent to the
extent that we neglected the ninety-five percent who wanted to do the work. So,
they were kind of the examples of the twelve principles of quality leadership,
were actually divided into three areas, with four tenets under each: systems,
teams, and leaderships. And, of course, policing at the time involved a lot of solitary work in a car. You did not work as teams, so, the team aspect of leadership was very important, too.

So, we brought that program to the Madison Police Department. I was willing to take those early risks. There were a lot of folks who were in the department that said, “You know, this is just another, another novel idea of the chief that will come and go if we just neglect it.” So, we ended up putting in—at the time, we thought it was unique enough that we should study it and share it with the profession. So, we put in for a grant from the National Institute of Justice and they liked the idea and so they provided support to fund this kind of radical change initiative in Madison, Wisconsin. We called it the Experimental Police District.

The department at the time, back in the early ‘80s, mid-‘80s, was like most police departments around the country: you worked out of one centralized location regardless of the size of your community and you were segmented into areas of your responsibility, such as Detectives or Traffic or Patrol, because that was the easiest way to organize. And Patrol was by time of day. There was no focus on working to the best interests of the citizens in a specific area. So, the Experimental Police District was an effort to take one-sixth of the resources in the city and take this small geographic area in a designated part of the city—it happened to be kind of the worst part of the city or perceived worst part of the city, in terms of crime—bring those people together and then apply these new rules of leadership and customer focus.

And, so, some of the unique things that they did is, in most police departments, a chief will designate who his deputy chiefs’ and captains’ responsibilities will be for the next year or so. So, right around this time of year, Chief Bones would be saying, “Okay, this captain’s going to be in Patrol, this captain’s going to be in Detectives, this captain’s going to be in Community Outreach,” and then after that, then lieutenant assignments are made and then sergeants’ assignments are picked by seniority and are made. And then, finally, the police officers get to choose by seniority. So, one of the unique things that
was developed by this employee research group is they wanted to kind of turn that apple upside down. So, the police officers picked first and then the sergeants picked and then the lieutenants were assigned—or, I’m sorry—then the lieutenant and the captain who were going to be working in this Experimental Police District had to apply to the workers that were identified in this district and go through an application process to be their leader, which I don’t think has ever been done in policing up until that time and I’m not sure it’s been done since that time. So, the employees put together a small group. [Laughs] They required a resume, they required an interview, they asked a lot of good questions about staffing, about discipline, about customer focus, about what your vision was, and ultimately I was selected from a group of lieutenants that had put in, to be the lieutenant of the Experimental Police District. The captain had no other competition, so he got it by default.

So, we ended up going down there for about a year, eighteen months, and we did some really creative things. As a young lieutenant, I was really proud of the officers. For instance, we would have a spot that had been traditionally a hotspot for citizen complaints for speeding. It was Monroe Street. And, you know, going in in the morning, that was one of the only ways into the inner city; going out in the afternoon, people were left going to their houses and they would speed through this neighborhood. So, we did a number of different things with the citizens, and one of the remarkable things we did—it was around Thanksgiving time and we thought that maybe we could get the message through if we just had a short conversation with people instead of writing, contacting them, writing a ticket and then going back and giving them the ticket. So, we put together a group with the community from that neighborhood. We ran radar in the traditional way. The officer would call out the vehicle in violation of the speed. We would pull them over. And both the officer and the citizen would then engage the motorist in a short conversation as to why it was important to adhere to the speed limits going through that neighborhood. And it was received very highly by our neighborhood. It was received, I think, very highly by the public, although what it created was, we were the only part of the city that was doing it. The rest of the city were
handing out tickets. So, the question comes up is kind of the fairness and equity issue of police giving warnings in one part of the city and ticketing in the other. But, it was still very unique. We had a great experience.

The police foundation studied the Experimental Police District in terms of what we were trying to do there with the twelve principles of quality leadership and customer focus, and yet at the same time the rest of the department continued on pursuing the same objectives but not in an accelerated pace. And, of course, the police foundation study came back and said, yeah, we had changed the environment: citizens were happier with their officers, they knew them by name, officers were happier and more satisfied working in that type of environment than in the other environments. So, that had led to the department completely decentralizing. So, now they have five or six small work stations, all geographically based, doing the same thing.

And then, after the Experimental Police District--it was short-lived for me—about 1989, 1988, I decided to write for captain and then got promoted to captain and took over one of—well, I’m sorry, went to Patrol as one of three captains that were assigned to decentralize Patrol and go to the districts. Very rewarding. Then, my chief retired in 1993, a new chief came in, he placed me in the personnel and training team, which was one of the best assignments I ever had that prepared me for chief. And it allowed me the opportunity to hire about a hundred and twenty-five police officers and sit through interviews and understand, really, the responses that made for good police officers that reflected the values that you wanted to represent. And then spent I think five years in there and then came out and was assigned to a district, which was very gratifying because that was the system that I had built almost two decades earlier. So, I was the captain of the North District, had an incredible work force there. By that time, the uncertainty had been resolved and police officers were willing to take risks and go to work in those types of environments. And had a great experience in the North District; ultimately got an award from the community for our policing techniques and for our accomplishments. And, yeah, that was about it.
CB: Yeah. Cool. So, how did you end up in Boise, end up working for the Boise Police Department?

MM: Well, kind of interesting. I remember I was the captain of the North District, and chief Williams called me up and said I had visitors coming in from out West that wanted to know about our leadership tenets and community policing. Would you spend time with them? And after spending three or four hours with the group, I remember that they were from Boise, Idaho. One was the mayor, one was the city attorney, and I don’t know who else was there.

CB: Yes.

MM: And, you know, I spent some time with them and provided a workbook on our leadership philosophy and examples and how that related to a new changing and dynamic workforce and forgot about it. Said “thank you” and they went on their way and that was it. I know they talked a little bit about Boise. I was interested. It was, you know, the West, places that that I hadn’t been, and they were explaining their environment.

So, then one day out of the blue, in 2004, and I was looking at retirement, because my son wanted to join the Madison Police Department. He was graduating, and I thought that I’d give him his own space and leave so he wouldn’t have to work under the shadow of me. And then just out of blue there comes a recruitment brochure for the chief of police for Boise, Idaho. It wasn’t addressed to me personally; it was addressed to the Madison Police Department. And [laughs] it made its way to me and I looked at it and was not prepared to retire in early 2005, so, I said, “This looks like an interesting opportunity. I’m open to new things and change.” And submitted my application. And, to my surprise, I ended up responding in writing to six or seven questions that they asked in the written process, got a phone call and said, “Hey, we’d like you to come out and meet the community and interview with our staff,” and came out. I think that there were three or four candidates—maybe five. One of the candidates was the interim chief, Jim Tibbs. One of the candidates was Lee DeVore from Twin Falls; he was the chief down there. One of the candidates was a deputy chief out of St. Paul or Minnesota, who had his PhD. And I think there was another
guy. And, I mean, they really put us through a very intense process. There were meetings with the community, questions and answers. There was kind of a project that was given to candidates about working with the community in the schools. There was interviews with the departments. There were interviews with a representative group from the Police Department and the Commanders Association. And, finally, an interview with the mayor. And, to my surprise, I got a phone call saying, “Hey, you’re one of two finalists. The mayor would like to talk to you. Can you come down to City Hall?” I did. And I think that was kind of the telling moment, because a selection process for the police chief is really kind of a two-way street.

Mayors can select department heads and police chiefs, but you also, as a person looking for a job, have to know it’s the right fit. And I knew the community was the right fit. I had the opportunity to interview with the mayor for about an hour. He asked me a number of questions. I asked him a lot of questions, because I wanted to make sure that fit was right if I was moving eighteen hundred miles and really kind of re-starting a new chapter in my life. I asked him how he would handle disagreement. I felt that that was important. You know, that’s why police chief tenures in the United States are less than three years, because mayors and police chiefs don’t get along. Asked him what his vision was for the city, how he would handle transportation, and later he would tell me it was my questioning of him that impressed him and led to my selection. But I was convinced that, you know, the mayor was genuinely concerned about the city. He was a native here. His family grew up here. His family was involved in politics and law and teaching. And it was just the right fit and, you know, for over ten years, it was a great relationship.

CB: Yeah. Awesome. So, I know that, kind of before you arrived, the Police Department and Boise, it was kind of dealing with some drama from the former police chief. Was that something that was kind of apparent or--?

MM: Yeah, you know, it was a good organization, but I think you’re right. It was characterized by this lingering trouble by the last police chief’s involvement with the mayor, and the mayor had been indicted criminally for some offenses and they
just, you know, they just felt that that was not becoming of what they expected of the police leader. So, it was a good organization, but they wanted to see, they wanted to see that in their top representatives of the department that there was trust, there was a high degree of ethics, and that the police leader that was ultimately chosen could be one that they could work with.

CB: Yeah.

MM: So, yeah, it was, you know, it’s good and bad, I think, in a way. So, you don’t want to come into a good or great organization and be the police chief, because then the chances for improvement are so miniscule that you don’t feel like you make a difference. But, when you come into an organization that has had a troubled past with its leadership but is still a good organization in terms of being accepted by the community in the work that they do, it was much more rewarding and satisfying for me to do that.

