

Risk Management Solutions

A QUARTERLY NEWSLETTER OF THE ALABAMA MUNICIPAL INSURANCE CORPORATION AND THE MUNICIPAL WORKERS COMPENSATION FUND, INC.

SPRING 2004

K-9 Units: Municipal Liability Issues

By: Lorelei A. Lein, League Counsel, ALM

he use of dogs in law enforcement has a long history. We have all seen the spiked collared dog popular in cartoons. These caricatures are actually based on dogs used in ancient Greece and Persia that were often equipped with harnesses with sharp spikes. Such dogs were typically sent in advance of an attack by mounted soldiers in an effort to injure cavalry mounts. In the Middle-Ages, dogs wore armor and were trained to nip at the legs of opposing knights' mounts and the phrase "dogs of war" was born.

One of the first police canine programs in the United States began in

New York City at the beginning of the 20th century. However, it would be some time before the use of police dogs would be widespread in America despite the fact that their use was quite popular in Europe. Today there are hundreds of police agencies in the United States utilizing canine units for drug detection, crowd control, suspect apprehension, and officer protection.

As with any police activity involving the potential "use of force," the use of dogs in law enforcement raises issues of civil liability. Plaintiffs will typically claim the excessive use of force resulting from a dog bite and the unconstitutionality of the policies utilized within a police department with regard to canine units. While very few plaintiffs have succeeded in obtaining any significant damage awards, adequate training, supervision, and documentation can greatly minimize any liability.

There are two types of policies followed by police departments utilizing police dogs: "find and bite" polices and "find and bark" policies. Under a find and bite policy, a dog is trained to search for a suspect and is allowed to bite the suspect upon location. The dog is trained to

release the suspect upon an "out!" command, or to release the suspect once the suspect ceases to resist. As expected, the biggest criticism of find and bite policies is that the suspect is usually bitten.

While similar to the find and bite method, in the find and bark method a dog is trained to hold or circle a suspect and to maintain a constant bark until the suspect is secured by officers. The dog is not trained to engage a suspect unless the handler commands, the suspect fights with the dog, or the suspect takes aggressive action toward the handler.

Critics of find and bite policies advocate for the nation-wide use of find and bark training. However, the find and bark approach requires a

superior canine and immediate supervision by the handler. Many trainers assert that find and bark trained dogs are unpredictable when they locate a suspect after an aggressive search or encounter. The Los Angeles Police Department, considered a leader in canine police programs, gave up its find and bark policy largely based on studies which showed an inability to stop the dog from attacking in a find and bark situation.

Although there have been attempts to declare find and bite policies unconstitutional, no court has ever held such. While this is true, the simple fact remains, lawsuits don't happen unless a dog bites. However, the mere

fact that a police canine bites a suspect does not always expose a department to civil liability.

The main issues of litigation for canine units include the failure to properly train and supervise; canines as deadly force; and the failure to properly warn a suspect that a canine is going to be deployed.

With regard to negligent training, in *Kerr v. City of West Palm Beach*, 875 F.2d 1546 (11th Cir. 1989), one of the leading cases on canine liability, the Eleventh Circuit Court concluded that police dogs must be subject to continual rigorous training in law enforcement techniques. Such training ensures that the dogs will continue to respond with alacrity to the commands of their handlers. Without such training, the dogs' responsiveness to their handlers' commands deteriorates, resulting in more frequent and more serious injuries to apprehended suspects.

The policy followed by the City of West Palm Beach allowed the use of police dogs to apprehend suspected felons and those suspected of "serious misdemeanors". The

suspected of serious inisdemeanors. The failure of the policy to define what constitutes a "serious misdemeanor" was one of the primary concerns expressed by the court. The policy left the decision entirely up to the discretion of the officer handling a police dog and as a result, police dogs were being used to apprehend prostitutes, drunks, and petty thieves without any regard for the degree of threat posed to the apprehending officer. The officers displayed stars on the sides of their patrol cars indicating the number of bites their dogs had given and scrapbooks were maintained with photos of suspects and wounds. Several instances of dogs failing to release on command were documented but no remedial training had followed.



