

**City of Cincinnati  
Independent Monitor's  
Twelfth Quarterly Report**

**January 15, 2006**

Quarterly Report regarding compliance with and implementation of the Memorandum of Agreement between the United States Department of Justice and the City of Cincinnati and the Cincinnati Police Department, and the Collaborative Agreement between the Plaintiffs, the Fraternal Order of Police and the City of Cincinnati

Saul A. Green  
Monitor

Richard B. Jerome  
Deputy Monitor

**[www.cincinnati-monitor.org](http://www.cincinnati-monitor.org)**

## **INDEPENDENT MONITOR TEAM**

Saul Green  
Independent Monitor

Richard Jerome  
Deputy Monitor

Joseph Brann

Rana Sampson

Nancy McPherson

John Williams

Timothy Longo

David McDonald

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>PAGE</b>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	1
CHAPTER ONE. INTRODUCTION.....	7
CHAPTER TWO. MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT .....	9
I. General Policies .....	9
A. Mental Health Response Team .....	9
B. Foot Pursuits.....	10
II. Use of Force.....	11
A. General Policies .....	12
B. Chemical Spray .....	14
C. Canines .....	16
D. Beanbag Shotguns .....	18
III. Incident Documentation, Investigation .....	18
A. Documentation .....	18
B. Investigation.....	21
C. Review of Critical Firearms .....	23
IV. Citizen Complaint Process.....	24
A. Openness of Complaint Process .....	24
B. Investigation of Complaints.....	26
C. Adjudication of Complaints.....	29
D. Investigations by the CCA.....	30
V. Management and Supervision .....	32
A. Risk Management .....	32
B. Audit Procedures .....	36
C. Video Cameras .....	38
D. Police Communications Section .....	39
E. Discipline Matrix .....	40
VI. Training.....	41

A.	Use of Force - Management Oversight and Curriculum .....	41
B.	Handling Citizen Complaints .....	42
C.	Leadership/Command Accountability .....	43
D.	Canine Training.....	43
E.	Scenario Based Training .....	44
F.	Training Based on Review of Civil Lawsuits ....	44
G.	Orientation to the MOA .....	45
H.	FTO Program.....	45
I.	Firearms Training.....	46
	CHAPTER THREE. COLLABORATIVE AGREEMENT .....	47
I.	Implementation of CPOP .....	47
II.	Evaluation Protocol.....	81
III.	Pointing Firearms Complaints .....	88
IV.	Fair, Equitable and Courteous Treatment .....	88
A.	Data Collection and Analysis .....	89
B.	Training and Dissemination of Information .....	92
C.	Professional Conduct.....	93
V.	Citizen Complaint Authority.....	94
A.	Establishment of CCA and CCA Board .....	94
B.	Executive Director and Staff .....	95
C.	CCA Investigations and Findings .....	95
	CHARTS OF MOA AND CA COMPLIANCE.....	98
	APPENDIX.....	119

**CITY OF CINCINNATI  
INDEPENDENT MONITOR'S TWELFTH  
QUARTERLY REPORT**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This is the Twelfth Report of the Independent Monitor under the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the City of Cincinnati and the United States Department of Justice (DOJ), and the Collaborative Agreement (CA) among the City of Cincinnati, the Plaintiff class, and the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP). The period covered is from July 1, 2005 through September 30, 2005, though we also review more recent activities from October 1, 2005 to December 31, 2005.

This report details the implementation of and level of compliance with the MOA and the CA. The MOA calls for police reforms in the areas of police use of force, citizen complaints, risk management, and training. The CA calls for the implementation of Community Problem-Oriented Policing (CPOP), mutual accountability and evaluation, bias-free policing and the establishment of the Citizen Complaint Authority (CCA).

**MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT**

**General Policies (MHRT Team and Foot Pursuits)**

The CPD Police Academy, in partnership with mental health professionals, trained an additional 28 officers in September 2005 in responding to incidents involving persons who are mentally ill. This brings the number of trained MHRT officers to 198. These officers continue to be available and dispatched to respond to incidents involving mentally ill persons. The CPD is in compliance with these MOA provisions. We also determined that the CPD is in compliance with the foot pursuit provisions of the MOA.

**Use of Force**

The use-of-force statistics for the third quarter of 2005 continue to reflect the substitution of the Taser for other kinds of use of force. There were 166 Taser deployments in this quarter. The number of chemical sprays, physical force and takedowns have significantly decreased since the first quarter of 2004, while the number of Taser deployments appears to have increased slightly in the last two quarters. The Monitor found that the Taser deployments and other use-of-force incidents reviewed this quarter were in compliance with the use-of-force model required by the MOA. The Monitor also found the CPD to be in compliance with the MOA provisions for chemical spray, beanbag shotgun and canine deployment.

## **Incident Documentation and Investigation**

In September 2005, the Department of Justice and the CPD agreed on the documentation and investigation requirements for Taser incidents.

This quarter, the Monitor Team reviewed a sample of 44 investigative files involving use-of-force incidents. The CPD is in compliance with the investigative requirements of the MOA, including: having supervisors respond to the scene to investigate, evaluate and document each incident; ensuring that all officers who witness a use of force provide a statement regarding the incident; having the investigating supervisor complete a Use-of-force Report that is reviewed by a lieutenant or higher.

## **Citizen Complaint Process**

The City's complaint intake process is open and accessible and meets the MOA requirements. In the third quarter of 2005, the CPD and the CCA implemented written procedures to ensure that all complaints are received by and appropriately acted upon by both agencies. The CPD also followed up on complaints that were received by the CCA in early 2005 but which had not initially been assigned an IIS investigator and investigated by IIS. These cases are now being investigated and resolved by the CPD.

The Monitor reviewed a sample of citizen complaint investigations that were completed in the third quarter of 2005. While several of these investigations were well conducted and thorough, the Monitor identified others that were not consistent with the MOA requirements. The City is not in compliance with the requirement that investigations be completed within 90 days of the complaint. We also noted investigations where not all of the relevant evidence was considered, or where relevant witnesses were not identified and interviewed.

## **Management and Supervision**

Since October 2004, the CPD's risk management system, the Employee Tracking Solution (ETS), has been on-line, and officers and supervisors are entering records such as use-of-force reports and citizen complaints into the system. This quarter, the vendor completed the task of converting data from the CPD's old databases and importing them into the ETS. It also was able to implement the analysis and risk assessment components of the system, which compares the activities of officers with their peers, to identify officers and units whose activity is significantly above or below the average. Now that these capabilities are functional, the CPD can begin identifying officers, supervisors and units for administrative review and appropriate intervention, based on potential at-risk behavior.

## **Training**

As in the last several quarters, the Monitor finds the CPD to be in compliance with the MOA training requirements.

## **COLLABORATIVE AGREEMENT**

### **CPOP**

This quarter saw continued progress on some elements of the Collaborative Agreement. A number of trainings advanced CPOP this quarter: fifteen CPD officers attended training in Crime Prevention through Environmental Design; the new crime analysts received additional computer training; new supervisors received some training in CPOP and the CA; non-sworn employees were provided an update on the CA and the MOA; and lieutenants, captains, CPOP officers and their sergeants received training in the use of the new problem solving tracking system. This new system holds great promise for the CPD. Using the tracking system, CPD personnel will be able to easily access a number of different databases and can create city teams around problems, and any member of the City's team will have access to the tracking system for the purpose of review or updating of information. By next quarter, officers should have direct access to calls for service information and field interview and arrest data, all of which will help when analyzing problem places.

All unit commanders submitted quarterly problem-solving reports. In particular, we find continued improvement in the quality of the problem solving reported by the District Commanders. We hope to see the same among the special unit commanders in the upcoming quarters.

Finally, an important achievement for the quarter was the first annual CPOP Awards Ceremony, which took place in late October. Officers and citizens were honored for their work in reducing chronic crime/safety problems. The Community Police Partnering Center hosted the event, all Parties attended, and the work product resulting from the CA was evidence of the potential of the police-community partnership.

In the next quarter, the Parties will address CA outcomes as part of the CA deliverables. The CPD will have even clearer guideposts for each of the CA requirements if an agreement on CA outcomes is reached. As the third year of the monitoring of the Collaborative Agreement begins, we would like to see the CPD quicken its pace towards full adoption of problem solving as the principal strategy in crime fighting.

## Evaluation Protocol

The Parties brought in the RAND Corporation as a national expert to conduct the Evaluation Protocol. As noted in the RAND Year One Report, the CA provisions call for a comprehensive approach to evaluation that is broader than efforts in most other cities.

- The efforts undertaken in this first year of the Evaluation Protocol and the results of RAND's research have provided valuable information and lessons learned, that now need to be used to improve police-community relations and advance the goals of the Collaborative Agreement.
- The Monitor is convinced that the results of the Year One Evaluation Report reinforce and validate the CA's approach that problem solving must be the principal strategy for addressing crime and disorder in Cincinnati.

The results of the *community police satisfaction survey* show that the general public has a favorable opinion of the quality of police service in Cincinnati. African American residents in Cincinnati, however, have a less favorable view; there is less satisfaction with the quality of police service, less trust in the police and blacks are more likely than whites to think that race played a factor in police decisions. RAND reports that these views appear to be driven at least in part by "differences in neighborhood quality conditions and the style of policing in specific regions of the city [p. 242]." Black residents are more likely than whites to live in neighborhoods characterized by crime and disorder, and residents in high-crime neighborhoods in Cincinnati are more likely to see "proactive policing" such as aggressive traffic enforcement, and stopping and patting down individuals on the street corner.

RAND's review of the CPD's statistical data also supports this finding. Reported crime, calls for police service, and arrests are geographically clustered in the same Cincinnati neighborhoods, and these neighborhoods are predominantly black. Five neighborhoods comprise 31 percent of Cincinnati's reported crimes and 37 percent of the CPD's arrests. We do note, however, that the percent and distribution of reported crime is not always the same as the percent and distribution of arrests in a neighborhood; for example, Over-the-Rhine represented seven percent of Cincinnati's reported crime, but over twice that percentage (16%) of Cincinnati's arrests; conversely, Westwood also represented seven percent of Cincinnati's reported crime, but only three percent of Cincinnati's arrests.

One of the key findings in the RAND Year One Report is that the vehicle stop analysis showed no clear evidence of a pattern of racial bias on the part of CPD officers. Just as important, however, is that the RAND report did show

that traffic stops in Cincinnati had an impact on the black community because of the different strategies and type of policing in high crime, black neighborhoods. RAND found that traffic stops for black motorists were more likely to be longer than for white motorists, and more likely to involve additional investigation.

RAND's review of in-car camera videotapes of traffic stops reinforces the results from the traffic stop and statistical analysis. In this analysis, stops that involved black drivers were more likely: to take longer, to involve more officers, to include inquiries about drugs or whether the car could be searched, to involve equipment violations or expired tags, to include a search for contraband, or to have the driver be asked to exit the vehicle. As RAND notes, proactive policing of this sort puts a high burden on law-abiding black drivers.

Another important aspect of RAND's review of traffic stop videos is the correlation between the officer's communications and the driver's actions and the correlation of the driver's communications with the officer's actions. For example, the best predictor of the quality of a driver's communications was the length of the stop, and vice versa (more argumentative drivers correlated to longer stops; a less communicative officer and longer stops correlated with lower quality of the driver's response). RAND also found that the officer's communication tended to be more positive when the officer and the driver were of the same race; white officers listened more carefully, and were more accepting of what the driver was saying, when it was a white driver; black officers' communications were more positive with black drivers. Because there are more white officers than black officers, white drivers get more positive communications, which for black drivers may reinforce negative racial expectations and make subsequent interactions less likely to be positive. In terms of the quality of the driver's communications, RAND found that white drivers were more positive than black drivers, in terms of being more courteous, cooperative or apologetic.

The Parties are in compliance with the CA provisions requiring the development of the Evaluation Protocol and its implementation. What the CA now requires is that the Parties meet with the Monitor "to study the results of the evaluation instruments and determine what changes, if any, in the Agreement or in their actions should be pursued in light of the evaluation results," as required under the CA.

In our comments to the RAND Report, the Monitor set out several recommendations for actions that the Parties and the Cincinnati community should take. One area that has a significant prospect for improvement in police-citizen relations is communications in traffic stop encounters. As RAND states, "[s]ubstantial improvements are possible if both police and community members make the effort [p. 108]." The Monitor also seconded RAND's call for a larger dialogue about how black neighborhoods are policed. This would

include discussions regarding incorporating problem solving and CPOP into hot spot/crime sweep efforts, and an examination of how and where arrests are being made and how they correlate to reported crime. Aggressive traffic enforcement may engender greater distrust, and may not be effective in reducing crime or improving traffic safety.