CB: Absolutely. So, at the time, you would say that Boise, the Police Department, was accepted and kind of—

MM: You know, I think so. I think that there was a point in, you know, the department had gone through a number of years in the late ‘90s where there was a high number of officer-involved shootings. And I’m not sure that they were—they could have been avoided. You know, you’re dealing with one guy that’s on a bike dealing marijuana and he’s a wanted felon out of Nevada; he gets in a shootout with officers. You got two brothers who get in a shootout on a traffic stop that led to the loss of, the only loss of a Boise police officer in its one-hundred-and-fifty-year history. And you had a couple more incidents that were like that—a high-speed chase into the airport, and a guy who hijacked a car with a citizen in it and then took it downtown and got in a shootout with police. I mean, there were some of the things that I think were unavoidable, and, unfortunately, were attached to the department during that time. And then, in 2001, there was an incident involving a young man by the name of Matthew Jones. As I recall, Matthew had led kind of a troubled teenage life, had some issues that he was dealing with, and one night in December, when the family was out and police were called, when they returned home and this young man had a rifle with a bayonet affixed to it.
The officers were called and then one officer ended up confronting him or seeing him, and the young man charged at the officer with the bayonet and the officer shot him in self-defense and killed the young man. So, that was the type of environment I was coming into in the early years because that happened in mid-December and I took the job January 1st, 2005.
CB: Okay, so, can you tell me a little bit about how you got interested in the ombudsman position, kind of, any of the experiences you had that qualified you for that position, that sort of thing.

PM: But I just have to go back a little bit if I may, in terms of answering the question of what interested me in it. The position of ombudsman came as a result of public outcry, for lack of a better word, in response to those officer-involved shootings. There were editorials being written, letters to the editor, community meetings. There were a couple of groups formed that were calling for establishment of a police commission or a police oversight board. There was a call for the ouster of the then police chief. So, there was tremendous and significant public concern about why, in a very short period of time, there had been so many officer-involved shootings, when in the years before that there hardly were ever any. Was this because the police were encountering terrible armed subjects or was it because the police themselves had changed their tactics? There was just great community concern. People were writing in to the newspaper saying that they were afraid to have their young adult or teenage children go downtown for fear of being shot by the police.

And, so, the Boise City Council and the Mayor’s Office had some town hall meetings, and they sent representatives of the City down to a conference in Oakland, California, held by a new organization called the National Association for the Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement, to learn about what other communities were doing to provide some sort of community oversight of the police. Out of that study group and out of town hall meetings and deliberations by
the Council and the Mayor, the City announced that they were going to create an ombudsman’s position to—it was very sort of general, but to handle complaints against the police and to help to rebuild community trust of the Police Department. So, they embarked on a national search for an ombudsman.

It was a fairly public process. The finalists were brought into Boise and answered questions in a town hall meeting. They were on television, answering questions live. They went through interviews and background checks. And, finally, the City decided to make an offer to a young woman who had recently graduated from law school Back East and had moved, recently moved, to Boise. And she accepted the position and between the time when she accepted the position and when she was scheduled to start, over a period of just a few short days, some news reports came out that she had applied to be a Boise police officer, and then after the last officer-involved shooting, had withdrawn her application. And that this information had not been shared with the public as part of her background. And there were concerns that she had perhaps some sort of bias either for or against the police. There were concerns about why this information had not been shared with the public. And on the day this young woman was supposed to begin to start as Boise’s first ombudsman, she resigned—or indicated that she was not going to take the position.

So, that gets to your question about what interested me. I was not interested in the position up to that point, but was very, very concerned about police-community relations. Those listening to this history should know that I had been a police officer in my youth, in my late teens and early 20s in California in my home town of Menlo Park as well as the neighboring town of Atherton, and I had certainly great regard for and support for police and the necessity of their role in our society, and knew that with a fractured relationship of trust between the police and the community that it was not going to make for a safe city and a peaceful city. And, so, I was very concerned about it, interested in how the City was going to use this ombudsman position, which was a fairly new concept, and when the City announced that it was going to start over again to try and find someone to become the first ombudsman, it was then that I decided that, because
of my background and my concern for this issue and the experiences I had, that perhaps I could offer something to a city I’d grown to love and where my wife and I were raising our children. And, so, that’s when I decided to apply for the position.

CB: All right. So, you said, you used to be a police officer. So, maybe, can you tell me a little bit more about your professional background, so I can kind of know some of the experience that you did have?

PM: Right. So, I began working for my home town police department as a non-sworn employee when I was eighteen. A year later, because California law allowed it at the time, I was sworn in as a fully qualified reserve officer and worked full-time then as a reserve officer for the city in various functions. And when I went to finish my college education at Santa Clara University, I went part-time as a paid reserve officer for the neighboring town of Atherton. I have a bachelor’s degree in business from Santa Clara and went to work for a year with a semi-conductor company in Silicon Valley, in the early years of Silicon Valley. Then I followed an urging and a desire that I had to explore whether I was called to a ministry and spent four years in the seminary.

After discerning that that really wasn’t my calling, I went back and got a master’s degree in counseling psychology and went to work in human resources. So, the bulk of my career before becoming the Boise police ombudsman was in human resources. I worked as a management consultant. I worked as an HR manager and executive for a variety of different companies, which brought us to Boise, and there I was working for the Boise Cascade Corporation. So, you know, when I looked at the need to have someone that could be sensitive to people’s concerns, to listen to all sides, certainly by counseling training and my human resource background came to the fore. My certainly understanding of law enforcement and having worked as a patrol officer and in other roles in a police department would give me some understanding of and regard for the role of law enforcement. And then, finally, certainly as a police officer in a minor way, but then as an HR person, I had conducted administrative or employee investigations into allegations of misconduct of various sorts in companies I’d worked for, and
so I thought I had some investigative background I could bring to the ombudsman position as well.

CB: Okay. So, after the woman stepped down, can you tell me a little bit about the application process and kind of how you came to be the ombudsman?

PM: Certainly. So, I filled out an application, sent it in, don’t remember how many people applied the second time around, but they were winnowed down into about, I believe, ten of us. We then, the ten or so that were semi-finalists, if you were, were interviewed. I recall the interview was in the conference room right there in the Mayor’s Office at Boise City Hall and around the interview table were the mayor’s chief of staff, the human resource manager, somebody from the City Attorney’s office. There were three Council members on the interview panel. One of them was recovering from surgery, I think, and actually was on the phone. The other two were there in person. There was a representative from the police officer’s union. There were a couple of people from the community—community representatives. I think that just about covers it. It was a big panel—pretty intimidating.

CB: Yeah, absolutely.

PM: [Laughs] And, you know, it was a long interview, and after those interviews, then there were background investigations on a smaller number. I don’t know exactly how many number, but after those—so, I had to fill out an extensive, twenty-some-odd page questionnaire in the Idaho State Police—no, I’m sorry, it was an Idaho State Police background questionnaire that they used, but actually the City hired a private investigative firm to do the background investigations. So, I started getting calls from friends and neighbors around the country, wondering what I was in trouble for, because somebody was calling asking a lot of questions about me. [Laughter]

CB: Yeah.

PM: And, so, out of that, three finalists were selected. And three of us then, well, let’s see, we went on a live radio talk show. The first time they’d been live on television. We got downgraded to radio. It was a very popular morning talk program there in Boise at the time. And, so, we were on—took, you know,
questions from the radio hosts as well as call-in questions from the public. There was a live news conference after that that was televised. And there were, I think each one of us had private interviews with the mayor. And then, at the end, I’ll never forget, I was traveling back to Chicago on business with Boise Cascade when I got a call from the Mayor’s Office in Boise indicating that they wanted to explore offering the job with me and talking about issues of pay and benefits and the like and timing. And it was, oh, I guess maybe a couple weeks later that I was introduced to the Council as the mayor’s nominee and, you know, confirmed in the job. I wanted to say, just one little anecdote that I guess are [unclear at 18:07] for these oral histories that I’ll share with you. When my name was released as a finalist, and I think I’m mixing up my memories here, this was the time I was in Chicago, so when my name was released as a finalist, the news media wanted a picture of me and I was out of town. I wasn’t available for them to take a picture. And they tracked us down, or tracked my wife down in our home, so there’s the media showing up at our front door and wondering whether my wife had a picture that they could use to run on the news and in the newspaper. And she had a nice portrait that had been done for me as part of my Rotary membership, done by a local photographer and, so, she had to quickly get ahold of the photographer and get their permission, because it was a copywritten portrait, to get their permission to have that used. So, that’s a—yeah, everyone else had a news photograph and I had a really nice portrait. [Laughter]

CB: Well, that’s nice for you.

PM: There you go. There you go. So, anyway, so that’s kind of how the selection process worked. It lasted a long time. It was, you know, at a certain point became very public, and then, the other anecdote is I remember the mayor did not announce who, of the three finalists, who he’d picked until right at that City Council meeting where he was going to ask them to confirm my appointment. So, I remember being brought into the Mayor’s Office by a back door and waiting, waiting there for that point on the agenda to come up and then walking across into Council Chambers. That was kind of fun.
CB: Wow. Very cool. So, in our previous conversation, you mentioned that one of the ways to talk about the Ombudsman’s Office in Boise was kind of in like various phases. Can you kind of describe that again for me?

PM: Sure, well, I would say there were at least three phases. The first phase was the start-up phase. The second phase was the phase of making it operational. And then the third phase would be the, you know, the, oh—the word I would use to describe that just, you know, just fully operational, I guess, for the lack of a better term.