Leslie Hines of the Demopolis Police Department with "Jenny"

continued next page

K-9 Units

On the issue of negligent supervision, the court in the *Kerr* case concluded that supervisors failed to adequately supervise the performance of members of the canine unit to ensure that both misbehaving dogs and officers exhibiting bad judgment in the use of canine force received corrective training. Supervision applies to all supervisors and includes supervision of standards; training, testing, and evaluation to those standards; appointment, entrustment, and retention of both the dog and handler; deployment and the use of canine force.

The *Kerr* case, which did find liability on the part of the city, the police chief, and the individual officers involved, provides two very valuable lessons for canine units. First, misdemeanor suspects who pose no threat should not be apprehended by police dogs. Second, canine programs must be adequately supported with training resources, both in the initial selection of dogs and handlers and in continued in-service training. Many states are fortunate to have qualified training staff and facilities available to police officers through their Peace Officers Standards & Training (POST) divisions. While there are several private training resources available to police departments and officers in Alabama, POST has no training available for Alabama law enforcement nor do they have any regulations or standards required to operate a canine unit.

In many cases, plaintiff's attorneys have attempted to have the use of police canines classified as deadly force. To date, no federal court has ruled that police canines are deadly force and there are numerous cases specifically holding that the use of police dogs does not amount to deadly force. Rather than resulting in deadly force, one court has determined that the use of police dogs may actually prevent the use of deadly force. In *Robinette v. Barnes*, 854 F.2d 909 (6th Cir. 1988), one of the few cases involving an actual death as a result of the use of a police dog, the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals stated:

Instead of generally causing deadly force to be used to apprehend criminals, we believe that these dogs can often help prevent officers from having to resort to, or be subjected to such force ... The use of dogs can make it more likely that the officers can apprehend suspects without the risks attendant to the use of firearms in the darkness, thus, frequently enhancing the safety of the officers, bystanders and the suspect.

Id. at 914.

In addition to the issue of deadly force, there have been several cases where the suspect claims he did not receive any sort of warning that a dog was about to be deployed. Some courts have held that a warning must be given prior to using a dog as a potential use of force. The Fourth Circuit found it clearly established that it is objectively unreasonable for a police officer to fail to give a verbal warning before releasing a police dog to seize someone. Vathekan v. Prince Georges' County, 154 F.3d 173 (4th Cir. 1998). Vathekan involved the release of a police dog into a house where the dog found, bit, and seriously injured a sleeping woman. In an earlier Fourth Circuit case, Kopf v. Wing, 942 F.2d 265 (4th Cir. 191), the court concluded that releasing a police dog without warning, into an extremely narrow passage between a shed and a fence, where the suspects were essentially trapped, could be deemed objectively unreasonable. *Id. at 268-69*. However, at least one Circuit has held an officer who failed to warn a suspect that a dog was going to be deployed was entitled to qualified immunity because the "duty to warn" was not clearly established by constitutional law. See Kuha v. City of Minnetonka 328 F.3d 427 (8th Cir. 2003).

Other areas of litigation include the repeated applications of force, inadequate report writing, post bite interviews, and accidental bites. With regard to accidental bites, it is key that they be settled immediately. The definition of an accidental bite is biting a person that was not intended to be bit, or simply put, biting the wrong person. You can do everything right and still have an accidental bite.

continued from cover

One effective technique for dealing with accidental bites is to establish an instant settlement procedure. The effectiveness of such a settlement and liability release depends on three elements. First, a supervisor must have immediate access to funds up to a predetermined amount for a cash settlement, and an ability to charge emergency medical bills. Second, the agency's legal advisor must have a written settlement agreement prepared in fill-in-the-blank format. Third, the agency must settle with the bite victim promptly, before legal action is taken. This type of quick settlement may significantly reduce the cost of an accidental bite and save administrators and political officials from public relations headaches.