The RAND citizen survey demonstrates the wide gap in perceptions between whites and blacks in Cincinnati that must be addressed. These gaps must be reduced in future years for the CA to be successful and for its goals to be achieved.

### **CCA**

The CCA and the CPD have developed written procedures for the timely exchange of information and the efficient coordination of the CCA and the CPD investigations. All complaints should now be directed to the CCA in a timely manner, and complaints initiated at the CCA also will be referred to the CPD to be opened by IIS.

The MOA requires that the City Manager take appropriate action on CCA's investigation within 30 days of the completion of the investigation. It also requires that the City take appropriate action, including discipline where warranted, on completed CCA investigations. At the end of the third quarter of 2005, there were a number of cases where the City Manager did not make a final determination after the completion of the CCA investigation. There were also cases in which it did not appear that the City took appropriate action, including discipline, on completed CCA investigations. The City is in partial compliance with these MOA provisions.

## **CHAPTER ONE. INTRODUCTION**

Two very significant events related to CA compliance occurred during this quarter. First, on October 27, 2005 the Partnering Center held the first annual CPOP Awards Ceremony. The event was well-attended by police and community members, with the following awards being presented:

- Outstanding Community Efforts in CPOP
- Outstanding Individual Contribution in CPOP
  - Police
  - Individuals
  - Organizations
  - CPOP Partnering Award
  - CPOP Innovation Award
  - Special Recognition for CPOP Efforts
  - Friends of the Collaborative Awards

Over 20 individuals and organizations were the recipients of these awards. The event was attended by the Monitoring Team, community representatives, and all of the Parties including the Chief of Police, the President of the FOP, Plaintiffs' representatives, and dozens of CPD members. Holding the ceremony brought the Parties into compliance with another provision of the CA. Just as important, the awards ceremony was inspirational and demonstrated the rewards of the CA, fair and equitable treatment for all, crime reduction and increased trust.

The second significant occurrence was the December 2005 release of the *RAND Police-Community Relations in Cincinnati: Year One Evaluation Report*. The Parties selected the RAND Corporation as a national expert to conduct the Evaluation Protocol required by the CA. The efforts undertaken in this first year of the Evaluation Protocol and the results of RAND's research have provided valuable information and lessons learned, that now need to be used to improve police-community relations and to advance the goals of the CA. The results of the Year One Evaluation Report reinforce and validate the CA's approach that problem solving must be the principle strategy for addressing crime and disorder in Cincinnati.

The Monitor's Comments to the RAND Report describe several recommendations for actions the Parties and the Cincinnati community should take. The recommendations center on the need for improved communications by police and citizens in situations as specific as traffic stop encounters, to increased dialogue about how black neighborhoods are policed.

The CA now requires that the Parties meet with the Monitor "to study the results of the evaluation instruments and determine what changes, if any, in

the Agreement, or in their actions should be pursued in light of the evaluation results.” The process of study and analysis has begun, and improvement in police-community relations can be achieved if the Parties and the community take steps to bring it about.

The CPD continues to make progress toward substantial compliance under the MOA. Three areas where improvements were made are incident documentation and investigation, the citizen complaint process, and risk management and supervision. Although the CPD has not reached compliance with all of the MOA provisions in these three areas, significant progress has been made since the last quarterly report.

Much was accomplished this quarter that can serve as a springboard for improved police-community relations, and accomplishing substantial compliance with the agreements.

## **CHAPTER TWO. MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT**

### **I. General Policies**

#### **A. Mental Health Response Team [MOA ¶ 10]**

##### **1. Requirement**

The CPD is required to create a “cadre of specially trained officers available at all times to respond to incidents involving persons who are mentally ill.” These officers will be called to the scene and assume primary responsibility for responding. Training for these officers shall include multi-disciplinary intervention training, with a particular emphasis on de-escalation strategies, as well as instruction by mental health practitioners and alcohol and substance abuse counselors. The CPD also shall implement a plan to partner with mental health care professionals, to make such professionals available to assist CPD officers on-site with interactions with mentally ill persons.

##### **2. Status**

The Police Academy, in partnership with mental health professionals, completed a 40-hour training course for 28 new MHRT officers in September 2005. The additional MHRT officers bring the total complement to 198 MHRT officers.

During the third quarter of 2005, the CPD received 1,778 calls involving mentally ill persons. In 123 of those instances, the call did not meet the criteria for dispatch and was cancelled or the call was handled by another agency. In 264 cases, the call was dispatched as another incident type and later changed to a MHRT by the responding officers. This equates to 1,391 calls eligible for MHRT officer dispatch. For 1,255 of the calls, a MHRT officer was dispatched. Thus, MHRT officers were dispatched to 90 percent of MHRT eligible calls.

For this reporting period, there was one call for which an MHRT officer was not working, and 10 calls for which a MHRT officer was working but not available for dispatch (1 percent). An additional 48 calls handled were categorized as “unknown” (3 percent). The remainder of the calls (77) were ones in which a MHRT response was disregarded by the supervisor or the situation was handled before MHRT arrival (6 percent).

The Psychiatric Emergency Services Department of University Hospital continues its partnership with the CPD. This partnership has enabled Mobile Crisis Team personnel to work within police districts in conjunction with police personnel. Currently, the program operates in Districts One and Five.

For the third quarter of 2005, statistics were maintained for individuals in both districts who could be identified as being in need of mental health services. Identification is made through an incident history, police reports (Form 316), or by hospital records. Information regarding the number of MHRT runs handled by police, the Mobile Crisis Team, or a combination of both is also tabulated.

<b>2005 Third Quarter</b>	<b>District One</b>	<b>District Five</b>
Total runs	339	242
CPD only	178	144
Mobile Crisis Team only	56	27
CPD assisted by the Mobile Crisis Team	85	58
Mobile Crisis Team assisted by CPD	20	13
Total individuals identified	223	197
Mobile Crisis Team consultations	2	1

### **3. Assessment**

The Monitor finds the CPD to be in compliance with the requirements of MOA paragraph 10, including MHRT policy and training; availability of trained MHRT officers during all shifts; appropriate responses to MHRT calls; and a partnership with mental health professionals making such professionals available to assist the CPD onsite in interactions with mentally ill persons. The addition of 28 new MHRT officers should be a very helpful complement to the program. More MHRT trained officers should mean that there will be fewer situations where a particular District does not have an MHRT officer on shift and CPD will need to dispatch an MHRT officer from a different District to the scene.

#### **B. Foot Pursuits [MOA ¶ 11]**

##### **1. Requirement**

The MOA requires the CPD to develop and adopt a foot pursuit policy. The policy must require officers to consider particular factors in determining whether a foot pursuit is appropriate.

##### **2. Status**

The tactical and risk considerations involved in foot pursuits were discussed during roll-call scenario trainings in July, August and September 2005.

### 3. Assessment

The Monitor reviewed 19 use of force and citizen complaint investigations in which a foot pursuit was involved. The supervising investigator documented a review of the foot pursuit on the Use-of-force report in 18 of these cases.<sup>1</sup>

The CPD's policy, training and actual practice on foot pursuits is in compliance with this MOA paragraph.

### II. Use of Force

In the table below, we provide the statistics for Use-of-force incidents for the last thirteen quarters.

**USE OF FORCE TABLES**

	3rd Q 2002	4th Q 2002	1st Q 2003	2nd Q 2003	3rd Q 2003	4th Q 2003	1st Q 2004	2nd Q 2004	3rd Q 2004	4th Q 2004	1st Q 2005	2nd Q 2005	3rd Q 2005
Chemical Irritant - Unrestrained Subjects	69	102	96	140	92	90	76	30	10	8	8	12	5
Restrained Subjects	24	15	26	15	19	15	10	9	10	9	11	10	3
Physical Force	52	67	71	79	27	29	17	4	2	1	4	4	3
Takedowns with injury					26	12	11	4	8	6	10	3	2
Non-compliant suspects					35	48	40	41	30	31	23	18	29
PR 24	9	7	5	3	5	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Canine	5	5	2	5	2	2	4	1	3	5	6	7	5
Taser	1	1	1	2	0	0	72	177	198	148	137	143	166
Beanbag/ Foam round	1	0	0	4	0	0	1 foam	0	0	0	0	0	2
Pepperball	1	0	1	1	5	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Firearms Discharge	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	1	2	0
<b>Total</b>	162	197	203	249	211	203	234	268	262	209	200	199	215

<sup>1</sup> The investigating supervisor in Tracking No. 71457 did not evaluate the officer's foot pursuit. Also, in Tracking No. 70413, the supervisor did not address any of the details of the foot pursuit, but does state that the pursuit meets CPD policy.

The use-of-force statistics for the third quarter of 2005 continue to reflect the substitution of the Taser for most other kinds of use of force. The number of chemical sprays, physical force incidents and takedowns have significantly decreased since the first quarter of 2004. The number of Taser incidents has slightly increased over the last two quarters, and the total number of use-of-force incidents increased slightly since the last quarter. The CPD notes that over the last 12 months there has been a decrease in injuries to suspects from use-of-force incidents, and a decrease in injuries to officers from use-of-force incidents.

**A. General Policies [MOA ¶¶ 12-13]**

**1. Requirements**

Under the MOA, Cincinnati is required to revise its Use-of-force policy. The revised policy must do the following:

- It must clearly define the terms used in the policy
- The term “force” must be defined as it is defined in the MOA
- It must incorporate a “Use-of-force model” that relates the officer’s responses and use-of-force options to the actions of the subject, and teaches that disengagement, area containment, or calling for reinforcement may be an appropriate response to a situation
- Whenever possible, individuals should be allowed to submit to arrest before force is used
- Advise against excessive force
- Prohibit choke holds
- The term “restraining force” must be removed from the CPD’s policy
- The CPD’s revised Use-of-force policy must be published on the CPD’s website and be disseminated to community groups

**2. Status**

In the October 18, 2005, Staff Notes, the CPD issued revisions to its Use-of-force policies, Procedure 12.545, to reflect the agreement between the Justice Department and the CPD regarding the documentation and investigation requirements for Taser incidents (see Section III.A below).

## **Taser Implementation**

In the third quarter of 2005, there were 166 Taser deployments. Approximately half of these deployments occurred during a foot chase of the subject (49 percent). Also in this quarter, there were 21 injuries to subjects associated with these Taser incidents, mostly minor abrasions and cuts, but no injuries that met the definition of serious injury in the CPD's use-of-force procedures.

In its November 12, 2005, MOA Status Report, the CPD noted that there were 16 Taser incidents in the third quarter of 2005 in which the subject had a deadly weapon (firearms, knife).

### **3. Assessment**

The Monitor has previously determined that the CPD's Use-of-force policy and training are in compliance with the MOA provisions. During this quarter, the Monitor reviewed the CPD use-of-force investigations to assess whether officers are implementing the CPD's use-of-force policies in compliance with the MOA. As required by the MOA, the CPD's procedures incorporate a use-of-force model that "relates the officer's responses and use-of-force options to the actions of the subject."

In the 31 Taser incidents that the Monitor Team reviewed this quarter, the documentation and investigation indicated that in each of the incidents, the officer's use of force was reasonably related to the level of resistance and actions of the suspect. This did include several incidents where the subject's resistance consisted of "conspicuously ignoring" the officer, refusing to lie on the ground, refusing to put his/her arms behind his/her back and submit to being handcuffed, or refusing to spit out contraband that the officer believed the subject had in his or her mouth. However, because the CPD's use-of-force policy allows officers to use the Taser if a subject is non-compliant, and the CPD puts the Taser at the lowest level of the use-of-force continuum (along with chemical spray), these circumstances are within the scope of the requirements of the MOA.

The Monitor also reviewed 13 incidents involving force other than Tasers. For these incidents, it appeared that the officer's use of force was reasonably related to the actions and level of resistance and actions of the subject.

There were five taser incidents where a warning of use of force was not given [Tracking Nos. 70413, 71097, 71627, 72727, 73138]. In four of the incidents, the investigating supervisor reports that the warnings were not given because of the exigency of the situation [Tracking Nos. 70413, 71097, 71627, 73183]. The Monitor concurs with two, but finds that in the other three

incidents, the officer had an opportunity to warn the subject that refusing to submit to arrest would result in a use of force [Tracking Nos. 70413, 72727, 73138].