So, the start-up phase—one of the things that I had spoken with the mayor and the Council president about, before I accepted the position, was, I wanted to make sure that there was sufficient time to set in place clear guidelines for what the ombudsman would do, so that public expectations and law enforcement expectations would be reasonable and could be met. I was very concerned that, you know, a whole lot of anticipated outcomes were being placed on the position that, if not properly managed, would lead to, you know, public dissatisfaction, law enforcement dissatisfaction, and ultimately a failure of this fairly innovative approach. So, it’s important to understand that it was a big career risk. I was hired as an at-will special advisor to the mayor. There was no legislation, there was no real position description, there was nothing to prevent the mayor, six months later, from deciding that, you know, this was a failure and [unclear at 22:26] they need an ombudsman. Or, for expectations not to be met because they really hadn’t been clearly defined.

So, what I asked the mayor and the Council to do was to give me six months between when I began, which was in April of 1999, and when I had to actually begin to start receiving and handling complaints about the Police Department. And in those six months, I researched all the various different ways in the United States and Canada and other parts of the world where various forms of civilian oversight of law enforcement had been tried or were in operation. I held a series of meetings, one on one, small groups, larger groups, throughout Boise, listening to what people in the community, in various groups, those that had advocated for change, those who were supportive of the police, tried to get as
broad an understanding of what all of them wanted, what they hoped would happen, what they were afraid might happen—just to really get an understanding of what public expectations were. I met extensively and continuously with the police command staff as well as the representatives from the police officers’ union. I worked closely with the City Attorney’s Office and even made some site visits—one down to the Bay Area of California, where there were several police oversight, civilian oversight agencies and operations, as well as back to Minnesota. The trips to the Bay Area and to Minneapolis-St. Paul, I brought along the internal affairs lieutenant for the Police Department and the president of the Boise Police Officers’ Union to come with me and for us to experience together and ask questions together and learn about this together.

I also, at the same time, went through the ten-week advanced academy that all new Boise police officers go through. I didn’t go to the state police academy that every police officer has to go through, but I did go through the second advanced academy that, once a new hire for Boise has graduated from the state academy, they then go through additional training in-house at Boise. I went through nearly all of that. There were, with a couple of these trips I had to make and other meetings, I missed a few courses here and there. But, for the most part, I attended probably between three hundred and three hundred and fifty hours of training in that first six months. And that was so that I really had a good, solid basis for what the job and expectations of a Boise police officer were and that [unclear at 26:06] my understanding was current.

So, out of all of that, I, with the help of the City Attorney’s Office, crafted draft legislation for the City Council to consider. It was a city ordinance that established the community ombudsman, which was the title that was adopted; what the authority, what the requirements, how it would operate in broad terms. And that was presented to the Council and was unanimously passed by them. Then, based on—and that was, I think, I started in April, the city ordinance was passed in July, and by September I had a very detailed set of procedures that were based on the ordinance, so it operationalized the broad authority and responsibilities in the ordinance—operationalized those into how actually we
would handle and investigate complaints and do the other duties. Those were in place by the end of August so that, I believe, sometime in September, I can’t remember the actual date, we opened the doors and myself and an administrative assistant were the two employees and began to receive and investigate complaints. So, as you can imagine, that was a busy first few months.

CB: Yeah, absolutely. So, were you guys working—you were working out of City Hall, is that correct?

PM: I was. I think [laughs] my first month or so I was in a closet in the Mayor’s Office.

CB: Oh, no!

PM: It had a phone and a desk—and a chair. And then they found me a conference room down on the first floor, right inside, sort of off the main lobby when you come off of Capitol Boulevard. And a conference room that we turned into—sort of subdivided so it was an office for me and for the administrative assistant. And we were there for—in that conference area—for close to a year. Up on the third floor, there was an area that had been occupied by the City Attorney’s Office previously—was currently, in 1999, unoccupied. And that was renovated and offices for the ombudsman were built up there, right next to the Mayor’s Office. We moved there sometime in 2000.

CB: Okay. So, can you kind of describe to me the various relationships that you made, both formal and informal, with various community groups? Like, I know you talked a lot to people and then, you know, the police union and that kind of thing.

PM: Well, we’re going back a ways, so I’ll try and remember as best I can. I certainly know that, in that first year, I spoke in front of every Rotary Club, Lions Club, Exchange Club, Kiwanis Club. Any sort of civic or service group that had speakers that I could find, I got on their agenda and spoke to them and answered their questions and listened to them. And, you know, it’s a wonderful way to meet people—and people of all walks of life and interests. So, I certainly did that. I met with the people that had organized the two formal groups during 1997 and ‘8 that were calling for establishment of a police commission or a civilian oversight board. I met with them. They were sort of disbanding at that point. You know, an
ombudsman wasn’t what they had wanted, but they certainly were interested in what I was doing and I certainly learned a lot from them. As I said, I met regularly with the union leadership and continued that during my tenure there as the ombudsman. I met regularly with the police chief and his command staff. I met with other law enforcement agencies to understand what my relationship could be with them. I met with—I went to schools, I spoke in front of government classes and high schools in the Boise and Meridian districts, I went to junior high and spoke to social studies classes. I met with school counselors, with principals. Went to Boise State and spoke with criminal justice students there, as well as their student body organization, student body president and the like. I remember early on establishing a working relationship with the woman’s center there on the Boise State campus, because there were concerns that they had about how the Police Department was responding to allegations of sexual assault on campus, which, as you know, continues to be a major problem around the country. Oh, I met with the NAACP, got to know the senior pastor and the congregation at St. Paul’s Baptist Church and always felt welcome there to attend Sunday services. It’s just a great choir, by the way. And actually one of the City Council members, Jerome Mapp, was on the City Council at the time that I was appointed, was a deacon in that church, and, you know, they had concerns about policing and police relations with African-Americans in the community. So, I got to know them and met with them on some regular basis.

I joined a group called the Ada County Human Rights Task Force, which had been established before the ombudsman’s position, as a group that was responding to victims of human rights violations or victims of racial discrimination or hate crimes. There had been, in the ‘90s, kind of concurrent with what was going on in northern Idaho at the same time, some white supremacist activity in the Boise area, and people of color and gays and lesbians were feeling targeted, and this group was set up to provide support to them. And I joined that group as a way of making sure that the Ombudsman’s Office was attuned to and aware of any concerns that people of color or people who felt marginalized in some way or may have issues with law enforcement, that I knew what their issues
were. I think that’s just a—I’m sure I’ve forgotten many people, but that gives you some thumbnail anyway.

CB: Right. A very wide expanse of people.

PM: That was a lot of fun. [Laughs]

CB: Yeah.

PM: And I tried to keep, you know, to keep those relationships alive during the fourteen years I was ombudsman. It was an effort. You know, people, they [unclear at 34:13] something new and something different, and so, try to find a way to stay on people’s agendas and stay in dialog with them. And, really, what you have to say is, “We’re still doing what we’re doing. We’re doing it well. Sometimes that’s a challenge.”

CB: Absolutely. So, can you kind of tell me about how, after you kind of started actually investigating, can you tell me about how you were received by the community, by people in general, and then also by the Police Department?

PM: It was an interesting experience, and it was, in the first year, certainly the first few months but even after we got established into the first year, there continued to be, I would say, significant public interest in how this was going to work and what was going to happen. I will never forget the first, oh, I would say, significant complaint that got any sort of media attention. We were flooded. Let me just back up. The office was flooded with complaints when we turned on the switch and went live, if you will.
(sample begins mid-interview)

CB: Right. Okay. So, okay, so you were present, so the night that Officer Mark Stall was shot, correct?
RW: Yep, yes.
CB: Can you tell me about that?
RW: Sure. So, again, we’d had a series of officer-involved shootings and it was a tense time, but in April of 1997, Officer Bryan Hagler made a traffic stop over on Fairview Avenue and it was behind Q’s Billiards on Fairview. And he stopped a lone mail subject in a vehicle, and I don’t remember what he had stopped him for, but turned out he was a suspended driver and had a history of assault and battery on a police officer and some different things that would be of concern.

And Bryan noticed some ammunition in the glove box when the driver opened his glove box to get his registration out. And so he asked him about that. “I see ammunition, you know. You have a gun?” “No.” “What’s the ammunition for?” “Oh,” he said something about shooting some other time. But he kept asking him, “Do you have any weapons?” and he kept saying, “No.” And so Bryan said he had a funny feeling and ultimately didn’t go back to his car to run records checks and the stuff that you would normally do. He just felt that he needed to stay there and keep an eye on this guy right at this window.

And so he called for an assist and he stayed right there and did his checks with dispatch over his portable radio. And ultimately found out the guy was suspended, and so he decided to arrest him. And as soon as his assist officer got there, he had him get out of the car. And as he got out, as the suspect or the driver got out, he told him to put his hands on top of his head and then release his
fingers. He was going to take control of him and pat him down for weapons, because he was concerned that he may have a weapon based on his interaction. And at that time the guy reached down and he had a little holster sewn in his pocket of his jeans that was holding a gun so it wouldn’t—it was a small gun but it kept it from sliding all the way down his pocket so it was accessible. And he reached down and pulled that gun out and spun and tried to pull away from Bryan and started shooting underneath his left arm at Bryan, and Bryan continued to spin with him and try to gain control of him, but one of the bullets that he fired hit Bryan in the shoulder and came out the center of his back. And they all kind of went down in a—they both went down in a heap and the assist officer was trying to get, you know, where he could do something to help, but Bryan ended up pushing away because he couldn’t control him and the guy was shooting at him and drawing his gun and firing, and they ended up shooting that guy and killing him. And this was April of 1997.