Virtually all trial and appellate court opinions addressing liability for caninerelated injuries address the issue of verbal control of the dog by the handler. The necessary degree of control can only be achieved and maintained by regular training. Handlers must train under the circumstances they and their dogs are likely to encounter. Non-handler officers should also be trained in containment and canine techniques so that they will be prepared to support the canine deployment without interfering and potentially causing injury.

Some states offer liability protection for all political entities with police canine programs. Under Utah Code Ann. section 18-1-1, no agency will be liable for an injury caused by a police canine if the canine is trained as a police service dog and the injury occurs in the course of a reasonable apprehension, arrest, search for a suspect or crowd control. Alabama does not have any statutory liability protection specific to police entities with canine programs.

Agencies that wish to maintain a police canine program must be prepared to pay the cost. Such costs include training, training, training, the initial modification of a patrol vehicle, home kennel facilities, harnesses and leads, food, regular grooming and veterinary care, and, did we mention, training. Further, canine programs involve investments of a great deal of time for the handlers for ongoing care and training.

Finally, it is vital that departments utilizing canine units keep meticulous records. At a minimum, the following records should be maintained:

- Selection criteria and basic training of handler and canine
- In-service training
- Validity tests for narcotics detection
- Patrol officer containment training
- Deployments and apprehensions
- Bites, including accidental bites and any corrective actions
- Supervisory inspection of training and deployment
- Awards and certifications
- Public relations appearances

In conclusion, police departments beginning or maintaining a canine program can significantly reduce their department's liability relating to the program. Such departments should commit to training for the dogs and officers involved, just as firearms qualification and familiarity; use of force; and emergency vehicle operations require significant training commitments. Document the selection and training process and maintain complete records, taking care to create successful public relations at the same time. Consult with departmental legal counsel to draft policies that steer canine activities away from known liabilities. When the accidental bite occurs, be prepared to make it a legal and practical success for the citizen and the police department. Canine programs can be cost-effective and nearly liability-free with proper planning, documentation and supervision. For more information, please visit www.policek9.com.

Municipal Reserve Police Officers

By: Roger Owens, Police Safety Consultant,
AMIC and MWCF

everal times each month I am called by elected officials, city clerks, police chiefs or police officers inquiring about the use of reserve police officers. While I can make a case for or against the use of municipal police officers, I don't usually recommend them because of the liability issues associated with their use. There is also a safety factor that needs to be considered. Two police officers making a traffic stop or answering a call is usually safer than when there is only one officer. Also, most reserve police officers work without compensation, which helps our municipalities when extra manpower is needed.

I do recommend that if a municipality is going to use reserve police officers that the city or town review and follow the State Law (11-43-210) on the use of Municipal Reserve Law Enforcement Officers. Each police department should also write a departmental policy on the appointment and use of their reserve police officers. The written policy should cover *all* the rules that reserve officers and on-duty certified officers are required to follow when a reserve officer is on duty. Some of the important parts of the law are as follows:

- Applicant must be a least 19 years old, of good moral character and reputation
- Never been convicted of a felony or a misdemeanor involving force, violence or moral turpitude
- Must consent to a background search and fingerprinting
- Reserve officers have no powers of arrest unless he/she has completed the training requirements as set out in article 3, chapter 21, Title 36 code of Alabama
- Must be under the direct control and supervision of a certified law enforcement officer at all times (may help with traffic or crowd control without direct supervision when a certified officer has supervisory control that would be considered within reasonable limits)
- Reserve officers can not carry a firearm unless he/she obtains a County-issued firearm permit and the appointing authority approves the use of the firearm

I also recommend that if firearms are allowed, the reserve police officer be required to qualify with the firearm before he or she is allowed to carry the firearm. As with certified police officers, reserve police officers should be required to qualify with their firearm each year and the same number of times as their certified police counterparts. A municipality should *never* allow a reserve officer to carry a firearm until he or she has been given a *documented* class on the use of force (both deadly and non-deadly).