The Monitor finds the City in compliance with the provisions of MOA ¶¶12 and 13. However, given the incidents in which officers did not warn subjects that use of force would be used if they did not comply with the officer's orders, the Monitor will carefully assess this issue in the next quarter.

## **B. Chemical Spray [MOA ¶¶14-19]**

### **1. Requirements**

The CPD must revise and augment its chemical spray policy to do the following:

- Clearly define terms
- Limit use of spray, including against crowds, to only those cases where force is necessary to effect the arrest of an actively resisting person, protect against harm, or prevent escape
- Provide that chemical spray may be used only when verbal commands would be ineffective
- Require supervisory approval for use of chemical spray against a crowd, absent exigent circumstances
- Require a verbal warning and the opportunity to comply before using a chemical spray, unless doing so would be dangerous
- Require officers to aim at the subject's face and upper torso
- Provide guidance on duration of bursts and recommended distance
- Require officers to offer to decontaminate sprayed individuals
- Request medical response for complaining subjects
- Prohibit keeping sprayed subjects in a face down position any longer than necessary
- Prohibit use of spray on a restrained person, except to protect against harm or escape

- Use of spray against restrained persons must be investigated, including tape-recorded statements of officers and witnesses
- Investigations of these incidents must be reviewed by the CPD's Inspections Section
- Provide restraining equipment in CPD squad cars
- Provide in-service training on chemical spray
- Account for chemical spray canisters
- Periodically review research on chemical spray

## **2. Status**

There were eight deployments of chemical irritant for the third quarter of 2005, three involving subjects who were restrained and five involving subjects who were not restrained. This is a significant drop in chemical irritant usage and is the lowest number of chemical spray incidents in the 13 quarters the Monitor has reviewed. Seven of the eight chemical spray reports document a warning of impending force. According to the CPD, the eighth report (Tracking No. 69012) explains the exigent circumstances which made the warning impractical. Decontamination of sprayed individuals occurred in all but one of the deployments. That incident involved approximately 20 individuals involved in a bar fight, and the CPD use-of-force report states that the participants fled the scene after the chemical irritant was dispersed (Tracking No. 71199).

## **3. Assessment**

The CPD's policies regarding the use of chemical spray comply with the MOA.

The Monitor Team reviewed seven chemical spray incidents from the third quarter of 2005. In each of the incidents reviewed, chemical spray was used where force was necessary to protect persons from physical harm, to effect the arrest of an actively resisting subject, or prevent the escape of the subject, in compliance with MOA ¶14(b). Spray was aimed at the appropriate target and for the proper duration, and the subject was offered decontamination, MOA ¶¶14(f), 14(g), 14(h). A verbal warning that chemical spray would be used was made in six of the seven cases, in compliance with MOA ¶14(e). In one case [Tracking No. 69012], the report documents the reasons why a warning was not feasible (the officer was attempting to place the resisting subject in the police car, when the subject kicked the officer).

The Monitor determines that the CPD is in compliance with MOA paragraphs 14-19.

### **C. Canines [MOA ¶20]**

In the third quarter of 2005, there were 181 total canine deployments, 35 canine apprehensions (where a suspect was found and arrested) and five canine bites. This is a bite ratio of 14 percent.

#### **1. Requirements**

The MOA requires the CPD to revise and augment its canine policies, subject to the review and approval of the Department of Justice. The CPD is to make continued improvements in its canine operations, including the introduction of an “improved handler-controlled alert curriculum” and the use of new canines. Specifically, the new canine policy must:

- Limit off-leash deployments to searches of commercial buildings or for suspects wanted for a violent offense or reasonably suspected of being armed.
- Require approval of a supervisor before deployment, except for on-leash deployments.
- Provide for a loud and clear announcement, warning of the canine deployment, and require officers to allow the suspect time to surrender.
- Handlers shall not allow their canines to bite a person unless the person poses an imminent danger, or is actively resisting or escaping.
- Where the canine does bite a person, the dog shall be called off at the first moment the dog can safely be released. The policy shall prohibit canines from biting nonresistant subjects. Also, immediate medical attention must be sought for all canine related injuries.
- The CPD shall track deployments and apprehensions, and calculate bite ratios. These bite ratios shall be included in the Risk Management System.

## 2. Status

During the third quarter of 2005, the CPD had five incidents involving a canine bite.

Pursuant to MOA ¶20, the CPD calculates canine bite ratios for its Canine Unit and for each canine/handler team for six-month periods. The bite ratios for six-month periods in 2005 are as follows:

	<u>Deployments</u>	<u>Finds</u>	<u>Bites</u>	<u>Ratio</u>
February 1, 2005 - July 31, 2005	313	53	10	19%
March 1, 2005 - August 31, 2005	337	59	12	20%
April 1, 2005 - September 30, 2005	354	62	12	19%

The bite ratio for March-August is above the 20 percent unit threshold set out in the MOA for a review of canine operations. In addition, the CPD calculated the bite ratios for each handler/canine team. Four of the handler/canine teams had a bite ratio above 20 percent for a six-month period. Based on the bite ratio of the Canine unit and several of the canine handler teams, the Special Services Commander reviewed each of the canine bite incidents to assess whether they were consistent with CPD policy and the MOA.

## 3. Assessment

### a. Policy

The CPD's Canine policy meets the requirements of the MOA. Canine training is assessed under MOA ¶84.

### b. Review of Investigations

The Monitor reviewed five canine bite investigations from the third quarter of 2005. In each case, supervisory authorization was given in compliance with the MOA. Also, a canine warning was made in three cases, while in two cases the subject was reasonably believed to be armed [Tracking Nos. 64537 and 68227]. In reviewing the canine bite investigations, the Monitor has determined that the circumstances of the canine engagements were consistent with the MOA provisions. We also note that while there were initial flaws in the supervisory investigations, the chain of command identified deficiencies in the investigation, and counseled the supervisors: medical attention should have been called to the scene [Tracking Nos. 64537, 67981]; supervising investigator should get subject's refusal to be interviewed on tape [Tracking No. 65223]; leading questions [Tracking No. 68227].

As discussed above, the Special Services Commander reviewed the investigations of canine bites for the six months from January 1, 2005 to June

30, 2005 in light of the bite ratio being above 20 percent. This review is in compliance with MOA ¶20(h). The Monitor concludes that the CPD is in compliance with paragraph 20 of the MOA.

**D. Beanbag Shotguns and 40 Millimeter Foam Round  
[MOA ¶ ¶21-23]**

There were two beanbag shotgun deployments in the third quarter of 2005. The Monitor reviewed one of the beanbag deployments, involving an armed subject who fired shots at the officers. The CPD is in compliance with the MOA requirements relating to beanbag shotgun deployment.

**III. Incident Documentation, Investigation**

Documenting and reporting officers' use of force allows CPD supervisors to evaluate the appropriateness of the individual use of force and to track an officer's behavior over time. It also allows the CPD to analyze use-of-force incidents, trends and patterns to evaluate officer tactics and determine whether any changes in procedure or training are needed.

**A. Documentation [MOA ¶ ¶24-25]**

**1. Requirements**

- All uses of force are to be reported. The Use-of-force form shall indicate each use of force and require evaluation of each use of force. Use-of-force Reports will include the supervisor's and officer's narrative description, and the officer's audio-taped statement.
- The CPD will implement an automated data system allowing supervisors access to all use-of-force information.
- The CPD will implement a Canine Deployment form.
- If the gun pointing requirement is triggered under the Collaborative Agreement, data reported shall be included in the risk management system.

**2. Status**

**a. Hard Hands and Takedowns without Injury**

According to the CPD, there were 29 incidents in the third quarter of 2005 involving a takedown or use of hard hands, without an injury to the suspect.

### **b. Hard Hands and Takedowns with Injuries**

The CPD reports that there were two incidents in the third quarter of 2005 in which an officer used hard hands or a takedown and the suspect was injured, but not a serious enough injury to require hospitalization.

### **c. Taser Investigations and Documentation**

In September 2005, the Department of Justice and the CPD agreed on the documentation and investigation requirements for Taser incidents. Taped statements will be taken of the subject, the involved officers and all witnesses, including officers, when the Taser is deployed against a restrained person (e.g., a person handcuffed). The CPD also agreed to take a taped statement when the subject makes a complaint or alleges excessive force or misconduct by an officer. A complaint in this situation would be where the subject's description of the use of force, or the events leading up to the use of force, are different than the officer's description of the incident. Also, the CPD agreed that even in investigations in Taser incidents where taped statements are not required, the investigative report will include information that the subject was interviewed. The CPD revised its Use-of-force Procedure 12.545 on October 18, 2005 to reflect this agreement.

## **3. Assessment**

### **a. Hard Hands and Takedowns Without Injury (Non-Compliant Suspect Forms – Form 18NC)**

This quarter, the Monitor reviewed 14 Non-Compliant Suspect Reports. Each report contained narratives prepared by the officer and investigating sergeant, the later of which assessed the appropriateness of the force used and the officer's compliance with department policy and state law. All but one of the reports was accompanied by an arrest and investigation report. The report that did not involved a stop of a subject who was potentially armed; that investigation did not result in an arrest. One of the incidents was not immediately reported to a supervisor because the officer did not realize that the level of force used required completion of an 18NC report and subsequent investigation by a supervisor. The officer did report the incident at the beginning of his next tour of duty. An ESL entry was made that reflected counseling as to the prompt reporting of such incidents.

In each of these reports, the officer included a description of the events leading up to the use of force, the subject's resistance, and the officer's actions to overcome the resistance. The forms were reviewed by a supervisor, who provided written comments on the tactics used and the appropriateness of the

use of force. The CPD is in compliance with the requirements applicable to these incidents.

### **b. Hard Hands and Takedowns, With Injury**

During the third quarter of 2005, there were only two takedowns or use of hard hands that resulted in injury to the suspect, but not hospitalization. The investigative report in these types of cases must include a narrative description of the events leading to the use of force, the subject's resistance, and the force used by the officer. In addition, the investigation will include a review and determination of whether the officer's actions in regard to the initial stop or seizure were within CPD policy, and a review and determination of whether the use of force was within CPD policy.

The Monitor Team reviewed one Injury to Prisoner Report from a takedown from the third quarter of 2005, and three Injury to Prisoner Reports involving chemical spray. The Monitor Team finds that the reports included a narrative description of the events leading to the use of force and the force used. Also, in the reports, the supervisors reviewed the officers' initial stop, decision to arrest, and use of the takedown or chemical spray, and evaluated compliance with the CPD's policy and procedure. The CPD is in compliance with the MOA requirements for these incidents.

### **c. Taser**

The Department of Justice and the CPD agreed on the level of documentation and investigation required for Taser incidents. Taped statements are necessary for incidents in which Tasers are deployed on a restrained person, or where the subject makes a complaint of excessive force. In incidents where tapes are not required, the investigative report will document that the subject was interviewed.

In this quarter, the Monitor reviewed 31 Taser incidents, and ten citizen complaint cases in which a Taser was deployed. One of the incidents involved the use of a Taser on a restrained person. [Tracking No. 72727]. Although taped interviews were not conducted in this investigation, the incident occurred in September 2005, before the CPD revised its Use-of-force Procedures to require tapes for Taser incidents involving restrained persons. For Taser incidents in which a complaint was made, there were four incidents where taped interviews were not made by either the investigating supervisor or by IIS. [Tracking Nos. IIS 05110, IIS 05111 and IIS 05152]. These incidents also occurred before the agreement on Taser documentation. Several of the Taser use-of-force reports do document the fact that the subject was interviewed, although other incidents we reviewed this quarter occurred before the CPD revised its Use-of-force Procedures in light of the agreement between the DOJ and the CPD, and do not include that documentation. We will monitor the

CPD's compliance with these requirements in the next quarter.

## **B. Investigation [MOA ¶¶26-31]**

### **1. Requirements**

- Officers to notify supervisor following any use of force, or allegation of excessive force. Supervisor to respond to scene. Incident not to be investigated by officer who used force or who authorized force.
- CPD supervisors will investigate each use-of-force incident, with evaluation of compliance with CPD policies and tactics, including the basis of any stop or seizure.
- IIS will respond to scene of all "serious uses of force" and all canine bites with serious injuries. Inspections Section will review all investigations of canine bites, beanbags, foam rounds and baton uses.
- Investigators prohibited from asking leading questions. Investigators to consider all relevant evidence and make credibility determinations. No automatic preference for officer's statement over citizen's; statements of witness with connection to complainant should not be discounted. The CPD to resolve material inconsistencies. The CPD will train investigators on factors to consider in investigations.
- Investigators to ensure that all witness officers provide statement. Supervisors will ensure that reports list all officers involved or on scene, and document any medical treatment or refusal of medical care.
- Lieutenant or higher will review each investigation conducted by CPD supervisors and identify any deficiency and require corrections. CPD supervisors to be held accountable for quality of investigations. Appropriate non-disciplinary or disciplinary action will be taken if investigations are not thorough, properly adjudicated, or where appropriate corrective action is not recommended.