Bryan was pretty seriously injured, but he was able to rehab and come back to work. And just five months later, in September, is when he was back at work and made a stop, traffic stop, on a vehicle downtown, so it was September 20th, 1997, and he and his partner that night, Officer Steve Van Doren, were a two-man unit and that was the first night they’d ever worked together as a two-man unit. Steve was new to the team. He’d been on about a year, so he was a fairly new officer, but he’d only worked on that night shift team, that was his first night. So, they were together for the first time that night. They were getting to know each other and kind of work out who did what, who ran the radio, who ran the computer, who drove, and all that stuff. And Bryan was driving and Steve was the passenger.

But they saw this vehicle go by and it was on the cruise down—downtown, there’s a cruise that was pretty well established and people made a specific route down Main Street, turned on Fifth, went back down Idaho Street, turned on Fourteenth, Fifteenth, or Sixteenth, and back around to Main. I guess it would be Fourteenth or Sixteenth because Fifteenth was a one-way the other way. And they would just loop around and around and around. It was kind of a big deal
back then. It’s making a resurgence now, but for quite a while it fell out of favor. Back then, it was a big deal and these guys were on the cruise and they were, Bryan and Steve, were working the cruise. At 1:20 a.m., they saw this car go by and it just seemed out of place to them. Both the car and the occupants of the car as they saw it go by didn’t appear like the typical folks who would be—you know, young people cruising. So, they saw the car. It looked like it had been hand-painted or painted with a spray can in somebody’s backyard, primer grey. Did not have a front license plate on it. It had an old faded Pennsylvania blue and yellow license plate on the back, and it struck them as being out of place. And, so, they got the beyond car and were going to run it to see if perhaps it was a stolen vehicle or if something came back of, you know, of interest.

And as they were behind it, the vehicle made a lane change without signaling and they then had probable cause to stop it. They didn't stop it because they were trying to get a return from dispatch to find out if it was stolen and had not got that information back yet when all of a sudden that car made an abrupt left turn, again without signaling, into a parking lot that was next to the Ryder’s Bar at Fifteenth and Idaho. That bar no longer exists. It’s been torn down and there’s a construction project going on right now on that lot. But that’s where the suspect vehicle made an abrupt turn and stopped quickly. And, so, Bryan and Steve decided, “Well, we’re going to effect a traffic stop now. We can’t wait.”

So, they turned their overhead lights on, pulled in behind it, and just as they came in behind and stopped, both occupants of the suspect vehicle jumped out of their car and made aggressive movement toward the driver’s side of the police car. So, they came and they were coming at him pretty hard and pretty aggressively and he was giving them commands to get back in their car. Now, to kind of paint a little bit of a mental picture, both of these guys were fairly young—one was twenty-nine, one was twenty-seven—turns out they were brothers, although they didn’t know that at the time. Both dressed in black leather jackets, white T-shirts, and blue jeans and black boots. So, they were dressed virtually identical to each other, and they had long hair, kind of scruffy, some facial hair, but they were fairly rough-looking characters. And they were coming
at the driver’s side, coming towards Bryan, and disregarding his commands
telling them to get back in the car. As Officer Van Doren was the passenger in the
patrol car, he was checking out on the radio, letting dispatch know that they’d
made a traffic stop, and as soon as he finished, he stepped out of the passenger
side of the police car just about the time that both of those guys got to around the
front bumper of the patrol car coming towards the driver’s door. He started to yell
at them, “Get back in your car! Get back in your car!” They stopped for just a
second, did a little double-take, like looking from one officer to another, and it
was almost as if—according to both of those officers—they didn’t realize there
were two officers in the car. And they went, “Oh.” And, so, they hesitated and all
of a sudden decided, “Well, we better back in the car.” So, they turned around and
slowly made their way back to their vehicle and they got in. Both Bryan and Steve
called for an assist unit, independent of each other. Steve had called for an assist
and Bryan didn’t hear him do that. And Bryan then called for an assist. So, it’s
very unusual for a two-officer car to call for an assist because there’s two officers
there on a traffic stop. They can handle whatever they need to do. But they hear
both officers independently call for an assist.

We knew that something was up. So, we as in the other officers in the
downtown core—there were quite a few obviously on a Friday night and Saturday
morning, a lot of officers downtown because it’s busy. I heard that call and went
to respond, and back then we had the analog radios—we didn’t have digital—and
so, if two officers pressed the button at the same time it would just cause a
[transcriber’s note: makes crackling noise], you know, a squelch kind of sound,
and you covered each other. And, so, somebody answered the radio at the same
time I did and I got covered and I went, “Well, whatever. I’ll just go there
anyway.” So, I hadn’t told dispatch that I was en route but I started that direction
and I was only ten blocks away. So, I was at Fifth and Idaho and headed
westbound on Idaho and the traffic stop was at Fifteenth and Idaho. I had a
civilian rider with me. We have a ride-along program. And she was a new Ada
County records clerk, and Ada County required their new records clerks to go on
at least two ride-alongs, I think, at the time, with the City Police Department so
they could have an idea of what happened in the field and therefore do their jobs better when routing reports and dealing with stuff in the records department. So, I had just met that young lady that night because they had called and asked if she could ride with somebody on my team and I ended up taking her. So, we had been out on patrol since about probably 6 p.m. and it was now 1:20 a.m. And we’d processed—I think we arrest a drug driver and we’d been to some different calls for service and made some traffic stops and different things, and, so, she’d been to the jail and seen that process, and I asked her what she wanted to do, and she was like, “I don’t know.” I said, “Well, we’ve been on the Bench all night. Do you want to go downtown and see what it’s like down there?” “Sure.” So, that’s how we ended up downtown and we were there at Fifth and Idaho when this traffic stop happened.

So, we were headed towards that scene, and Officer Dale Rogers was a K-9 handler and he had his adult daughter, Cameo Adams, riding with him. And he actually passed me on Idaho Street headed towards Fifteenth and Idaho [laughs], passed me somewhere in the neighborhood of Eighth or Ninth, and so he got there just a couple of seconds before I did. We both pulled up virtually the same time. And a short time later, Officer Rob Berrier and Mark Stall were in a two-man car and they pulled up. And just a few seconds after that, Officer Gary Wiggins showed up and he was in a one-man unit. So, within just a few seconds of each other, you had the two original officers, me, my civilian ride-along, Dale, his civilian ride-along, Mark, and Rob—a two-man unit—and then Officer Gary Wiggins. So, there were seven officers and five police cars within about a minute of the initial call for assist. And that seemed like overkill because there was only two guys in this car. And, so, Rob and Mark—I think it was Mark that actually said, “Looks like you guys have plenty of people here; we’re going to get out of here.” So, they were moving to leave and we had made a quick plan—I say “we”: Bryan Hagler, Dale Rogers, and I had made a quick plan that we were going to do what we call a high-risk stop and get the occupants of the vehicle out one at a time and bring them back to us, as opposed to us going up and approaching the vehicle. It’s kind of like an ambush situation: if somebody’s waiting to shoot you
and they’re in the vehicle, you don’t want to go up to it. So, it was a way of maintaining better control and being safer. So, Bryan decided to give commands and asked me to be the contact person. When they came back, I would physically contact them and, you know, pat them down for weapons and then find out what the deal was, because they were being fairly, again, belligerent. They were yelling out the window and it was a fairly tense situation. They were definitely not cooperative, as evidenced by the fact that they jumped out and aggressed Bryan at the beginning. And they continued to yell stuff out the window as we were there kind of making our quick plan and deciding how to handle it.

So, this all took place in a very short time, but essentially Bryan gave commands and he was just yelling. He wasn’t using the P.A. on his car or anything because we were fairly close and they could hear just fine. And, so, he said, “Passenger, keep your hands where we can see them. Remain in the vehicle. Driver, keep your hands where we can see them. Step out of the vehicle.” The driver got out and he turned and faced us and, again, wearing a black leather jacket that came down past his waist a few inches. It was open, but his hands were crossed in front of him and he was looking at us, and he just had a look of utter contempt on his face. And he hunched his shoulders a little bit and crossed his hands in front of him and kind of tilted his head back and looked at us and he just looked down his nose and had that look of, “What?” And, so, Bryan was explaining, had explained to him, “This is why we stopped you. You need to signal for your lane change. You didn’t signal. And you need to be cooperative. And you’re not under arrest at this time. And he called him “sir,” very polite—Bryan’s always polite.

And, so, as the guy turned around—or turned to face us—he was standing there with his arms crossed in front of him. Bryan said, “Lift your jacket up and turn around.” And he looked at us and said, “I don’t think so.” And Bryan said again, “Lift your jacket up and turn around.” And the second time he said, “I don’t think so.” And, so, then the rest of us started to chime in and I remember yelling, “Lift your jacket up and turn around.” Somebody else said, “Do what you’re told.” And a third time he said, “I don’t think so.” And then everything
kind of went into slow-motion for me and I guess, I learned afterwards, it’s very, very common in a high-intensity, kind of adrenalin-dump situation that you experience things like auditory exclusion. Your hearing may not be—you may not hear things normally. You may experience tunnel vision. Your sight, your vision, is affected. And I definitely experienced both of those things. But everything went into slow-motion for me. And I had started to move. I left a position of relative cover behind a police car and I started to move out to the left to try to flank this guy, because in my experience—and I thought I was a veteran officer—again, I’d been on less than four years at that time. But, in my experience, every time somebody was a “no” person, somebody who didn’t follow directions or commands or orders, we ended up in a foot pursuit with them. They would always turn and run and we’d have to chase them and tackle them, right? So, I had started to move, thinking I was going to move out to the side so that, if he turned to run, I would cut him off and be able to tackle him without just having to chase him forever.