Reserve police officers should be selected using the same criteria used to hire a regular police officer. A thorough background investigation should be completed. Following the investigation, if there is anything found that would keep the person from being hired for a regular police officer's position – or if there is any doubt as to the person making a good reserve police officer – the person should not be appointed. If problems arise with the reserve officer following his or her appointment, the reserve officer should be dismissed immediately.

Reserve officers are only as good as their training. Each department should train their reserve officers as to what they can and cannot do; what they should and should not do; and what's expected of them on and off of the job. When a person volunteers to be a reserve police officer for the right reasons (not just to carry a badge and gun) and is trained properly, he or she is usually successful and provides a great deal of help to the police department served.

Risk Management Awards for 2003

Instituting risk management and loss control activities by the members of the Municipal Workers Compensation Fund (MWCF) and the Alabama Municipal Insurance Corporation (AMIC) are considered to be proactive steps that benefit not only the member's loss ratio but the overall success of the MWCF and AMIC insurance programs. Not only are employee, property and liability losses minimized, but – most importantly – employees and citizens reap the rewards of a safer workplace and community.

In recognition of the efforts and successes of our members, the Board of Directors of the MWCF and AMIC approved the establishment of a Risk Management Award during 2002. It was determined that an award program would be developed based on the loss ratios for the member's prior year. For those members of both the MWCF and AMIC programs, the loss ratios would be combined and divided by two to reflect the overall loss ratio.

Four levels of awards are being presented to acknowledge the efforts and accomplishments of those members in the areas of Risk Management for the year 2003. Members are eligible to receive the Presidents Award once every five years and the Gold, Silver and Bronze annually.

- ALM President's Award Top 5% for 5 years
- Gold Award Loss Ratio below 5%
- Silver Award Loss Ratio of 5% to 20%
- Bronze Award Loss Ratio of 20% to 40%

Awards were mailed to the recipients along with a press release. Recipients of these awards are being acknowledged in this issue of the 2004 *Risk Management Solutions* newsletter and at the League Convention.

Defining Moment

STATUTORY COVERAGE: Generally refers to insurance coverage mandated by law. This normally only applies to Workers Compensation insurance and is the minimum amount of coverage as set out by Alabama State law. By using the term "statutory" instead of specifying the terms of the coverage in a policy, should the law change, coverage will automatically reflect the change. Therefore, the policy will not have to be rewritten to reflect the new law.

2003 Risk Management Awards

ALM President's Awards (Top 5% for 5 years)

Alabama League of Municipalities Aliceville Housing Authority Ashland, Goodwater-Lineville Solid Waste Disposal Authority

Bayou La Batre

Brent

Brewton Housing Authority

Brookside

Center Point

East Central Alabama Gas District

Fairview Forkland

Fort Deposit Water Works & Sewer

Goodwater Waterworks & Sewer Hamilton Water & Sewer

Hartford

Heflin Housing Authority

Linden Utilities

Luverne

Marion Housing Authority Marshall County Gas District

Millport

Nauvoo Waterworks

Odenville Utilities

Oneonta Utilities

Pell City Housing Authority

Pickensville

Rainbow City Utilities Board Russellville Electric Board Russellville Waterworks & Sewer South Central Alabama Regional

Housing Authority

Susan Moore

Tarrant Housing Authority Valley Housing Authority

Vernon

Wilcox County Gas

Winfield Waterworks & Sewer

Gold Awards (Loss ratio below 5%)

Abbeville Housing Authority Addison

Alabama Municipal Election Authority

Alabama-Tombigbee Regional

Commission

Aliceville Housing Authority Aliceville Water & Sewer Andalusia Housing Authority