### **2. Status**

On October 18, 2005, CPD Procedure 12.545 was revised to require documentation and investigation of Taser incidents consistent with the agreement between the DOJ and the CPD.

### **3. Assessment**

#### **a. Policy**

The CPD's policies on investigating Use-of-force incidents comply with the MOA.

#### **b. Review of Force Investigations**

During this quarter, the Monitor Team reviewed 44 investigative files involving use-of-force incidents (including Taser deployments, canine bites, hard hands and takedowns, and chemical sprays). We reached the following conclusions from those investigations:

- In all of the use-of-force incidents, the officer notified a supervisor, and the supervisor responded to the scene (MOA ¶26).
- There was only one incident where the use of force was investigated by a supervisor who used force or authorized the use of force, or whose conduct led to the reportable incident [Tracking No. 70564] (MOA ¶26).
- In all of the incidents, the supervisor investigated, evaluated and documented the incident giving rise to the use of force, and the documentation included facts and circumstances that either justified or failed to justify the officer's conduct (MOA ¶27).
- In all of the incidents, the supervisor reviewed the basis for the initial stop and seizure and determined whether the officer's actions were within CPD policy (MOA ¶27).
- In all of the incidents, all officers involved in or at the scene of the use of force were identified on the Use-of-force Report and provided a statement (MOA ¶30).
- All of the use-of-force investigations were reviewed by a lieutenant or higher. In a number of incidents, the lieutenant or captain reviewing the investigation determined that the investigation was not sufficiently thorough and directed that deficiencies be corrected [Tracking Nos. 64537, 67981, 65223, 68227, 70564, 73461]. (MOA ¶31).

The MOA also requires the CPD in use-of-force investigations to consider all relevant evidence; to prohibit investigators from using improper leading

questions; to prohibit investigators from giving an automatic preference for officers' statements over witness statements, or to disregard statements of interested witnesses; and to make efforts to resolve material inconsistencies between witness statements, and make credibility determinations where appropriate. The Monitor makes both a qualitative and quantitative assessment of the CPD's compliance with these requirements. (MOA ¶29)

For the canine bite investigations and investigations of chemical spray on restrained subjects (where there are tapes of the supervisor's interviews), the Monitor determined that improper leading questions were used in only one case, and in that case, the supervisor was counseled by the chain of command [Tracking No. 68227]. For the other use-of-force investigations, such as Tasers and chemical spray on unrestrained subjects, where the Monitor does not have tapes or transcripts of interviews, we could not determine whether improper leading questions were used. Because the large percentage of use of force investigations do not include taped interviews, the Monitor is unable to make a compliance determination for the MOA provision prohibiting improper leading questions.<sup>2</sup>

With respect to the other requirements of paragraph 29, based on the documentation that was available, the Monitor Team found that most of the use-of-force investigations: considered all relevant evidence; identified and interviewed relevant witnesses; identified and explored material inconsistencies among witnesses and evidence; and avoided bias (in favor of police) in questions or the description of evidence and events. This was not the case in Tracking No. 71097, however.<sup>3</sup>

The Monitor concludes that the CPD is in compliance with MOA paragraphs 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 and 31.

## **C. Review of Critical Firearms [MOA ¶¶ 32-34]**

### **1. Requirements**

- **Critical Firearms Discharges.** The CPD investigations will account for all shots, and locations of officers discharging their firearm. The CPD will conduct appropriate ballistics or crime scene analysis, including gunshot residue or bullet trajectory tests.

---

<sup>2</sup> Nor can the Monitor assess whether the CPD made appropriate credibility determinations in incidents with only a written use of force report.

<sup>3</sup> Based on statements in the officer's reports, it appears there may have been an independent witness to the incident. This was not addressed in the supervisor's investigation.

- A Firearms Discharge Board (FDB) shall review all critical firearms discharges and review IIS and CIS investigation for policy compliance, tactical and training implications. The FDB will prepare a report for the Chief of Police. The FDB will determine (a) whether all uses of force during the encounter were consistent with CPD policies and training; (b) whether the officer(s) used proper tactics; (c) whether lesser force alternatives reasonably were available.
- The policy for the FDB shall include: a review within 90 days from the end of the criminal investigation; FDB to act as quality control; authorize recommendations to the Chief of Police; require annual review for patterns, with findings to the Chief of Police.

## **2. Status**

There were no firearms discharges at a suspect in the third quarter of 2005. There were three investigations of firearms discharges from previous quarters (05-pi-01, 05-pi-02 and 05-pi-04) that were reviewed by the Firearms Discharge Board and the FDB reports from those incidents were approved by Chief Streicher in this quarter.

## **3. Assessment**

The CPD's policy on critical firearms discharges and the Firearms Discharge Board complies with the MOA. In this quarter, a Monitor Team member attended the FDB review of one of the 2005 firearms discharges. For each of the FDB Reports, the FDB determined that the firearms discharges were consistent with CPD policies and training; that the officers used proper tactics; and that lesser force alternatives were not reasonably available. The Monitor finds the CPD to be in compliance with the MOA provisions.

## **IV. Citizen Complaint Process**

### **A. Openness of Complaint Process [MOA ¶¶ 35-38]**

#### **1. Requirements**

- Publicity program for complaint process
- Availability of complaint forms, informational brochure at municipal offices and CPD district stations. CPD officers are required to carry brochures and complaint forms in their vehicles while on duty.

- If a citizen objects to an officer's conduct, that officer will inform the citizen of his or her right to make a complaint. Officers will not discourage any person from making a complaint.
- Complaints may be filed in any form. Intake officers not to opine on veracity or mental capacity. Complaint form completed for every complaint.
- Every complaint to be resolved in writing.
- Each complaint gets a unique identifier that will be provided to the complainant, and each complaint is tracked by the type of complaint.
- Copies of allegations filed with the Citizen's Police Review Panel (CPRP), the Office of Municipal Investigations (OMI), Citizen Complaint Authority (CCA), Human Relations Commission referred to IIS within five (5) days.

## **2. Status**

In the first and second quarter of 2005, there were several complaints that were initiated at the CCA and the complaint form was forwarded to the CPD. These complaints were investigated by the CCA, but there was no parallel CPD investigation initiated at that time. In July 2005, the CPD identified this problem and opened investigations in these cases. According to the November 12, 2005, MOA Status Report, all but three of these investigations have now been completed by the CPD. Also, in August 2005, the CCA and the CPD developed written procedures for ensuring that all complaints received by the CCA are referred to IIS and appropriately investigated; and that all complaints received by the CPD are referred to the CCA, so a decision can be made by the CCA regarding whether a CCA investigation should be opened.

## **3. Assessment**

The City is in compliance with the MOA requirement that complaint forms and informational material be made available in public buildings such as City Hall, the library and CPD District buildings, and that officers carry forms and materials in their vehicles at all times while on duty. Also, the City has now put in place new protocols to compare the cases that the CCA has in its files with the cases that the CPD has in its files, to ensure that every complaint is opened and investigated appropriately.

The Monitor reviewed 19 IIS investigations of citizen complaints completed in the third quarter of 2005. The Monitor found the CPD to be in compliance with the MOA provisions prohibiting officers from discouraging any person from making a complaint, and that complaints can be filed in any form, including in writing or verbally, in person or by mail, telephone, fax or e-mail.

The Monitor also finds that the CPD is in compliance with the requirements that a complaint form will be completed for each complaint, that each complaint will be assigned a unique identifier, and that each complaint will be resolved in writing. Therefore, the CPD is in compliance with MOA ¶¶36 and 37.

## **B. Investigation of Complaints [MOA ¶¶39-50]**

### **1. Requirements**

- Preponderance of evidence standard; City will develop appropriate training
- Officers who used spray or other force, or authorized the conduct at issue, may not investigate the incident
- All relevant evidence to be considered
- No automatic preference of officer's statements. Investigators will attempt to resolve inconsistencies. No leading questions. All officers on the scene are required to provide a statement
- All relevant police activity, including each use of force, will be investigated; searches and seizures will be evaluated. Investigations are not to be closed simply because a complaint has been withdrawn
- Conviction of the complainant will not be used as evidence of the appropriateness of the action of the CPD officer
- Complainant to be kept informed
- IIS to investigate complaints of force, pointing firearms, searches, discrimination
- Citizen Complaint Resolution Process (CCRP) complaints will be fully investigated

- CCRP complaints will be investigated by the chain of command, with report. District or unit commander will evaluate investigation

For IIS Investigations:

- Interviews at convenient times
- Prohibit group interviews
- Notify supervisors of complaints
- Interview all appropriate CPD officers, including supervisors
- Collect and analyze all appropriate evidence; canvass scene for witnesses; obtain medical records
- Identify material inconsistencies
- Report on investigation to include a summary, proposed findings and analysis
- Investigation to be complete within 90 days, absent exceptional circumstances

## **2. Status**

Review of the data of IIS cases closed during the third quarter of 2005 showed that a total of 78 cases were cleared during the quarter. Of those cases, 31 exceeded the 90-day investigative requirement. The CPD's data of CCRP cases closed during the third quarter of 2005 showed that 48 cases were cleared during this time frame. Eight of those cases exceeded the 90-day investigative requirement.<sup>4</sup>

## **3. Assessment**

### **a. Time Period of Investigation**

Based on the data provided by the CPD, the CPD is not in compliance with the requirement that investigations be completed within 90 days of receiving the allegations.

---

<sup>4</sup> The MOA requires that IIS investigations be complete within 90 days after receiving the investigation "absent exceptional circumstances." The CPD policy allows investigators to submit an "extension request" for due to extenuating circumstances. None of the investigative files that the Monitor reviewed included an extension request, nor did the CPD document any exceptional circumstances for any of the other investigations that exceeded the 90 day limit.

## **b. Review of Investigations**

The Monitor reviewed 19 IIS investigations in this quarter.<sup>5</sup> Generally, these investigations were complete and thorough and in compliance with the MOA requirements. However, the Monitor determined that some investigations were not complete and thorough, as required by the MOA provisions.

- No complaints involved investigations where the on-scene investigation was conducted by a CPD member who authorized or was involved in the conduct that was the basis of the complaint. (MOA ¶40)
- Improper leading questions were used in one investigation [Tracking No. IIS 05074]. (MOA ¶41). Because of the leading questions in that investigation, it was not clear that the investigation was free of bias, and that an effort to make a credibility determination was made. Four investigations did not have tapes, so the Monitor could not determine if leading questions were used or not.
- The Monitor Team found that in many of the cases, the CPD considered all relevant evidence, including circumstantial, direct and physical evidence, as appropriate. Complaint investigations where not all of the relevant evidence was considered, or where relevant witnesses were not identified and interviewed, included Tracking Nos. IIS 05087, IIS 05093, and IIS 05111. (MOA ¶¶41, 49(f))
- Complaint investigations where sufficient efforts were not made to resolve material inconsistencies between evidence and witness statements, or where relevant areas of inquiry and follow up questions were not addressed, included Tracking Nos. IIS 05053 and IIS 05093. (MOA ¶¶41, 49(g))
- The investigating supervisor appropriately reviewed the initial stop and search and seizure, with the exception of Tracking No. IIS 05053. (MOA ¶42)

---

<sup>5</sup> In the next quarter, the Monitor will also be reviewing CCRP files from the CPD's Districts. While the ETS system contains electronic versions of the investigative reports from these cases, it does not contain all of the documents and materials from these files. For this reason, the Monitor did not make an assessment of compliance this quarter on the MOA provisions specifically related to CCRP investigations, MOA ¶¶47 and 48.