So, I started to move, but his eyes definitely locked on mine and his attention was on me as I moved over to the left. And, because of the situation, several of us had our guns out of our holsters. My gun was back behind my leg so that they never, they never saw a gun out. But I had it in my hand. And then, as I moved, I started to put it back in my holster and fastened it in because I thought, “I’m going to be in a physical confrontation real quickly. He’s going to turn and run; I’m going to chase him; I’ll tackle him, and then we’ll have to get him handcuffed.” So, I was—that was kind of the plan in my mind, and so I was putting my gun away, thinking that you can’t very well arrest somebody or tackle them or chase them with a gun in your hand. And, so, as my gun’s going away, his eyes were locked on me and he looked at me and then, just as fast as I could even imagine it, even though everything was in slow motion, I saw the quickest fast-draw [laughs] I’ve ever seen in my life. His hand brushed his coat to the side, his right hand came down, brushed his jacket to the side, exposing a nine-millimeter handgun—that was what it turned out to be; obviously, I couldn’t tell that at the time [laughs]—in a black leather holster on his hip. And, he came up
and drew that gun and it came up in my direction, and all I saw was a big, round, looked like a cannon [laughs]—huge, round muzzle of that gun and, again, that was part of the tunnel vision. That’s all I saw was the barrel of that gun, and it looked enormous. And I saw that come up and as it came up and was right in my face—granted, I was twelve to fourteen feet away from him at the time—but it looked like it was right in my face. And then I just saw the end of it blossom with a really pretty bright orange flower, just an orange thing came out of the end of it, and then it just kept doing that, just one orange blossom after another. And I somehow was trying to get my hand to get my gun back out of the holster when my brain had just told it to put it away—in action versus reaction, you’re always slower than somebody else. But I do remember my gun coming up into my hands and I could feel it recoil; I could feel it bucking in my hands, but it wasn’t firing. I couldn’t hear it. There was no bang.

And, so, I remember just being really concerned, like, “What’s going on?” I could feel it but I couldn’t hear it. I could hear what I remember as somebody popping microwave popcorn in the next room over here to my right. It was just a very faint pop-pop-pop-pop-pop-pop-pop-pop-pop-pop-pop-pop-pop-pop-pop-pop-pop-pop-pop, like somebody popping popcorn. That’s weird. And, so, as I’m there and I don’t know how many times my gun recoiled in my hands, but I still couldn’t hear it, and then all of a sudden I felt a shooting, burning sensation, the worst pain I’d ever felt in my life at that point, and it’s like somebody had taken a fireplace poker—one of those things to move the logs around the fireplace—and held it in the coals until it was just glowing red-hot or white-hot and then just rammed it right into my abdomen and it just felt like it seared all the way through.

Turns out it was actually just underneath my gun belt. The bullet actually glanced off my pepper mace holster and went through the corner of that. It was a nine-millimeter full metal jacket hollow-point round. And the leather from my holster filled that hollow area of the bullet up as it went through the leather. A hollow-point bullet is designed to expand. So, when it hits something of substance, that bullet is designed to expand and get bigger. It mushrooms out from the center and it creates a bigger wound cavity, thereby causing greater
disruption, you know, causes somebody to stop doing what they’re doing quicker, if you will. Fortunately, for me, the leather plugged that hole as it went through and caused the bullet not to expand like it was designed. The bullet actually—the jacket of the bullet—kind of fragmented. I have it here. I know this isn’t going to help anything with an audio or an oral history, but, for your purposes, I’ll just show you. This is the actual bullet that went through me. And, so, this is the jacket right there and you can see the sharp edges. And that’s the leather in the end of it. If that had not filled up, then that entire lead core would have expanded and made a bigger bullet or a bigger hole as it went through. So, it didn’t do that and thereby most likely saved my life.

But the bullet went through my lower abdomen, just a little bit on the right-hand side, deflected off that belt so it was kind of at a downward angle as it went through, and it dug a groove in the ball of my right hip socket and then it just went through and penetrated and blew the hip socket itself that the ball rotates in and blew it to pieces. And as it went through that path, it also struck the sciatic nerve, the sciatic nerve being responsible for virtually all of your muscle activity below your waist—your legs especially. So, along with that burning pain going through my abdomen, the bullet shattered my right hip-socket and hit the sciatic nerve, which caused what felt to me like a bolt of lightning went down my right leg and then my right foot just exploded. It felt like it blew up and blew it off. It just felt like it was gone.

And, so, I fell backwards on the pavement and was laying there. It turned out the driver was named Craig Brodrick and he was the one who fired the round that hit me. He fired several rounds, and he was also hit by bullets from my gun—Bryan Hagler and Dale Rogers returned fire on him. He was hit several times. They said he went down to one knee, kind of stumbled for a moment, got back up, and then ran or retreated back around the front of his car. At the same time as this was happening, his brother, Doug, two years younger, jumped out of the passenger side of the suspect vehicle and started firing. He was shooting a Glock Model 23, I believe—it’s a forty-caliber handgun—and he was shooting, they said he was shooting gangster-style, sideways as opposed holding the gun upright.
And he was just, you know, just firing indiscriminately in the area of the other officers that were on his side of the vehicle. So, Rob Berrier, Mark Stall, Gary Wiggins, and Steve Van Doren and then Dale Rogers were kind of all in that area. So, he was firing at them. One of his rounds hit Mark, and Mark was behind a pickup truck in the parking lot fairly close to the suspect vehicle, but Mark probably had the best cover of anyone behind that pickup. But it was just a random fluke, if you will, that that bullet hit him. And it entered right underneath his right armpit, just above his bullet-proof—or bullet-resistant vest, we call them. And, so, it missed his vest by about a half an inch to an inch and went in through his chest cavity, severed his aorta through his heart and exited out of his back and was trapped by the ballistic panel in his vest, between his back and the vest. So, he went down right there. He continued to fight. In fact, when it was eventually over and the firing stopped, Rob Berrier went up to him and kind of picked his head up off the ground. He had pulled him to a position of cover behind the wheel of the pickup before the shooting had stopped. And then he went through the process of, he kept saying, “Mark,” you know, “give me your gun. It’s all right. Give me your gun. He had to pry Mark’s gun out of his hand.” But Mark lost consciousness shortly thereafter and basically never regained it. So, I was on one side of the vehicle, laying on the pavement, and Mark was on the other side of the vehicle behind a pickup and he was laying on the pavement.

And I just remember, as I went down, I fell backwards on my back on the pavement, and I’m looking around and I’m holding my gun trying to figure out where this guy went that was just in front of me, shooting at me, and he’d disappeared and I couldn’t find him. And, so, it was dark, it was relatively cold that night. It was September but we’d been having relatively warm nights. I think it was pretty cold that night, I remember, and I’m laying there, looking for him and moving my gun as I’m scanning the parking lot. But all I could see were feet, and somewhere off in the distance to my right I could see a body laying on the ground, but to this day I don’t know if that body was Doug Brodrick, Craig Brodrick, or Mark Stall.
It turns out, as Doug had jumped out of the car and fired that fatal round at Mark and several other rounds, the officers on that side returned fire at him. He was hit about ten times and collapsed right there in the doorway of the passenger side of his car. Craig, the driver, after exchanging fire with me and Bryan and Dale, was hit numerous times. He ran back around the front of his car and over to the other side, where his brother had just collapsed on the pavement. And he resumed the gunfight with those officers on that side and firing at the officers. They returned fire and it was just an amazing amount of bullets going back and forth. In the end, there were, I believe, over seventy rounds fired in that entire exchange.

Craig was hit numerous times over on the passenger side of the vehicle, after he ran around there. The officers over there—I didn’t see this because it was obviously not in my line of vision, but they said he fell down on the pavement face forward and he’d been hit a lot and fell forward. There was a break in the firing. They said he raised his head up and raised his gun up again, and there was another volley of fire, several rounds. He was hit again, slumped forward on the pavement, and then they described it as just a really bad scene from a horror movie where the bad guy won’t die. And he raised his head again and moved to raise his gun up one more time. By that time, Dale Rogers had moved up to where he was just standing over the trunk of the suspect vehicle, and so he was pretty close and Craig was right there on the ground, and as he raised up one last time, Dale shot him again. And this time that bullet went in his head, kind of went through his eye, I think, and that ended the fight.

In the end, at the autopsy, there were, I think, twenty-six bullet holes found in Craig, and several of those were fatal. There was a bullet in his heart. There was a bullet in his liver. There was a bullet in his spine. He had numerous fatal rounds fired, but he was still fighting even though he was fatally wounded numerous times. He was still a threat. He was still fighting. He was still shooting, still attempting to bring his gun back up and shoot more when the very last round was fired. And I just think about that, how misguided, how unrealistic our entire population is because we watch TV and movies. We are trained to know if you
get shot, you’re done for, you’re out. And, you know, from the time I was a little kid watching Westerns, because I’m a John Wayne fan and my dad always watched Westerns, and in the Westerns, you know, somebody got shot and it blew them out of the street or it blew them through the batwing doors of the saloon or through the window. You got shot, it knocked you over and you were down and out. And in reality, that’s not even close.

There is no shooting somebody and knocking them through a window. It doesn’t happen, and it just depends on your frame of mind as to how long you can fight. Eventually, bullet wounds will force you to succumb, but there’s a long time and a long window of time where you can be a deadly threat, even if you’re fatally wounded, and that experience really brought that home to me because Craig Brodrick was not on drugs—the autopsy results showed there was no methamphetamine, there’s no PCP, there were no illegal substances whatsoever in his body. He had a blood alcohol content of about a point zero three, so maybe a couple of beers—not to the level to be impaired, certainly not by driving standards. And this was not a drug-fueled rage.