Anderson

Anniston Housing Authority Arab Housing Authority Arab Water Works Board

Ardmore Ariton

Asbury Water Board

Ashland

Ashland Water & Sewer Board Ashland, Goodwater-Lineville Solid

Waste Disposal Authority

Ashville Athens

Athens Housing Authority Auburn Water Board

Autauga/Prattville Library

Autaugaville Baileyton

Bay Minette Housing Authority Bear Creek Development Authority

Bear Creek Water Works Board

Beatrice

Belk

Benton

Berry

Berry Gas Board

Birmingham Regional Planning Commission General Fund

Blountsville

Blountsville Housing Authority Blountsville Utility Board

Boaz Water & Sewer Board

Boligee

Boston Housing Authority

Brent

Brent Housing Authority

Brent Utilities

Brewton Housing Authority Bridgeport Housing Authority

Bridgeport Utilities

Brilliant Brookside Brookwood

Brundidge Housing Authority

Butler Utilities

Calera Housing Authority Calera Waterworks

Camp Hill Utilities

Carbon Hill Housing Authority

Castleberry Center Point

Central Alabama Regional Planning

Commission

Centre Waterworks & Sewer

Centreville Water Works & Sewer Board

Chatom Chelsea

Chickasaw Housing Authority Childersburg Housing Authority Clanton Housing Authority

Clay Clayton

Clayton Housing Authority Clayton Water & Sewer

Coaling Coffee Springs

Coffeeville Coffeeville Waterworks

Coker Collinsville Colony Columbia

Columbiana Housing Authority

Coosada

Cordova Housing Authority Cordova Water & Gas Board

Cottonwood

Cottonwood Housing Authority

County Line Cowarts Crossville

Crossville Water Board Cullman Utilities

Dadeville Housing Authority Daleville Housing Authority

Dauphin Island Deatsville

Decatur Housing Authority Decatur Municipal Utility Board Decatur Personnel Board

Demopolis

Demopolis Housing Authority

Dodae City

Dora Waterworks & Gas Board

Double Springs Waterworks Board

Dozier Dutton

East Brewton

East Brewton Waterworks & Sewer

East Central Alabama Gas District East Geneva Co. Senior Citizens

Committee

Eclectic

Eclectic Water & Sewer

Elba Housing Authority

Elba Water & Electric Board

Elberta **Elkmont** Elmore

Elmore Water Authority

Enterprise Housing Authority **Evergreen Housing Authority**

Faunsdale

Fayette Housing Authority

Five Points Flomaton

Florala Housing Authority Florala Water & Sewer Board

Foley Housing Authority Fort Payne Housing Authority

Frisco City Gainesville Geiger

Georgiana Housing Authority

Geraldine Gilbertown Gilbertown Utilities Glencoe Water & Sewer

Glenwood Goldville Goodwater

Goodwater Housing Authority Goodwater Waterworks & Sewer

Gordo Housing Authority Gordo Water Board

Gordon Goshen

Greene County Ambulance Service Greensboro Housing Authority

Greensboro Utility Board Grove Hill Memorial Hospital Guin Housing Authority

Guntersville Housing Authority Gurley

Hackleburg Housing Authority Haleyville Housing Authority Hamilton Water & Sewer Harpersville Water Board

Hartselle Housing Authority

Hartselle Utilities Headland Housing Authority

Heath Heflin Housing Authority Heflin Water & Sewer

Helena Helena Utilities Board

Highland Lake

Hillsboro Hobson City Housing Authority

Hodges

Hokes Bluff Water Board

Indian Springs Jackson's Gap

Jasper Housing Authority

Jemison Kansas Kennedy Killen Kinsev Kinston

Lamar County Gas District

Langston

Lawrence-Colbert Counties Gas Board

Leeds Housing Authority

Leesburg Linden

Linden Housing Authority

Linden Utilities

Lineville

Lineville Water & Sewer

Lisman Littleville Livingston Loachapoka Louisville Lowndesboro

Luverne Housing Authority

Malvern Maplesville

Maplesville Water Works & Gas

Board

Marion Housing Authority Marshall County Gas District

McIntosh Mentone

Midland City Housing Authority

Midway Millport

Millport Housing Authority

Millry Montevallo Water & Sewer

Mooresville Moulton Housing Authority

Moulton Water & Sewer Board Moundville

Muscle Shoals Electric Board

Myrtlewood Nauvoo

Nauvoo Waterworks

Nectar New Brockton Housing Authority

Newbern **Newton Housing Authority**

Newton Water & Sewer

Newville North Courtland

Northeast Alabama Water & Sewer

Notasulga Oak Grove Odenville Utilities

Oneonta Housing Authority Oneonta Utilities

Orange Beach Water & Sewer

Board Owens Cross Roads Ozark Housing Authority

Opp Housing Authority

Paint Rock

Parrish Housing Authority Pell City Housing Authority Phil Campbell Housing Authority