- The complaint investigations reviewed and resolved all relevant police activity, including conduct not included in the initial complaint. (MOA ¶42)
- Four IIS complaint investigations did not include taped interviews of complainants, involved officers and witnesses [Tracking Nos. IIS 05093; IIS 05110; IIS 05111, IIS 05152]. One complaint involved an injury to prisoner report and the other three involved a Taser report. These reports do not include taped interviews, and IIS did not follow up to conduct taped interviews. In addition, for Tracking No. IIS 05074, taped interviews were not conducted for some of the witnesses. (MOA ¶49(a))
- In most of the cases reviewed by the Monitor Team, the investigator prepared a report that included a description of the alleged misconduct, any other misconduct identified during the course of the investigation, a summary and analysis of all relevant evidence gathered, and proposed findings and analysis supporting the findings. The findings were not supported by the evidence and sound analysis, however, in Tracking Nos. IIS 05053 and IIS 05093. (MOA ¶50)

The Monitor finds that the CPD has complied with MOA ¶¶39, 40, 42, 43, and 46. The City is not in compliance with the requirement that investigations be completed within 90 days of the filing of the complaint (MOA ¶50). The CPD is in partial compliance with MOA ¶¶ 41 and 49.

## **C. Adjudication of Complaints [MOA ¶44-45]**

### **1. Requirements**

- Every allegation to be resolved with one of four determinations: unfounded, sustained, exonerated, not sustained
- Unit commanders to evaluate each investigation to identify problems and training needs

### **2. Status**

During the third quarter of 2005, 78 cases, involving 120 allegations, were investigated and closed by IIS. Those allegations were closed as follows:

Sustained	39
Sustained Other	6
Exonerated	24
Not Sustained	27
Unfounded	24

During the third quarter of 2005, 48 cases, involving 51 allegations, were investigated and closed through the CCRP process. Those allegations were closed as follows:

Sustained	9
Sustained Other	1
Exonerated	5
Not Sustained	20
Unfounded	16

### **3. Assessment**

The City is in compliance with the requirement in MOA ¶44 that every complaint be closed with one of four dispositions: sustained, not sustained, unfounded or exonerated. (“Sustained-Other” is a sustained disposition for a violation that was not initially alleged in the complaint, but that was identified by the CPD.)

#### **D. Investigations by the CCA [MOA ¶¶ 51-56]**

##### **1. Requirements**

- The CCA is to assume all of the responsibilities of the Office of Municipal Investigation (OMI) within 120 days from the date of the Agreement
- Copies of all complaints, no matter with which office they are filed, will be directed to the CCA; the CCA is to have jurisdiction over complaints of excessive force, pointing firearms, unreasonable search or seizure, or discrimination; the CCA shall have a sufficient number of investigators, with a minimum of five

- CPD officers must answer CCA questions; the CCA executive director shall have access to CPD files and records
- The City to develop formal procedures regarding timing, notification, and the interviewing of witnesses to ensure that parallel investigations conducted by CCA and IIS do not impair the effective investigation of incidents
- The City will take appropriate action, including imposing discipline and providing for non-disciplinary corrective action where warranted, on CCA completed investigations
- The CCA will complete investigations within 90 days; City Manager to take appropriate action within 30 days of CCA completion of investigation

## **2. Status**

In the second quarter of 2005, the CCA and the CPD finalized formal procedures for the timely exchange of information and efficient coordination of CCA and CPD investigations. The CCA also was trained on the Employee Tracking Solution (ETS), the CPD's risk management system that maintains records of uses of force and citizen complaints. CCA staff now have access to the ETS system. In addition, the CCA is currently working with the Regional Computer Center (RCC) to finalize a case management system for citizen complaints.

## **3. Assessment**

### **a. Operations and Procedures**

The City has implemented a formal protocol for coordinating parallel CCA and IIS investigations and ensuring a timely flow of information between the agencies, consistent with the MOA ¶54. The City is also in compliance with MOA ¶52, requiring that each citizen complaint be directed to the CCA regardless of where it is initially filed, and MOA ¶53, requiring that CPD officers submit to administrative questions from the CCA, and that the CCA have reasonable access to city records, documents and employees.

MOA ¶55 requires the City to take appropriate action, including discipline where warranted, on completed CCA investigations, and MOA ¶56 requires the City Manager to take action within 30 days of the completion of the CCA investigation. The Monitor has examined the case management spreadsheet of citizen complaint investigations handled by both the CCA and IIS. At the end of third quarter of 2005, there were a number of cases where

the City Manager did not make a final determination after the completion of the CCA investigation. There were also cases in which it did not appear that the City took appropriate action, including discipline, on completed CCA investigations. The City is in partial compliance with MOA ¶¶55 and 56.

### **b. Sample Investigations**

The Monitor reviewed 13 CCA investigations in this quarter. Generally, these investigations were complete and thorough and in compliance with the MOA requirements. The CCA investigations:

- Considered all relevant evidence, including circumstantial, direct and physical evidence, as appropriate
- Identified and interviewed relevant witnesses, with the exception of Tracking No. CCA 05089
- Made efforts to resolve material inconsistencies between witness statements in all but two cases [Tracking Nos. CCA 05067 and 05089]
- Did not improperly use leading questions
- Reviewed and resolved all relevant police activity, including conduct that was not included in the initial complaint, with the possible exception of Tracking No. CCA 05089

The Monitor finds that the CCA has complied with MOA ¶¶41 and 42.

## **V. Management and Supervision**

### **A. Risk Management [MOA ¶¶57-64]**

#### **1. Requirements**

Under the MOA, the CPD is required to enhance and expand its risk management system by creating a new “computerized, relational database.” The CPD is to use the data in this system “to promote civil rights and best practices, manage risk and liability, and evaluate the performance of CPD officers.” MOA ¶57.

- The information in the Risk Management System is to include:
  - uses of force
  - canine bite ratio
  - canisters of chemical spray used
  - injuries to prisoners

- resisting arrest, assault on a police officer, and obstruction charges, where a use of force has occurred
  - critical firearms discharges
  - complaints, dispositions
  - criminal and civil proceedings against officers
  - vehicle pursuits
  - pointing of firearms (if added)
  - disciplinary actions
- The CPD must develop a plan for inputting historic data now in existing databases (Data Input Plan)
  - The CPD must develop a protocol for using the risk management system, subject to Department of Justice approval
  - The protocol will include the following elements: data storage, data retrieval, reporting, data analysis, pattern identification, supervisory assessment, supervisory intervention, documentation, and audit
  - The system will generate monthly reports
  - CPD commanders, managers and supervisors must review, at least quarterly, system reports and analyze officer, supervisor, and unit activity
  - CPD commanders and managers must initiate intervention for officers, supervisors or units, based on appropriate “activity and pattern assessment” of the information in the system
  - Intervention options are to include counseling, training, action plans; all interventions must be documented in writing and entered into the system
  - The data in system must be accessible to CPD commanders, managers and supervisors; they must review records of officers transferred into their units
  - Schedule for system development and implementation:
    - 90 days from April 12, 2002: issuance of RFP, with DOJ approval
    - 210 days from RFP: selection of contractor
    - 12 months from selection of contractor: beta version ready for testing

- 18 months from selection of contractor: computer program and hardware to be “operational and fully implemented”

## **2. Status**

CPD supervisors have been entering new data and forms into the ETS system since it went live in October 2004. This includes use-of-force reports, employee injury, civil suits, canine reports, closed internal investigation reports, citizen complaints, vehicle pursuits, vehicle crashes, and court appearances. In December 2005, the ETS vendor completed the data conversion to import historic data onto the system.

The CPD reports that the vendor has also now completed the analysis and weighting functions of the system. This is the component of the system that identifies officers and units whose data relating to particular fields (e.g., use of force, citizen complaints) are significantly above or below those of their peers. The analysis tools have been loaded onto the production server and are now available for supervisors to use. The CPD reports that a refresher course was offered to supervisors regarding the use of the analysis tools, and that the Department is ready to perform its first test analysis in the fourth quarter of 2005 using the data from the third quarter.

The MOA and the CPD procedures require supervisors at the end of each 28 day work period to conduct a review of the ETS data on officers under their watch. The review is of the previous 12 months of activity. Now that the weighting and analysis components of ETS are functional, supervisors can conduct these reviews. The CPD was also awaiting completion of the analysis tools and input of historical data before starting the quarterly reports by District, Section and Unit Commanders. These quarterly reports can now be run in the next quarter.

While the ETS system was being developed, the MOA required the CPD to use existing databases to monitor officer behavior. As we have noted in prior reports, the CPD maintained a manual risk management system known as the Department Risk Management System (DRMS). This system used existing databases and a matrix of risk factors to identify officers who are subject to an administrative review. Officers who accumulated more than a certain number of points within a 12 month period based on this matrix were identified for review.

During this quarter the CPD did not use the Department Risk Management System, as supervisors are entering all data into the ETS system. However, CPD supervisors and managers have not yet begun to conduct quarterly or 28 day work period reviews, to identify officers for potential interventions. Chief Streicher did direct that supervisors investigating citizen

complaints or use-of-force incidents pull up all of the ETS data on the officers involved in the investigation. A number of the use-of-force reports that we reviewed this quarter documented that the investigating supervisor did review the ETS data of the officers involved.

### **3. Assessment**

#### **a. Protocol and Data Input Plan**

The CPD is in compliance with the MOA requirements for the ETS protocol and data input plan. (MOA ¶60, 61)

#### **b. Implementation of ETS system**

During this quarter, the Monitor reviewed the implementation of the ETS system and its components. Now that the weighting and analysis components are working correctly, the CPD can use the system for its main purpose under the MOA: identifying patterns of activity for each data category, and then initiating intervention for individual officers, supervisors, and units based on appropriate activity and pattern assessment of the data in the system.

The CPD is in compliance with several of the MOA requirements relating to the design and operation of the risk management system, including collecting and recording the data listed in MOA ¶58, and including the appropriate identifying information about officers and citizens for incidents included in the system under MOA ¶59.

It is now necessary to assess whether the CPD is using the data in the system and initiating interventions for officers, supervisors and units as appropriate, as required under MOA ¶62. For compliance with ¶62, the CPD will need to document the following:

- The system is generating reports on a monthly basis describing the data analysis and identifying individual and unit patterns, ¶62(c);
- CPD commanders, managers and supervisors are reviewing system reports at least quarterly and evaluating individual officer, supervisor and unit activity, ¶62(d);
- CPD commanders, managers and supervisors are initiating interventions based on the information and pattern assessment in the system, ¶62(e)
- CPD commanders, managers and supervisors review the records of all officers recently transferred into their sections and units, ¶62(h)

- CPD commanders, managers and supervisors are evaluated on their ability to use the system, ¶62(i)
- Quarterly audits of the system are conducted by the Inspections Section, ¶62(j)
- Quarterly reviews are undertaken by CPD managers of relevant risk management system information to evaluate officer performance citywide, and to evaluate and make appropriate comparisons regarding the performance of CPD units, to identify any significant patterns or series of incidents, ¶62(k).

While the system capabilities are now sufficient for these actions, and some supervisors are reviewing the ETS data of the officers under their command, it does not appear that the CPD has begun to fully implement these requirements this quarter. For this reason, the Monitor finds that the CPD is in partial compliance with MOA ¶62. Because the CPD is in partial compliance with the requirements of MOA ¶62 for using the risk management system and its data, the CPD is also in partial compliance with MOA ¶57, which requires that the CPD regularly use the ETS data to “promote civil rights and best practices; to manage risk and liability; and to evaluate the performance of CPD officers across all ranks, units and shifts.”

### **c. Manual Risk Management System**

Paragraph 65 required the CPD to use its existing data systems for risk management until the new risk management system was in place. Now that the analysis functionality of the ETS system is working, the CPD is able to properly assess and evaluate its members’ activities to identify patterns and trends of at-risk behavior. Supervisors are now mandated to use the ETS to review each officer’s activity and establish an intervention plan when an officer exceeds established thresholds. Therefore, ¶65 no longer applies.

## **B. Audit Procedures [MOA ¶ ¶67-69]**

### **1. Requirements**

- The CPD to develop a protocol for audits
- The CPD to conduct regular audits of the citizen complaint process and integrity audits of IIS investigations
- Meetings with prosecutors to identify officer performance issues

## **2. Status**

The CPD Inspections Section conducted an audit of the CCRP process for the third quarter of 2005. Ninety three complaints were filed with the Department between July and September. An audit of 18 cases was conducted on the closed investigations. A summary of the audit was prepared on October 14, 2005.

The Inspections Section reviewed the files for the following criteria:

- The CCRP complaints were entered into the database and the case files were in a secure area.
- The required forms were completed for each CCRP investigation.
- All files contained the appropriate documents, including CAD and MDT printouts, photographs, arrest forms and offense reports.
- The investigating supervisor documented when the complainant was advised of the investigation disposition, even if the complainant chose not to participate in a CCRP meeting.