This was—they hated the police and they hated authority, they hated the government, and it was apparent, in bad experience as well as stuff that they found out later—detectives later served a search warrant on their apartment and found some bomb-making materials, found some anti-government literature, found some stuff that just painted the picture that they had an extreme distrust and a hatred of authority and law enforcement in general and government in general.

So, that’s what fueled their fight and their desire, for whatever reason, we don’t know, because we didn’t get to interview them, but they decided to go down in a blaze of glory and it was every intent in their hearts to kill cops and probably as many cops as they could do in the fight. So, a couple of things that go to mindset of them: Craig had two different knives tucked down his sock, so one on one side of his leg and one on the other side. One was a triangular-bladed stabbing knife, very sharp-edged, but it was designed to open up a very large wound cavity, so you would stab somebody straight-on with that knife; had no purpose other than that. It’s not like you could cut something with it. It was a three-sided
blade. And on the other side of his leg—it may have been on his other leg, I guess—was a plastic throwing knife, probably twelve inches long. And when I say plastic, I mean a polymer that would defeat a metal detector but is still very sharp, two-sided or two-edged, both sides sharp. And that was down one sock as well. He had a handcuff key sewn into a little pouch in the back of his belt, so that if he were handcuffed behind his back he could access the key in the little pouch behind his back and presumably undo the handcuffs and escape. So, they were planning a confrontation with law enforcement. There was no doubt by both their actions as well as their preparations. There was a nylon webbier duty belt in the trunk of their car. There were numerous other weapons in the vehicle. There were weapons back at the house—or the apartment that they lived in. So, these guys were obviously familiar with weapons and, you know, outdoor enthusiast-survivalist mentality, kind of a militia mentality, if you will, of anti-government leanings. So, that was, in a nutshell, the events of that night. Now, the aftermath, I don’t know if you want to go into that or not [laughs]—

CB: [Unclear at 43:01] Yeah, if you want to.

RW: So, after that happened, obviously I’m on one side of the car and Bryan Hagler came up to me and started questioning me and, “Where are you hit?” and “You’re going to be okay” or reassuring me, and Rob Berrier was doing the same with Mark and basically trying to comfort him and figure out where he was wounded. They said there was no blood coming out; it was all pooling in the back of his—I think it was all coming out the exit wound in his back and it was pooling in his chest cavity. But, as far as the entrance wound, they found the wound but it was not bleeding. And, so, he had lost consciousness but it was basically a wait for paramedics, and it was an eternity. It was probably four-plus minutes before paramedics got there. And they ended up scooping Mark up, working on him, and taking him directly to St. Al’s.

The second ambulance on scene took me. And I had a little disagreement with them because the only thing I could do is hold my right leg up like this and hold it up towards my chest, and it hurt so bad, and they kept wanting to straighten it out and strap me down on a board, and I kept fighting and saying,
“No, no, no!” They’d cut off all of—they cut off my uniform and removed my vest and everything, so I’m literally laying on the pavement completely naked and I was freezing to death and they were trying to strap me to this hard, cold, white board and strap my leg down. And eventually we compromised and I was able to keep my leg up and they ran the little strap or seatbelt underneath my right leg but over my left leg.

And, so, they got me on the stretcher and into the ambulance and we were on our way to the hospital, and I just, I kept feeling like I couldn’t ease the pain. So, I was just—I mean, I was really just struggling and shifting around and moving and I couldn’t find a position that I could ease the pain, but it felt like I was laying on a rock. There was something back there behind me on the board. I knew I was on a hard board, but I just kept fidgeting and moving and they just kept trying to say, you know, “Relax and calm down and we’re sorry we can’t give you anything for the pain but the doctor has to see you and you have to be clear,” you know.

And so they couldn’t give me anything but we got to the hospital, and at that time the trauma room at St. Alphonsus was a—basically, there were two beds in one room. And, so, Mark was in one bed and I was next to him in the other bed, on the left hand side of him. And he probably had fifteen doctors and nurses around him, working on him, and I had one male nurse named Orville [sp? 45:44] that I knew well from being in the ER [laughs]. So, Orville and I were talking and I was kind of cracking jokes with him and saying, you know, “Don’t I rate somebody better than you?” or “Why do I only get one nurse?” [laughter], but it was a very, obviously a somber situation, because I’m looking over there and they’re working on Mark and they ended up splitting his chest open and they were pumping his heart by hand and it was, obviously it was a mess, there was blood everywhere, and his head was turned towards me and I could see his eyes were kind of rolled back in his head, but he had his eyes open and I could just say his face every once in a while. Somebody would move and I would be able to look and see his face as they were doing all this stuff him and working on him, and I
just knew, “That does not look good.” I just looked over there and, like, “He’s not going to make it.” I knew it.

But I didn’t have any feeling associated with that. I remember just, it was the weirdest thing, because I’m looking over there, I’m like, “Hmm, sucks to be him,” which sounds horrible, but at the time I just had—I was completely devoid of any feeling about the whole thing, and I just looked at him and went, “He’s going to die.” And eventually he did. They ended up calling time of death for him, and I don’t remember what that was, but, in the meantime, I’m laying there and continuing to fidget and move around and I thought maybe I was laying on one of the belt buckles or the buckles from the straps, and so I’m fishing around back there, and I’d probably been in the ER for fifteen or twenty minutes. And, obviously, Mark was more seriously injured than I was. They weren’t really worried about me as much right then [laughs], because I was awake and alert and talking.

But I kept fishing around, and finally I reached back to try to figure out what I was laying on because I felt like I was laying on a rock, and turns out this bullet [laughs] had broken the skin of the exit area in back of my lower back or my butt and it was under the skin but it hadn’t come out, and that’s what I was laying on, kept feeling, and so I eventually reached back and it came out. I popped it out. It was kind of like, gross terminology, but like popping a zit, and it came out in my hand and I pulled it out, so I got this bullet in my hand, I go, “Oh. That feels better.” [Laughs] And, so, I ended up giving it to one of the officers that was standing in the trauma room there with me and I said, made some comment about, “You might want to book this into evidence or something.” And, so, this is the actual evidence envelope here. Says, “Removed at 02:05 hours,” so it was about thirty minutes or so after the shooting. But they did. They booked it into evidence and I got it back about four years later when the case was all resolved and there was a lawsuit filed by the parents of Craig and Doug Brodrick. F. Lee Bailey, who had been part of O.J. Simpson’s dream team of lawyers, he came to town, made a big splash, and they made a lot of comments in the media about how this, you know, horrible situation was a bunch of trigger-happy Boise cops and that we had
executed Craig and Doug Brodrick for no reason and they were not armed and that we had planted the guns on them and that I was the ringleader of the group and that I was just showing off for my girlfriend because I was having an affair with this girl that I was having on the ride-along. And this is stuff that was all, you know, front-page news obviously. The allegations that they made and said that: their theory of the crime was that we had decided to just kill these guys because we stopped them and, you know, they were from out of town, so we decided to kill them; we shot them multiple times and then we planted guns on them so it would make it look believable, and then they said Mark Stall was the only officer of the seven that were there that had a conscience because he, immediately afterwards, felt guilty and told us, “I can’t live with myself—I’m going to have to tell the truth about what happened,” and that we murdered these guys, and so, we ended up killing Mark to keep the secret, and so, Mark was killed by officers and that I shot myself to make it look more believable; I took one to, you know, make it look like a shootout, but I shot myself in a non-important area, you know, that wouldn’t be life-threatening; I shot myself in the hip. Which [laughs], I mean, if it wasn’t so outrageous and maddening, it would be comical, because it was so stupid and so far from the truth.

But, ultimately, they filed their lawsuit. They demanded twenty million dollars in damages for wrongful death for their sons. And I truly think maybe the parents, I mean, they had to know what their sons were like, because they raised them that—you know, they’d only been in Boise a few months. Craig, at twenty-nine years old, had never left home before. This was his first move out of his parents’ home, when he moved to Boise. And after he was kind of established here in Boise, had an apartment and a job, his brother, who was twenty-seven, had never left home before either, moved out to be with him and they moved to Boise together and they were here just a few months before this happened. But, so, I guess I don’t hold a lot of animosity towards the Brodrick parents, other than they had to know what their sons were like. They had to know. They were armed. They had to know of their mentality. They lived with them for twenty-seven and twenty-nine years, respectively. So, I know that they knew better, but I also think
that they were sold a bill of goods by F. Lee Bailey and the other attorneys and their private investigator, who came up with this whole theory from the inside of the Ada County jail, because he was a criminal. He was in jail awarding charges, or awaiting trial, on an armed robbery charge, so, you know, that was their star private investigator that had fed them all this stuff. So, anyway, in the end, the lawsuit did drag out for about three-and-a-half years. We went through depositions and interrogatories and motion hearings and you name it. All the court processes—over three-and-a-half years—as this lawsuit kind of chugged through the legal system. And, ultimately, when the parents ran out of money, the lawyers who had been paid to do all this stuff for three-and-a-half years, I believe, took the entire life savings of the Brodrick family back in Pennsylvania. And once we finally were able to depose their three star witnesses that they came up with, that no detectives were able to find, no police officers were able to find, the FBI came in and reviewed and investigated, they were never able to find these people, but they came up with three star witnesses who saw, quote on quote, what happened. And when we finally deposed those witnesses, their stories didn’t match each other, let alone any of the physical evidence on the scene or anything else. And it was obvious that they had no clue and were, you know, they had not been anywhere near the scene. And, so, once that became apparent, after the depositions, F. Lee Bailey bowed out and said, “I’m all done here,” and left and withdrew as counsel of record. The other two attorneys, from Idaho, I think were from northern Idaho—Coeur d’Alene somewhere and I think there was one from Spokane—they eventually all bowed out of the lawsuit and excused themselves. And, so, the Brodrick parents were left with nothing. They were like, “But, but, but—.” And, so, they tried to go forward, tried to convince the judge. He gave them months and months to find a new lawyer. They couldn’t find anybody that would take the case because there was no case. And ultimately they tried to go on their own and represent themselves, and the judge said, “This is way too complicated.” Eventually, he said, “You’ve got thirty more days if you can’t come up with an attorney; then we’re dismissing it.” So, in the end, three-and-a-half years afterwards, the lawsuit was finally dismissed with prejudice, meaning
they could not refile. It was done. So, it was a long legal battle but it was just kind of a mess that we were dragged through.