Phil Campbell Water & Sewer Board Pickens County Gas

Pickensville

Piedmont Housing Authority

Piedmont Waterworks & Sewer Pike Road Pinckard Pine Apple Pine Hill Pisgah Pleasant Grove Pleasant Groves

Pollard

Prattville Housing Authority Prattville Solid Waste Authority

Prattville Waterworks

Ragland

Ragland Housing Authority Ragland Waterworks & Gas Rainbow City Utilities Board Red Bay Housing Authority Red Bay Water & Gas

Reece City Reform

Reform Housing Authority Reform Water & Sewer Board

Rehobeth

Repton

Ridgeville Roanoke Housing Authority

Rockford

Rockford Gas Board Rockford Waterworks

Rogersville Waterworks & Sewer

Russellville Electric Board Russellville Gas Board Russellville Housing Authority Russellville Waterworks & Sewer

Rutledge Saint Florian Samson

Samson Housing Authority Sardis City Waterworks Board Sheffield Housing Authority

Silverhill Sipsey Skyline

Slocomb Housing Authority

Smiths Station

Snead

South Central Alabama Development Commission/Senior Aides Division South Central Alabama Regional

Housing Authority Southside Springville

Steele Waterworks Board Stevenson Housing Authority Storm Water Management

Sulligent Housing Authority Sumiton Gas Board

Sumiton Water Board

Summerdale Susan Moore Sweet Water

Sweet Water Water Works Sylacauga Housing Authority

Sylvan Springs Sylvania

Tallassee Housing Authority Tarrant Housing Authority Thomaston Water & Gas

Thomasville Waterworks & Sewer

Town Creek Trafford

Triana Housing Authority
Troy Board of Education
Trussville Utilities Board

Tuscumbia Utilities Department

Tuskegee Utilities Union Grove Utilities Uniontown Valley Head

Valley Head Housing Authority Valley Head Water Works Board Valley Housing Authority

Vernon

Vincent Housing Authority Vincent Water & Sewer

Vredenburgh Waterloo

Wedowee Water, Sewer & Gas Board West Alabama Regional Commission West Etowah Co. Water Authority

Wilcox County Gas

Wilsonville Wilton

Wilton Water & Gas

Winfield Housing Authority Winfield Waterworks & Sewer Winston County Industrial Develop-

ment Authority Woodland Woodville York

Silver Awards (Loss ratio of 5% to 20%)

Abbeville Water & Sewer

Adamsville

Alabama League of Municipalities

Alabaster

Albertville Utility Board

Alexander City

Alexander City Housing Authority

Allgood Andalusia

Andalusia Board Of Education

Anniston Water Board

Ashville Water & Sewer Board

Athens Utilities

Attalla

Bay Minette

Bay Minette Utilities Bayou La Batre

Bayou La Batre Water & Sewer

Berry Housing Authority Birmingham Airport Authority Birmingham Parking Authority Birmingham Regional Planning