The Inspections Section also attempted to contact complainants to evaluate whether their views and actions were accurately captured in the CCRP reports. Calls were made to 18 complainants, and seven complainants were contacted. The audit found that the CCRP investigations reviewed met the criteria set forth above.

The Inspections Section will conduct a semiannual audit of IIS investigations in the next quarter.

The CPD also had conversations with representatives from both the City and County Prosecutor's Offices to discuss individual and/or collective officer performance issues. According to the CPD's Status Report, the Department will re-emphasize the importance of proper case preparation and officer preparedness for court testimony.

## **3. Assessment**

The CPD is in compliance with MOA ¶¶67, 68(a) and 69. In the next quarter, the Monitor will assess the Inspection Sections' semiannual audit of IIS investigations for compliance with MOA ¶68(b).

## **C. Video Cameras [MOA ¶¶ 70-72]**

### **1. Requirements**

The MOA requires that mobile video recorders (MVR) be used in the following situations:

- Mandatory activation of MVR for all traffic stops
- Recording of consent to search, deployment of drug sniffing canines, and vehicle searches, to the extent practical
- Recording of violent prisoner transport, where possible
- Supervisors to review all tapes where there are injuries to prisoners, uses of force, vehicle pursuits, citizen complaints
- CPD to retain and preserve tapes for 90 days, or as long as investigation is open
- If a stop is not recorded, officer shall notify the shift supervisor of the reason why the stop was not recorded
- Periodic random reviews of videotapes for training and integrity purposes; supervisors are to keep a log book of these reviews
- Random surveys of equipment are to be conducted

### **2. Status**

Currently, the CPD has installed mobile or digital video recorders in 212 of the CPD's 236 patrol cars, although 16 of those MVR/DVRs are nonfunctional. In its November 2005 Status Report, the City states that it has identified funds to equip the forty vehicles that need new or replacement MVRs. Full outfitting of all marked beat cars is anticipated in the first quarter of 2006. In addition, all new CPD patrol cars will be equipped with a functioning MVR and unequipped vehicles will be phased out over time and replaced with new MVR-equipped vehicles.

In the second quarter of 2005, the CPD also revised its MVR policy, Procedure 12.537. Officers are now required to use their MVR/DVR equipment to record all prisoner transports. The camera is to be turned to face the rear seat for recording purposes.

### **3. Assessment**

Based on the City's commitment to equip all patrol cars with MVR/DVRs, the Department of Justice has accepted the City's current status regarding the number of patrol cars outfitted with MVRs as compliant with MOA ¶70. Also, the CPD is in compliance with MOA ¶¶71 and 72. Where officers are aware that a vehicle stop was not recorded, it appears they are notifying the shift supervisor of the reason the stop was not recorded. The CPD is also conducting periodic reviews of MVR tapes and random surveys of MVR equipment to confirm they are in working order.

For the CPD to remain in compliance, CPD officers must implement the CPD's MVR procedures by activating their MVRs in circumstances requiring MVRs, such as all traffic stops and pursuits. In this quarter, four investigative files did not appear to have an MVR recording [Tracking Nos. 69621, IIS 05042, IIS 05045 (audio not on), IIS 05074 (MVR incomplete)].<sup>6</sup> However, in two of those cases, the CPD supervisor identified the violation, the officer was counseled and an ESL was issued.

We also note that the RAND Corporation identified problems with MVR recordings as part of its first annual report for the CA Evaluation Protocol. One of the components of the evaluation protocol is a review of MVR recordings of traffic stops. The RAND report notes that the video record was not complete in approximately 15 percent of the videotapes reviewed, omitting the beginning, the end, or a middle portion of the incident. In most of these cases, the camera was turned off or ran out of tape before the driver or officer left the scene. In addition, there were a large number of traffic stop incidents for which an MVR recording was not available. Because the RAND review was for traffic stops that occurred in 2004, rather than in 2005, the Monitor's compliance assessment for this quarter will not include the RAND data and concerns. It may be that the 2004 MVR problems encountered by RAND have been corrected in 2005. However, the Monitor will audit MVR recordings in the next quarter to assess whether CPD officers are complying with the MOA's MVR requirements.

#### **D. Police Communications Section [MOA ¶¶73-74]**

The CPD is in compliance with these provisions.

---

<sup>6</sup> There was also no MVR recording for Tracking No. CCA 05153, involving a subject on a bicycle who was told to stop but did not. The investigative report does not indicate whether the police vehicle's overhead lights were activated, and if so, why there was no MVR.

## **E. Discipline Matrix [MOA ¶¶ 75-76]**

### **1. Requirements**

- CPD to revise disciplinary matrix to increase penalties for serious misconduct violations, such as excessive use of force and discrimination
- CPD will revise the matrix to take into account an officer's violation of different rules, rather than just repeated violations of the same rule
- Where matrix indicates discipline, it should be imposed absent exceptional circumstances. The CPD shall also consider non-disciplinary corrective action, even where discipline is imposed

### **2. Status**

The CPD and the CCA are currently in the process of finalizing a CPD/CCA Citizen Complaint Case Management System. The CPD/CCA Citizen Complaint Case Management System will include the following fields: CCA Case Number, CPD Case Number, CPD Date Received, CPD Date Closed, Incident Date, Allegations, Complainant Name, Sex and Race, Officer Name, Sex and Race, CPD Disposition, CCA Disposition, Date Submitted to City Manager, City Manager's Disposition, CPD Action. When cases have conflicting findings from the CCA or the CPD, these cases will be the focus of the City Manager's attention for resolution.

The CPD and CCA manually prepared a spreadsheet on cases received by the CCA from January 2005 to September 2005, which includes the discipline imposed for those cases completed and sustained.

### **3. Assessment**

Review of the data for 2005 investigations indicate appropriate discipline for cases sustained by the CPD and affirmed by the City Manager. The City is in compliance for this quarter.

## **VI. Training**

### **A. Use of Force—Management Oversight and Curriculum [MOA ¶¶ 77-81]**

#### **1. Requirements**

This section of the MOA requires the CPD to:

- Coordinate and oversee use-of-force training to ensure that it complies with applicable laws and CPD policies
- Designate the Academy Director with responsibility for:
  - the quality of training
  - the development of the curriculum
  - the selection and training of instructors and trainers
  - establishing evaluation procedures
  - conducting regular (semi-annual) assessments to ensure that the training remains responsive to the organization's needs
- Provide annual use-of-force training for all recruits, sworn officers, supervisors and managers
- Have the curriculum and policy committee regularly review use-of-force training and policies to ensure compliance with laws and policies

#### **2. Status**

The Academy Director's position remains vacant and Human Resources indefinitely suspended the search for a new Director. Captain Rahtz, who was serving as the Acting Director, was transferred to a new assignment in December and has been replaced by newly promoted Captain Paul Broxterman. In addition, Lieutenant Tony Carter has filled the lieutenant's position, which had been vacant.

The Training Committee did meet on November 16, 2005 and reviewed curriculum, progress toward 2005 training goals and CALEA recommendations regarding standards for Training Committee members.

Management training was conducted this quarter and included a session on the Citizen Complaint Authority and their administrative processes involving use-of-force investigations, a legal update covering constitutional and liability issues, and tactical skills covering a wide range of use-of-force considerations and decision-making abilities during deadly force encounters.

Roll call sessions are also routinely utilized to review CPD policies governing the use of force, as well as to present scenario-based training (see MOA ¶85 below). Roll call training covering the use of Tasers and the Crisis Negotiations Team was provided during this quarter.

### **3. Assessment**

The CPD remains in compliance with these provisions; however, the Monitor encourages the City to reopen its search for the Director of the Training Academy and fill that position.

## **B. Handling Citizen Complaints [MOA ¶82]**

### **1. Requirements**

The MOA requires the CPD to provide training on the handling of citizen complaints for all officers charged with accepting these complaints. The training must emphasize interpersonal skills so that citizen concerns and fears are treated seriously and respectfully. This training must address the roles of the CCRP, IIS, CCA and CPRP so that complaint takers know how and where to make referrals. For the supervisors who investigate and determine outcomes of citizen complaints, their training must include how to establish appropriate burdens of proof and evaluate factors related to establishing complainant and witness credibility. The objective is to ensure that their recommendations regarding the disposition of complaints are unbiased, uniform, and legally appropriate.

### **2. Status**

As noted above, a two-day Management Training course was conducted this quarter for all sergeants and lieutenants. One of the training blocks involved a presentation by Mr. Greg Baker and Mr. Wendell France on the CCA and their administrative processes relating to the use of force and citizen complaint investigations. Another session covered the state of the Department, management expectations and the future direction of the organization.

### **3. Assessment**

The CPD is in compliance with this section of the MOA.

## **C. Leadership/Command Accountability [MOA ¶83]**

### **1. Requirements**

The MOA requires that CPD Supervisors will continue to receive training in leadership, command accountability and techniques designed to promote proper police practices. Within 30 days of assuming supervisory responsibilities, all CPD sergeants are to receive this training, and it will be made part of the annual in-service training. This requirement acknowledges the important role leaders at all supervisory levels play in ensuring that appropriate demeanor, behaviors, and tactics are used in the operations of the agency.

### **2. Status**

The Management Training course conducted this quarter satisfies the requirement for the annual in-service training and the topics covered were responsive to many of the requirements of this section of the MOA. Additionally, a new supervisors' course was provided in December for the three newly promoted sergeants and other civilian staff.

### **3. Assessment**

The CPD remains in compliance with this provision.

## **D. Canine Training [MOA ¶84]**

### **1. Requirements**

The MOA requires the CPD to modify and augment its training program. This includes the complete development and implementation of a canine training curricula and lesson plans that identify goals, objectives and the mission of the Canine Unit specified in the MOA. Formal training on an annual basis for all canines, handlers, and supervisors is also required, as is annual re-certification and periodic refresher training with de-certification resulting when the requirements are not met. Within 180 days of the MOA, the CPD was required to certify all in-house canine trainers.

### **2. Status**

There was nothing to report during this quarter.

### **3. Assessment**

The Monitor Team will be observing canine training in the first quarter of 2006 and will assess compliance in our next Report.

**E. Scenario Based Training [MOA ¶ 85]**

**1. Requirements**

The CPD is required to ensure that training instructors and supervisors engage recruits and officers in meaningful dialogue regarding particular scenarios, preferably taken from actual incidents involving CPD officers. The goal is to educate the officers regarding legal and tactical issues raised by the scenarios.

**2. Status**

The Training Academy staff continues to routinely develop and provide new scenarios for Roll Call training, many of which are based on actual CPD incidents. A master calendar (schedule) for roll call training is provided so that shift supervisors are aware of who is responsible for presenting and discussing the topics. The scenarios utilized this quarter included cases involving the use of force and search and seizure matters. The use-of-force incident was one based on an actual CPD matter (scenario 2005-09). The search and seizure cases were based on contemporary case decisions.

**3. Assessment**

The CPD remains in compliance with this provision.

**F. Revised Training Based on Review of Civil Lawsuits Pertaining to Officer Misconduct [MOA ¶ 86]**

**1. Requirements**

The MOA requires that the CPD periodically meet with the Solicitor's Office to glean information from the conclusion of civil lawsuits alleging officer misconduct with the purpose of using the information to develop or revise training. This requirement is related to Paragraph 85.

**2. Status**

The quarterly meeting of the City Solicitor's office and the CPD was held on August 25, 2005, and covered litigation involving several termination cases and the status of these cases. There was no change in all but one of these and the City decided not to appeal the decision in the one case where an employee was reinstated and awarded back pay. The meeting that was scheduled for December will be reviewed in the next report, as those minutes were not yet available.

### **3. Assessment**

The CPD is in compliance with this requirement.

## **G. Orientation to the MOA [MOA ¶87]**

### **1. Requirements**

The MOA requires the City and the CPD to:

- Provide copies of the MOA and explain it to all CPD and relevant City employees
- Provide training for employees affected by the MOA within 120 days of each provision's implementation
- Continue to provide training to meet this requirement during subsequent in-service training

### **2. Status**

There is nothing new to report this quarter.

### **3. Assessment**

The City remains in compliance with this provision.

## **H. FTO Program [MOA ¶88-89]**

### **1. Requirements**

The MOA requires the CPD to develop a protocol to enhance the FTO program to include:

- The criteria and method for selecting FTOs
- Setting standards that require appropriate assessment of an officer's past complaint and disciplinary history prior to selection
- Procedures for reappointment and termination of FTOs at the Training Academy Director's discretion
- Reviewing FTOs at least bi-annually with recertification dependent on satisfactory prior performance and feedback from the Training Academy

## **2. Status**

Because of promotions that occurred this quarter the supervision of the FTO program is currently in transition. Sgt. Tom Tanner has been selected as the interim FTO program coordinator until personnel vacancies at the Academy are filled and new duties are assigned. The scheduling of the next bi-annual recertification of the FTOs will be determined in the next quarter.