So, not only that, but, you know, Mark dying and his wife, Cheryl, and his two daughters, Janelle and Julia, they were three and six years old at the time, lost their husband, lost their father. And it was just a devastating time for everyone involved, but especially for Mark’s family, for Cheryl’s family, but it created a bond among them and the Police Department, the officers that were here. Mark’s dad and mom come up every year and they attend the memorial service out at POST and, you know, we’ve become very good friends with them and there have been a lot of really good things that have happened out of Mark’s sacrifice and losing his life. But very far-reaching, very impactful on a lot of people—well, not only those that were there but dispatchers, I mean, you name it. This community was rocked by that event.

And, going to Mark’s funeral, I was able to attend—the paramedics came to the hospital and took me. I was still in the hospital but they promised the doctor they’d take care of me [laughs] and convinced him that I could go. And they took me in the ambulance to the funeral and then out to the gravesite service. And that funeral procession stretched from Dry Creek Cemetery all the way to Boise State University. The people were getting there before the last car pulled out of the parking lot. So, it was huge and people lined the streets to pay respect. Hands over their hearts, or waving. I remember sitting up in the ambulance just to look out the window for a minute going down State Street, out by Glenwood, and there were people on both sides of the road just as far as you could see, there were people. And it was amazing to watch and see.

But the community really seemed to take a turn, I guess, at that point. The vocal naysayers were still present. We ended up with a police ombudsman after that and, you know, there were people calling for civilian oversight of the Police Department, and that didn’t really stop, but I think there was a different feeling in the community and, by and large, the majority of the community said, “Enough’s enough. This is a bunch of crap and it’s got to stop.” People are, you know—people had been shooting at us and that kind of stuff in all those other officer-
involved shootings, but no officers were killed. But now we had an officer killed. And I think it brought clarity to people’s minds about, you know, “This is real and maybe it’s not just Boise cops being trigger happy.” So, at least that was the sense that I had at the time. So, I don’t base that on any empirical evidence [laughs]; I just base it on anecdotal evidence and a feeling, I guess, but—

Anyway—the other parts, I think, I guess, would be purely kind of my perspective of what happened in the aftermath and different things I experienced, and I don’t know that that’s necessarily what you’re looking for, but—

CB: If you want to talk about it—
RW: Okay.
CB: Yeah, I mean, I’m interested, but—
RW: Okay.
CB: It’s up to you.
RW: Whatever you—whatever you think, but I know I was in the hospital for about seven days afterwards, recovering, and then I’d had exploratory surgery where they kind of opened me up from the middle of my chest all the way down to the groin area, and they’d looked in and tried to figure out where the bullet had gone and if it caused any damage to vital organs and all that stuff.

So, I went through that exploratory surgery, obviously emergency surgery, that night, and my wife was able to get there before then. And, so, she was there before I went into surgery. But, ultimately, they found that the bullet had traveled a path—the doctor was explaining this to me a couple of days later, up in the ICU. He came up and he brought a model of a pelvic girdle and was showing me where the bullet went. And he squeezed his fingers together and there was literally no space between his thumb and his forefinger and he said, “That bullet came about that far from your femoral artery.” And, he said, “I don’t know how it traveled the path it did without severing that artery, and if it would have, you would have bled to death before you ever got to the hospital. You would have been done.”

And, so, when I look at that bullet and how it didn’t expand and I remember the doctor holding his fingers together, he said, “You were millimeters, literally millimeters, from severing your femoral artery with that bullet.” And, he
said, “I don’t know how it happened.” But I just think if that bullet had expanded like it was designed—if it hadn’t hit my belt first, if it hadn’t filled up with leather—I probably would be dead. It was that close. So, that’s a sobering thought, you know. But I feel very fortunate to have survived and to live and to be, you know, able to return to work and do all the stuff that I’ve been able to do since then.
EXHIBITION PROPOSALS

The following proposals have been prepared using example forms utilized by real museums.22 These proposals represent the first introduction to the respective historical/community institutions regarding the presentation of such an exhibition. That being the case, these proposals are simply summaries and require much more extensive work before any such exhibition would be ready for assembly and visitation. Due to the time constraints that applied to this project, such detailed proposals have not yet been prepared. Each of the proposals is prefaced by some background information on the possible location, including details on the physical space and visitation.
City Hall Exhibition

This exhibition would be divided into two parts, directed at two different audiences. The larger portion of the exhibition would be located at Boise City Hall in downtown Boise. On the third floor of Boise’s City Hall, located across from the Mayor’s office, is a built-in display case with locking glass doors and adjustable glass shelves. The Boise City Department of Arts & History maintains this exhibition space.

Every two to three months, staff of that department selects a different Boise-related theme and prepares a new exhibition. This process includes writing exhibition labels, which undergo editing from other members of the Arts & History staff, selecting photographs, and finding artifacts to express the selected theme. The current exhibition is on the history of the Ustick townsite in southwest Boise. Previous exhibition topics include the 20th Anniversary of the Arts & History grant program, Remarkable Women of Idaho, Art in Boise, and the James Castle House and His Art.

The second half of the exhibition would be located at City Hall West. This exhibition space at this location is a small set of built in shelves. Currently, an array of random artifacts occupies the shelves, including a hat, an old walkie talkie, a police sign, and a house plant.
EXHIBITION CONTENT

Proposed Title: “Community as a Constant: A Recent History of the Boise Police Department”

Originating Organization: Boise Department of Arts & History

Purposed Exhibition Dates: September 2017 to December 2017

Curator(s): Chelsee Boehm, Annie Murphy (assistant), Brandi Burns (editor), Amy Fackler (editor)

Exhibition Description:

- Exhibition Goals: The goal of this exhibition is two-fold. The exhibition at Boise City Hall would be directed toward citizens, while the exhibition at City Hall West would be geared toward law enforcement officials. With this in mind, the goal of the Boise City Hall exhibit would be to teach Boise citizens about the work of the Boise police department, how it has changed in recent years, and the personal experiences of Boise police officers. The goal of the City Hall West exhibition will be to provide the citizen viewpoint on how the departments changes in the last twenty years have effected life in Boise.

- Exhibition Content: Due to the limited amount of space at both exhibition locations, it is likely that much of the content would be visual with brief captions. Ideally, an interactive website or online component would be prepared so that those visiting the small exhibitions can visit the page online to gather more information. The large cabinet on the third floor of City Hall would allow the presentation of several artifacts. The Arts & History Department has several relevant artifacts in their collections. Since the exhibition space at City Hall West is just wall shelves, it is unlikely that artifacts would be put on display, since they would have zero protection.

- Target Audience: The target audience of the exhibition at Boise City Hall would primarily be City of Boise employees and any Boise citizens who happen to pass through the third floor. The target audience at City Hall West would be employees and sworn officers of the Boise Police Department.

- Key Themes, Messages, or Educational Content: Key themes of the exhibition at City Hall would be; Community Policing, History of the Boise Police Department, and police officers as people. The key theme of the City Hall West exhibition would be citizen’s experience with police.

Potential Collaborators and Artifact Lenders: The Boise City Department of Arts & History would provide any artifacts featured in the City Hall exhibit. The Boise Police Department would provide photographs and other visual documentation for both the City Hall and City Hall West exhibitions.
PROPOSED PUBLIC PROGRAMING

Public Programing: To encourage further involvement with the information provided in each part of the exhibition, it would be most helpful if a website, or a similar type of online component were prepared. If funding could be found to produce a small publication, such as a short book or pamphlet, this might also be helpful.

Briefly explain concepts or goals for the above programs: The limited shelf space, as well as the time allotted for each exhibition on the third floor of Boise City Hall requires that there be some sort of other component to provide more information.

EXHIBITION BUDGET

Typically, it does not cost more than $10 to print the labels and photographs required for the third-floor exhibition space at City Hall. Based upon this, it is unlikely that printing costs for the City Hall West exhibition would exceed $10.

Figure 1: Display Space at City Hall West

The exhibition space in the lobby of City Hall West, located near the reception desk. The diagram on the right represents a cross section of the shelves. The dotted lines represent the glass shelves, which cannot be adjusted.
Figure 2: Display Cabinet on Third Floor of City Hall.