Commission/Senior Aide

Boaz

Boaz Gas Board

Brantley Brundidge Carrolton Cherokee

Cherokee Waterworks & Gas

Board Chickasaw Clanton

Clarke-Mobile County Gas District

Cordova Courtland Dadeville

Dauphin Island Water

Dekalb-Cherokee Counties Gas

District

Dothan Housing Authority

Double Springs

East Alabama Regional Planning

& Development Commission Eufaula

Eufaula Housing Authority

Fayette Water Works Board

Fort Payne Fultondale Gas Board

Geneva Georgiana

Georgiana Water & Sewer

Good Hope

Graysville Water & Sewer Board

Grove Hill

Guntersville Electric Board

Haleyville

Hamilton Housing Authority

Harpersville Hayden Henagar

Huntsville Housing Authority

Jacksonville Lafayette Leeds Level Plains Luverne Madison Millbrook

Mobile Airport Authority Mobile Water & Sewer

Montgomery Housing Authority

Montgomery Transit

Moulton

Mount Vernon

Mulga Muscle Sho

Muscle Shoals Utilities

New Brockton

North Central Alabama Regional

Odenville

Ohatchee

Opelika Housing Authority Opelika Waterworks Board

Opp Utilities Pelham

Phenix City Housing Authority

Piedmont Priceville

Prichard Housing Authority

Rainbow City Red Bay Red Level Riverside

Roanoke Utility Board

Satsuma Scottsboro Scottsboro Housing Authority

Section

Section Silas

South Alabama Utilities

Steele Sulligent

Tarrant Electric Department

Toxev

Troy Housing Authority

Tuscaloosa Housing Authority Tuscaloosa Parking & Transit

Authority Vincent Weaver Webb

West Jefferson Wetumpka

Wetumpka Water & Sewer

Winfield

Bronze Awards (Loss ratio of 20% to 40%)

Aliceville

Andalusia Rescue Squad, Inc.

Anniston

Anniston Express

Arab Auburn Bessemer Branchville

Brewton Centre

Chickasaw Utilities

Childersburg
Citronelle
Columbiana
Creola
Cullman

Cullman-Jefferson Counties Gas

Cullman-Je
District
Daleville
Daphne
Dora
Douglas
Elba
Eldridge
Enterprise
Falkville

Foley Gadsden Gardendale

Graysville Guin Water & Sewer Board

Guntersville

Hackleburg

Haleyville Water & Sewer Board

Hamilton

Hammondville Hartford

Heflin Hurtsboro Irondale

Kimberly Lexington Lipscomb Locust Fork

Midland City Monroeville

Monroeville Housing Authority

Montevallo

Mulga Waterworks & Utility Board

Napier Field New Hope New Site Newton Northport Opp

Orange Beach Phenix City Phil Campbell Prattville

Prattville
Riviera Utilities
Roanoke
Rogersville
Saraland
Sheffield Utilities

Southeast Alabama Gas Southeast Alabama Regional Planning & Development

Commission

Southside Waterworks Board Tarrant

Thomaston
Top of Alabama Regional Council of

Governments Troy

Tuscaloosa Tuscumbia

USS Alabama Battleship Commission Warrior

Wedowee

SkidCar Schedule

 Tuscaloosa April 20 - 30, 2004 Fayette May 4 - 14, 2004 Homewood June 8 -18, 2004 Jacksonville July 13 - 23, 2004 • Decatur August 10 - 20, 2004 September 14 - 24, 2004 Gardendale • Hoover October 19 - 29, 2004 November 9 - 19, 2004 • Citronelle December 7 - 17, 2004 Montgomery

For additional information, contact the Loss Control Division at 334-262-2566.



Popular Safety Videos for the Spring Season

- Fleas, Ticks and other Parasites (1.004)
- Right-of-Way Mowing Safety (5.032)
- Wheelbarrows (4.045)
- Tractor Safety (5.045)
- Lyme Disease: Danger in the Grass (7.026)

To check-out a safety video, simply call, FAX, or e-mail your request to Rachel Wagner at:

334-262-2566; rachelw@alalm.org;
or FAX at 334-263-0200.

EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES LAW HOTLINE 1-800-864-5324

Through a toll-free Employment Practices Law Hotline, members can be in direct contact with an attorney specializing in employment-related issues. When faced with a potential employment situation, the hotline provides a nocost, 30 minute consultation.



publication wit your staff and For more information, call: 334-262-2566.



PERMIT NO. 340

CHYNCE SEKNICE KEÓNEZLED

ALABAMA LEAGUE OF MUNICIPALITIES
P.O. BOX 1270 • 535 ADAMS AVE.
MONTGOMERY, AL 36102



Montgomery, AL