## **3. Assessment**

The CPD remains in compliance with this provision.

### **I. Firearms Training [MOA ¶¶ 90-91]**

#### **1. Requirements**

The MOA requires all CPD sworn personnel to complete mandatory annual re-qualification firearms training to include satisfactorily completing all re-qualification courses and achieving a passing score on the target shooting trials, professional night training and stress training to prepare for real-life scenarios. The CPD is required to revoke the police powers of those officers who do not satisfactorily complete the re-certification.

The MOA also requires firearms instructors to critically observe students and provide corrective instruction regarding deficient firearm techniques and failure to utilize safe gun handling procedures at all times. The CPD is required to create and implement an evaluation criteria checklist to determine satisfactory completion of recruit and in-service firearms training. For each student, the firearms instructors will complete and sign a checklist verifying satisfactory review of the evaluation criteria.

#### **2. Status**

Annual firearms qualifications were conducted throughout this quarter and this was completed in December.

#### **3. Assessment**

The CPD remains in compliance with the provisions in ¶¶ 90-91 of the MOA.

## **CHAPTER THREE. COLLABORATIVE AGREEMENT**

### **I. Implementation of CPOP [CA ¶29]**

Problem solving is at the center of the Collaborative Agreement, and each CA requirement is a building block in shaping a police agency into a community problem-oriented policing (CPOP) organization. As noted in paragraph 16 of the CA: “The City of Cincinnati, the plaintiffs and the FOP, shall adopt problem solving as the principal strategy for addressing crime and disorder problems.” This fundamental approach grew from a jointly signed Agreement that seeks a positive, collaborative path for Cincinnatians towards improved police-community relations, organized around more effective policing. Progress on CPOP and Cincinnati Police Department reform is reported below.

#### **1. Requirement 29(a)**

The City, in consultation with the Parties, shall develop and implement a plan to coordinate the work of City departments in the delivery of services under CPOP.

#### **2. Status**

In the second quarter of 2003, the Parties formally adopted a CPOP coordination plan, entitled the “City of Cincinnati Plan for Community Problem-Oriented Policing.” Since then, liaisons from the Departments of Buildings and Inspections, Public Services, Community Development and Planning and Health, Parks and Recreation, Fire, Water Works, and Metropolitan Sewer District received training on their roles and responsibilities as resources to the Problem Coordinators (the CPD member or Partnering Center outreach worker assigned to a CPOP team).

In February 2005, the Parties met and agreed upon a final definition for CPOP. In the spring of 2005, the Parties stated that they believe the CPOP definition will “inform an updated structure for the City department participation in CPOP.” Also in the spring, the City’s Code Enforcement Task Force developed and distributed to CPD employees and community leaders a Citizen’s Guide to Community Action: Addressing Nuisance Complaints and Neighborhood Blight, an extremely good example of the value that coordinated city services can bring to addressing specific types of community problems that cross city agency boundaries.

In June 2005, the City outlined a revised structure for accessing City department resources to support CPOP. The Neighborhood Code Enforcement Response Teams (NCERT) will serve as a primary way to access city department resources to support CPOP. Teams will serve as self directed work units consisting of one representative from each of the following Departments:

Buildings and Inspections, Health, Police, and Fire, with support on an as-needed basis by Law. NCERT Teams, facilitated by Neighborhood sergeants, will address the most serious safety code violations and provide access to city department resources to support CPOP.

In September, 2005, the City Manager expanded the role of S. Gregory Baker, Manager of Police Relations to include coordination of citywide implementation of CPOP. The City also noted that its Service Tracking System (Customer Service Response, or CSR) will be a separate system from the CPOP database tracking system. CSR will be linked to CPOP, to expand access for data entry to other city departments. The link will also provide CPOP users the ability to view CSR service requests and actions taken in the CPOP window interface. In the summer and early fall, COP officers, their sergeants, the Partnering Center and the Plaintiffs were briefed about the capabilities the new system will have.

This quarter, lieutenants and captains were being trained in the new tracking system as well. The Cincinnati Area Geographic Information System (CAGIS) continues its work on the system and is arranging linkages with Health, Fire, and Buildings and Inspections databases. The City reports that “once all departments are online with accessibility to CSR and the CPOP/SARA application, documentation of multi-departmental problem solving will be realized. Detailed workflows between all of the departments can then be tracked online.”

Also this quarter, NCERT multi-jurisdictional teams were relied upon in five of District One’s projects:

1. The Vine Street Lab Project
2. 1300 Walnut Street (assisted with problem identification)
3. 1519 Republic Street
4. 1010 York Street
5. 547 Findlay Street (clean up project)

### **3. Assessment**

The Monitor believes that the new, separate city service tracking system (CSR) is a benefit to police and citizen problem solvers, and the link that will be established between the revised CPOP tracking system and the CSR can facilitate interagency collaboration. We look forward to seeing the system on line.<sup>7</sup>

As we noted in prior Reports, the Monitor’s assessment of compliance requires documentation of the City’s implementation of its coordination plan.

---

<sup>7</sup> We report on improvements proposed to the CPOP tracking system in 29(m).

This can include the number of agencies involved, the range of City services provided, the number of projects with interagency cooperation (including the work of the Neighborhood Code Enforcement Response Teams), and whether the intervention assisted in reducing the problem. To determine compliance, the Monitor will evaluate the information in the CPD's revised CPOP tracking system (on which we report more fully in 29(m)), which should be used to better track the involvement and effectiveness of inter-agency collaboration, including the number of agencies involved, the range of City services provided, the number of projects with interagency cooperation, and whether the intervention assisted in reducing the problem.

Based on a review of the CA Status Report, the Monitor finds that the City is in partial compliance.

### **1. Requirement 29(b)**

The Parties will develop a system for regularly researching and making publicly available a comprehensive library of best practices related to CPOP.

### **2. Status**

The CPOP website now links to over 50 different publications about crime, disorder, partnerships, problem-solving, and community policing under a “problem-oriented policing best practices” tab. In addition, the website contains links to more than 40 problem-oriented guides for police on specific crime and safety problems,<sup>8</sup> as well as evaluations of specific responses to crime. The website also links to the Partnering Center brochure,<sup>9</sup> which provides information about the Center, about CPOP and about problem-solving and the SARA model.

The Partnering Center provided links for the new publications to the Hamilton County Public Library for inclusion in that part of the County Library website devoted to CPOP, <http://www.cincinnati.org/cpop/>, so residents have resources in countering crime. Partnering Center staff direct residents to these resources.

The ‘Best Practices’ contents are now organized into categories making it easier to find specific resources:

- crime prevention
- problem-oriented policing – general
- community building

---

<sup>8</sup> The main CPD website (<http://www.cincinnati-oh.gov/police/pages/-5072-/>) indicates that there are only about 19 problem-oriented policing guides, although there are approximately 40.

<sup>9</sup> <http://cagisperm.hamilton-co.org/cpop/documents/CPPCbrochure%20color.pdf>

- crime prevention through environmental design
- school safety
- crime analysis and mapping
- crime reporting
- youth violence and prevention
- community surveying
- community oriented policing
- gun violence reduction
- POP – crime/problem specific

As of yet, the CPD has not adopted the Monitor’s recommendation that it post the best practices library on the Department’s main website, not just the CPOP website. While the CPOP website is accessible to all officers, as stated by the CPD, we believe the best practices library will be used more frequently by officers if it is posted directly on the CPD website.

### **3. Assessment**

Again, the Monitor compliments the Parties for their collaboration on a comprehensive library. The CPOP library may be the most comprehensive web library on a police department website. With the work of the Parties and the Partnering Center in developing the virtual best practices library and making these publications available in hard copy through the Hamilton County Library, the Monitor finds the Parties to be in compliance with CA ¶29(b). The Parties have been in compliance with this section for six consecutive quarters.

As we have noted in prior reports, section 29(b) is also related to sections 29 (c) and (d). We believe that compliance for 29(c) and 29(d) will require training within the CPD of some of the 29(b) best practices, as well as their use in crime reduction efforts. Towards that end, we recommend that the CPD broaden dissemination of the best practices library to all officers, not just CPOP officers (adding it to the CPD’s website is one way to do this).

#### **1. Requirement 29(c)**

The City, in consultation with the Parties shall:

- Develop a continuous learning process through the CPD
- Document and disseminate experiences with problem-solving efforts in the field throughout the CPD
- Make available to the public experiences with problem-solving efforts

- Emphasize problem-solving in (but not limited to) academy training, in-service training, and field officer training

## **2. Status**

Each of the elements of this section is discussed below.

Continuous Learning Process in the CPD: In January 2005, the CPD included a 50-minute CPOP training presentation in the Department's annual management training. In late May and early June, the CPD, the Partnering Center, and the Regional Community Policing Institute jointly presented CPOP training for new sergeants and FTOs. The training included information about the following:

- the Collaborative Agreement (CA) and the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)
- the Department's collaboration with the Community Police Partnering Center (Partnering Center)
- the SARA model and how it is incorporated by the Department in problem solving efforts
- access and utilization of the CPOP website
- practical examples of CPOP projects
- the proactive role of sergeants and FTOs in this new style of policing

The training curriculum used is comprehensive, it contains a number of scenarios for the supervisors and FTOs to discuss, details about the CA and MOA, and information about resources that are available to supervise/manage CPOP efforts (POP guides, scenario role-plays, CPOP website, etc.).

Last quarter, the Partnering Center and the CPD co-presented training for COP officers and supervisors on citywide integration of CPOP, work flow, City Watcher, and the revised CPOP tracking system. This quarter, Mr. S. Gregory Baker and Lt. Col. Cindy Combs updated the CPD's non-sworn members about the Collaborative and MOA Agreements. Also, new supervisors' training included segments about CPOP, problem solving, and the CCA. The FOP suggests that the CPD develop a video about CPOP so that all sworn members will have the same training. They suggest a five minute video about CPOP be presented to all sworn members.

Experiences with problem-solving efforts in the field will be documented and disseminated throughout the CPD: During the last eight months, the CPOP tracking system, the system the CPD uses to document its CPOP efforts, has been under revision. The new system is partially operational this quarter.

The CPOP efforts from the old tracking system have been transferred to the new system and some have been updated because the new system requires more information about projects than the prior system.

The CPD stated that it would develop one roll call training a month devoted to problem-solving. Last quarter, the CPD issued its first problem-solving roll call training bulletin describing a drug market reduction effort on a bridge in Kennedy Heights, which we reported on in our October 2005 Monitor Report. This quarter, no additional roll call trainings were developed; however, the Police Relations Sections reports that it continues to work with Police Academy staff on future efforts.

Experiences with problem-solving efforts in the field shall be made available to the public: The revised tracking system is on-line this quarter; it is designed to contain more precise descriptions of crime/safety problems, some of the CPOP efforts contain a bit more detail and the public has access to these through the CPOP website. (See section 29(m) for more details.)

Problem solving will continue to be emphasized in (but not be limited to) academy training, in-service training, and field officer training: In the spring of 2005, the Partnering Center offered a 2-day training about problem-oriented policing, crime prevention through environmental design, and situational crime prevention. Sixteen CPD officers attended. In October 2005, the CPD sent 13 officers to the International Problem-Oriented Policing Conference in Charlotte; the officers reported back with positive comments about the conference. Partnering Center staff also attended the conference. Also this quarter, the Partnering Center arranged for two segments of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design training for staff, CPD, and citizens. Thirty-five people attended: 15 designated by the Partnering Center, ten citizens, and ten from the CPD.

### **3. Assessment**

The Monitor applauds the training efforts made in 2005. It represents an increase in commitment to training around CPOP. We believe that the training undertaken in the last three quarters is a good first step towards introducing Department employees to CPOP, including non-sworn employees as well as new sworn supervisors. We believe the CA requires the CPD to prepare and schedule additional training opportunities for its employees, particularly officers not in COP units, to emphasize the CPD's commitment to CPOP as the principal policing strategy of the CPD, and train these officers in working on specific, documented crime, disorder, and safety problems beyond answering calls for service or handling cases. Expectations for involvement should be clear and ultimately supported by the performance appraisal system.