Diagram on the left is the third-floor exhibition space. Diagram on the right is a cross section of the display case. The dotted lines represent the adjustable glass shelves.
Old Idaho State Penitentiary Historic Site

The Idaho State Historical Society maintain the old Idaho State Penitentiary site off Warm Springs Avenue in southeast Boise. Last year, the Old Pen had approximately 64,000 visitors. The site includes multiple buildings and many permanent exhibitions. At several locations at the site, there are also temporary exhibitions, though this has not been a regularly planned occurrence.

Visitors Services Coordinator, Amber Beierle has offered two locations for the possible presentation of this exhibit. The first is located in the Administration Building at the Idaho Pen site. This room, pictured in the diagram below, is the permanent site for a video that plays regularly for visitors to the site. The room is filled with chairs and a large projector screen to fit this purpose. The allotted space for any exhibition is small, at the back of the room. To fit the space, the exhibition would have to primarily be posters or other content hung from the wall. This room is ideal for the inclusion of any artifacts because it is temperature controlled. The second location is known as the Trusty Dorm. This small building provides a much larger space for a possible exhibition, however, the building is not temperature controlled, and thus no historical artifacts could be used.

If actually produced, the exhibition on this oral history project on the Boise Police Department would ideally include some sort of audio or listening component. There are several ways to do this. First, some sort of listening device could be provided on site. For example, a small listening stations with individual pairs of headphones or there could be some sort of audio projection that plays the audio recordings out into the entire room. Each of these techniques has certain pros and cons, and the final source of audio cannot
be determined without some sense of a budget. As of the writing of this proposal, there are no available funds to produce an actual exhibition.

EXHIBITION CONTENT

Proposed Title: “Community as a Constant: A Recent History of the Boise Police Department”

Originating Organization: Boise Department of Arts & History

Purposed Exhibition Dates: January 2018-April 2018

Curator(s): Chelsee Boehm

Exhibition Description:

- Exhibition Goals: The goal of this exhibition is to educate visitors on the recent history of the Boise Police Department, specifically how the department has transitioned into community policing techniques. In teaching visitors about community policing methods and the relationships that the Boise Police Department has created with citizens of the city, the goal is to help people gain an appreciation, or at least an understanding, of the work that the members of the Boise Police Department do. In a perfect world, such an understanding would lead to further dialogue between the citizens of Boise and the officers of the BPD.

- Exhibition Content: The exhibition would be broken up into several parts. The various parts would likely include a brief history of the Boise Police Department before the time period covered in the project, a timeline of events between 1990-2014, a “hall” or list of significant individuals and how they effected the city and the Boise Police Department, and a historical analysis to help visitors understand and digest all the information that they have just read.

- Target Audience: The target audience of the exhibition at the Old Idaho State Penitentiary would be citizens of Boise, including those who are interested in the history of the city and law enforcement themes.

- Key Themes, Messages, or Educational Content: The key themes of the exhibition would be community policing, law enforcement, and community. One of the most significant messages that should be conveyed to visitors is that members of Boise’s law enforcement community, despite their roles and responsibilities, are human beings. It is easy to forget that the officers in a uniform are just people.

Potential Collaborators and Artifact Lenders: Boise City Department of Arts & History has a few artifacts related to the time period studied by the Boise Police Department oral history project. These items would be loaned to the Idaho State Historical Society, in the care of the Old Idaho State Penitentiary. The Boise Police Department would be a primary source of photographs and other visual documentation related to the project.
PROPOSED PUBLIC PROGRAMING

Public Programing: Ideally, a website or some sort of interactive web component would be produced to complement the exhibition at the Old Idaho State Pen. The online portion could contain snippets of the oral history interviews, as well as providing more in-depth information on the history of the department, the specific time period that was researched, and the nature of the Boise Police Department oral history project itself.

Briefly explain concepts or goals for the above programs: As previously mentioned, it is important for the audience at the museum, or those who visit the online component, to realize that members of the Boise Police Department, and those who work in law enforcement across the nation, are simply human beings. Along with this, it is important for visitors to understand what limitations law enforcement officials face and how they should be held accountable to the communities that they serve. It is also exceedingly important that the recent history of the Boise Police Department be placed into the context of current events, i.e. issues of police brutality and and events such as those that occurred in Ferguson, Missouri.

Possible speakers: If willing, it would be great to have one or more of the individuals who were interviewed in the oral history project speak at the opening of the exhibition. However, depending on the location of the exhibition, this might be difficult.

EXHIBITION BUDGET

The costs of the exhibition would include printing of exhibition labels, interpretive text, and any relevant images. Depending on the quality of these printings, the anticipated cost for this is approximately $200.

If an audio component could be included, the price range is expansive. Some techniques can cost as little as $250, while others can reach over $1000.
Figure 3: Room in the Administrative Building at the Idaho Old Penitentiary

This is the current layout of the prospective room. The space available for the display of
the exhibition is that behind the chairs at the back of the room.

Figure 4: Trusty Dorn at the Idaho Old Penitentiary
The Idaho Black History Museum

The Idaho Black History Museum is housed inside a historic church that was relocated to Julia Davis Park. The exhibition space is a large, open room. Currently, the museum has several permanent exhibitions that are held by tri-fold wooden structures, as well as a few glass exhibition cases. Director of the Idaho Black History Museum, Phillip Thompson has endorsed the presentation of this exhibition at the location.
EXHIBITION CONTENT

Proposed Title: Community as a Constant: A Recent History of the Boise Police Department

Originating Organization: Boise Department of Arts & History

Purposed Exhibition Dates: April 2018 - August 2018

Curator(s): Chelsee Boehm

Exhibition Description:

- **Exhibition Goals**: The goal of this exhibition is to educate visitors on the recent history of the Boise Police Department, the techniques of community policing, and how the story of the Boise Police Department fits into current trends in American policing.

- **Exhibition Content**: The exhibition would contain several different parts. Ideally this would include; 1. A brief history of the Boise Police Department and the city of Boise before 1990, 2. An explanation of community policing and its practice, 3. A timeline of events – such as officer-involved shootings, the appointment of the community ombudsman, etc. – and how they effected the BPD and Boise citizens 4.

- **Target Audience**: The target audience of the exhibition at the Idaho Black History museum would be members of the Boise community, primarily those who care about history and ongoing issues with law enforcement.

- **Key Themes, Messages, or Educational Content**: The key themes of the exhibition would be community policing, law enforcement, and community. One of the most significant messages that should be conveyed to visitors is that members of Boise’s law enforcement community, despite their roles and responsibilities, are human beings. It is easy to forget that the officers in a uniform are just people.

Potential Collaborators and Artifact Lenders: Boise City Department of Arts & History has a few artifacts related to the time period studied by the Boise Police Department oral history project. These items would be loaned to the Idaho Black History Museum, according to the organizations processes. The Boise Police Department would be a primary source of photographs and other visual documentation related to the project.

PROPOSED PUBLIC PROGRAMING

Public Programing

Briefly explain concepts or goals for the above programs

Possible speaker: Cherie Buckner-Webb of the Idaho State Legislature, William “Bill” Bones of the Boise Police Department, Rabbi Daniel Fink, or Jill Gill of the Boise State University History Department. Each of these speakers could provide specific information on the current and historic relationships between members of society and law enforcement officials.
EXHIBITION BUDGET

The costs of the exhibition would include printing of exhibition labels, interpretive text, and any relevant images. Depending on the quality of these printings, the anticipated cost for this is approximately $200.

Stands or exhibition pedestals would have to be purchased, rented, borrowed, or constructed.

If an audio component could be included, the price range is expansive. Some techniques can cost as little as $250, while others can reach over $1000.
Figure 5: Idaho Black History Museum

This is the current layout of the exhibition space inside the Idaho Black History Museum.
23 Internal report from Amber Beierle to author, January 17, 2017.
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Figure 6: The exhibition space at City Hall West, located in the main lobby across from the reception desk.
Figure 7: The exhibition space on the third floor of Boise City Hall, across from the Mayor’s office.
Figure 8: A view of the proposed exhibition space in the Administrative Building at the Old Idaho State Penitentiary. Note the current exhibition content hung on the wall.
Figure 9: Another view of the exhibition space inside the Administrative Building at the Idaho State Penitentiary, note the current exhibition content hanging on the wall.
Figure 10: Another view of the exhibition space inside the Administrative Building at the Idaho State Penitentiary. If presented here, the exhibition would share the room with a video presentation that is played on loop during the Penitentiary’s visiting hours.
Figure 11: Interior of the Trusty Dorm, taken from the entrance of the building. On the left side of the building are “comic foregrounds,” or painted wooden images with round cut-outs for visitors to stick their faces in.
Figure 12: The east wall of the Trusty Dorm. Mugshots of various Idaho State Penitentiary prisoners are currently hang along the wall. This wall would be used to hang any exhibition materials.
Figure 13: Interior of the Trusty Dorm, taken from the back of the building. On the right side of the image are "comic foregrounds," or painted wooden images with round cut-outs for visitors to stick their faces in. On the left side of the image is the current photograph exhibition.
Figure 14: On the right are the wooden tri-fold structures that hold the permanent exhibitions inside the Idaho Black History Museum.
Figure 15: On the right is a glass display case for permeant exhibition artifacts at the Idaho Black History Museum. There are two of these display cases inside the main exhibition space.
Figure 16: A view of the main exhibition space inside the Idaho Black History Museum, taken from the front entrance. On the right are the permanent exhibitions. On the left is a temporary exhibition on arrest rates in Ada County.
Figure 17: A view of the main exhibition space inside the Idaho Black History Museum, taken from the center of the room. On the left are the permanent exhibitions. On the right is a temporary exhibition on arrest rates in Ada County.