The FOP suggests a five minute video about CPOP so all officers receive consistent information about CPOP. The Monitor concurs with this suggestion. A short video can provide Chief Streicher an important vehicle for voicing commitment to addressing crime, disorder and other safety problems through problem-solving and sharing it with Department personnel as part of a larger training curriculum.

We recognize that training the entire Department is time-consuming given the size of the Department. We suggest the CPD begin planning for it, blocking off the training calendar and developing the training that will help CPD move from a special unit approach to CPOP to department-wide responsibility for tackling crime and other public safety problems through problem solving. While the CPD states that all officers received problem solving training in the Academy, and CPOP training during the 2005 in service training, in discussions with CPD personnel, there were some who did not recall having had problem solving training, and others who remembered some training only when they were in the Academy. Interest in engaging in problem solving appeared to flow from self-initiative: those who were interested in it looked at problems, including problem locations; others did not. We believe the CPD leadership should send a clear message about its expectations and accompany it with training around problem solving and the resources for supporting problem solving.

With respect to documenting and disseminating problem solving experiences in the field throughout the CPD, we stated in our October 2005 Monitor Report that the roll call bulletin is an excellent start, but it is not sufficient by itself to meet compliance. Last quarter we noted that since the bulletin will only be used one day, the CPD must quickly pick up the pace of documenting and disseminating problem solving experiences. This quarter, no additional roll call bulletins were used. Also, we stated that similar write-ups of other problem-solving efforts that have undergone some evaluation can be disseminated in other ways, for example through the Blue Wave, the Department's new newsletter, or in Staff Notes, which go out to all Department employees. If problem-solving efforts undertaken by the CPD have not yet been evaluated, then CPD can draw on problem-solving efforts from other departments and share them as a basis of discussion among officers and units about types of problem solving CPD employees can undertake. We hope that by the end of next quarter the CPD will disseminate several problem-solving write-ups.

As for public accessibility of problem-solving efforts, the CPD's problem-solving descriptions remain accessible to the public via internet on the CPOP website. As mentioned earlier, the problem-solving descriptions contained in the CPOP website tracking system have migrated to the new system and some have been updated with additional details. The CPD is in compliance with the public dissemination requirement of this subsection.

Concerning the emphasis on problem solving throughout the CPD, some additional training has occurred and we hope to see a ramping up of the inclusion of CPOP in many more of the training sessions the CPD presents. The CA requires that problem solving be emphasized in Academy training, in service training and field officer training. Comprehensive training that shifts problem solving from a special unit responsibility to department-wide responsibility will put the CPD in compliance. To date, however, the CPD is not in compliance with this subsection requirement. The roll call training should supplement, but not supplant more intensive training that covers the fundamentals of problem solving and the role each person in the organization has in it and the types of accountability that will support the system.

In earlier Reports, we noted that 29(b), (c), and (d) are linked. These and other CA sections are meant as ways to facilitate the adoption of problem solving as the CPD's principal strategy to reduce crime and disorder in Cincinnati. We have found the Parties in compliance with the public dissemination requirements under 29(b) and (c). However, because problem solving is to be adopted as the "principal strategy for addressing crime and disorder problems," the portions of 29(c) and (d) that deal with training and dissemination within the Department require greater efforts, as they are meant as a way to effectuate significant change in the organization. We have determined that the City is in partial compliance with the requirements of 29(c) for training and dissemination to CPD members.

Currently, of the four subparts to this subparagraph, the Parties are in compliance with the public dissemination requirement. Progress on the other elements of this CA section is required. The Parties are in partial compliance with this section of the CA.

### **1. Requirement 29(d)**

The Parties will research information about how problem solving is conducted in other police agencies and disseminate research and best practices on successful and unsuccessful methods for tackling problems. The Parties will also disseminate information on analogous problem-solving processes used by other professions.

### **2. Status**

In the spring, the Partnering Center disseminated research about a particular crime problem, providing the Parties with a synopsis of the elements of effective community youth gun violence prevention strategies and an overview of effective youth gun violence initiatives in three cities: Boston, Richmond (CA), and Minneapolis-St. Paul, as reported in *Promising Strategies to Reduce Youth Gun Violence*, published by the Office of Juvenile Justice and

Delinquency Prevention. Over the summer, the Partnering Center provided additional material related to violence and violence reduction. These are now included on the CPOP website.

Last quarter, the CPD stated that the revised CPOP tracking system will offer additional opportunities for officers to examine research on crime/safety problems. The new system contains a query asking the officer: What guidelines (manuals, problem-solving examples, etc.) were used? Next to the query is a box entitled: Give specifics. In addition, a tool on the side bar within the Tracking System is a clickable icon that leads users to problem-solving material that can be reviewed to aid an officer in tackling crime/safety problems. In several of the more recent CPOP efforts, officers have clicked boxes indicating they have looked at research and written resources; however, the officers do not specify which materials they looked at and whether they were helpful. At least one officer, in a Crest Hill project, clearly used CPTED principles in reducing drug sales in an apartment building.

Also of note this quarter, the Ohio Service for Crime Opportunity Reduction, a collaborative with the University of Cincinnati, issued four reports containing its analysis of seven drug markets in four Cincinnati neighborhoods (along with possible interventions), an evaluation of a student crime prevention awareness project, and a report containing recommendations for constructing a citywide drug market reduction approach:

- Open-Air Drug Dealing in Cincinnati, Ohio: Executive Summary and Final Recommendations at [www.uc.edu/OSCOR/FINAL%20RECOMMENDATIONS.pdf](http://www.uc.edu/OSCOR/FINAL%20RECOMMENDATIONS.pdf)
- Avondale Crime Reduction Project at [www.uc.edu/OSCOR/AVONDALE.pdf](http://www.uc.edu/OSCOR/AVONDALE.pdf)
- Evanston Crime Reduction Project at [www.uc.edu/OSCOR/EVANSTON.pdf](http://www.uc.edu/OSCOR/EVANSTON.pdf)
- Pendleton Crime Reduction Project at [www.uc.edu/OSCOR/PENDLETON.pdf](http://www.uc.edu/OSCOR/PENDLETON.pdf)
- West Price Hill Crime Reduction Project at [www.uc.edu/OSCOR/W%20PRICE%20HILL.pdf](http://www.uc.edu/OSCOR/W%20PRICE%20HILL.pdf)
- University Student Crime Prevention Awareness Project Evaluation at [www.uc.edu/OSCOR/FINAL%20REPORT%20CRIME%20PREVENTION%20AWARENESS%20PROJECT.pdf](http://www.uc.edu/OSCOR/FINAL%20REPORT%20CRIME%20PREVENTION%20AWARENESS%20PROJECT.pdf)

### **3. Assessment**

Over the last several months we have seen improvements in the availability of research from which the CPD can devise countermeasures to crime. We noted in our June 2005 Report that the sharing of gun violence reduction strategies is an excellent start. We also hope that the revised CPOP tracking system will increase the use of crime reduction research, manuals and guides when police undertake a project. We believe the new system holds great promise. If officers identify more specifically the information that they reviewed and what they learned, we believe it will help the CPD to determine if training is needed in using problem-solving/best practice resources in reducing safety problems.

The OSCOR-generated reports from the University of Cincinnati are excellent research products. Five reports focus on drug markets. One of the five reports offers a citywide, comprehensive approach to drug market reduction, and the other four contain an analysis of seven separate drug markets within four Cincinnati neighborhoods. These drug market reports provide ample information to begin more strategic attacks on the markets and should be disseminated, if they have not been already, to District Commanders, Violent Crimes Task Force, Street Corner Narcotics, the Partnering Center, and CPOP teams for follow-up. The citywide OSCOR report lays out the “basic elements of successful approaches used in other cities:”

- long-term commitment
- measurable objectives
- comprehensive approaches
- accountability
- publicity
- on-going evaluations, and
- strategy maintenance

This framework shows that turning crime problems around requires intentional, planned, consistent efforts. The research reports contain the beginning analysis of these drug markets (specific analysis of the dealers and the buyers from arrest data was not available), along with information about the different types of interventions that have had positive effects on markets (48 different interventions are listed).

The seven drug markets studied generated over 3,000 calls for service to police in 2004. Although each of the markets is different, patterns were identified across markets concerning: types of drugs; dates/times of market operation; territorial behavior among dealers; methods of communication between market players; demographics of dealers, lookouts, and buyers; access to arterial routes; and the presence of nearby convenience stores.

These reports offer highly specific research which the City can use to reduce drug markets.

In addition, the citywide report shows how a comprehensive approach to closing drug markets across Cincinnati is achievable. One of the recommendations made is that CPD identify how many drug markets there are in Cincinnati:

- How many open-air drug markets are currently operating in Cincinnati?
- What is the precise location of each market? (Multiple sources of data should be used to identify discrete markets. Potential sources of information are calls for service, narcotic arrest information, and resident surveys. After the markets are located, the following site-specific questions should be asked to help develop responses)
- Who are the dealers/buyers and where do they live?
- What environmental features make this location attractive to dealers/buyers?
- What interventions have been or are currently being used to disrupt this drug market?
- Once identified, is there evidence to suggest that these interventions have or have not been successful?
- What other crimes that occur in this location are related to drug market activities (e.g., loitering, theft from vehicles, homicide)?

In discussions with CPD staff during our last Monitor visit, we heard widely different estimates of the number of open-air drug markets in Cincinnati. We believe that part of the adoption of problem-solving by the CPD is to use it to find out more about one of Cincinnati's major generators of crime and violence, its open-air drug markets. Some staff also suggested that the police should do sweeps at the drug markets and then the Partnering Center should come in and stabilize the area. This is unrealistic on several fronts. Sweeps without analysis will not be enough of an intervention in entrenched markets to begin stabilization efforts. Drug markets require more sustained solutions from police departments than sweeps, and an analysis of a drug market, as shown in the OSCOR reports, provides the beginnings of what is needed to see which interventions are most suited to each market.

As we noted in the prior quarter's Report, the following developments would demonstrate compliance with 29(d): research is used in problem solving projects (see 29(b)); projects apply situational crime prevention if appropriate (the CA specifically mentions situational crime prevention); projects that are on POP Guide topics show awareness of the guide and its elements; research is

used in crime reduction and traffic problem reduction efforts; best practice knowledge is used as a skills measure in the performance evaluations.

The Parties are in partial compliance with this provision.

### **1. Requirement 29(e)**

The Parties, through the Community Police Partnering Center, will conduct CPOP training for the community and jointly promote CPOP.

### **2. Status**

During the summer and early fall, 2005, the Parties engaged in several efforts to promote CPOP. Partnering Center staff used the media for outreach around CPOP, hosting a two-hour show on Cincinnati's WDBZ, 1230 AM – "The Buzz" on August 6 (live broadcast from the College Hill Festival which included members of the College Hill Forum, Citizens on Patrol, and the principal of Aiken High School), August 19 (live broadcast from the Jay Street Market event in Avondale), and August 27 (in-studio discussion featuring the role of the CCA and the ACLU in the Collaborative Agreement).

During the last quarter, the Partnering Center and CPD staff provided 18 basic SARA trainings,<sup>10</sup> 15 trainings to developing CPOP Teams, and 22 trainings to active CPOP teams. The CPD and the Partnering Center also sponsored other problem-specific training last quarter including: Court Watch Training and Landlord and Crime Prevention Training. The Friends of the Collaborative sponsored training as well; as part of it the Cincinnati-Hamilton County Community Action Agency hosted social services professionals for an educational session on CPOP.

Last quarter, as well, the Parties agreed to a joint statement promoting CPOP and emphasizing their commitment to CPOP. As stated by the Parties: "We believe the application of the problem-solving method used in Community Problem Oriented Policing offers the greatest hope of creating a strong and lasting Community/Police partnership that will result in safer neighborhoods."

This quarter, the Partnering Center held several "issue-specific" trainings and trained stakeholders new to CPOP in basic SARA methodology. Outreach continued in several neighborhoods to enlist residents to participate in CPOP efforts. The following list highlights the CPD/Partnering Center's training efforts:

---

<sup>10</sup> Four of the trainings this quarter were for basic SARA training in the communities of Corryville, Hartwell, Bond Hill and Walnut Hills.

- Court Watch Training
  - Partnering Center staff member, Valerie Brown-Green, coordinated with Terry Cosgrove of the Law Department and presented information on October 13, 2005, to eleven Millvale citizens.
  
- Corryville Student Police Academy
  - The Friars Club/Corryville Family Resource Center (CFRC) sponsors this event designed to build relationships between urban teens and police. The Partnering Center and the CPD's Training Section participated in this event on September 17, 2005.
  
  - The day-long event included:
    - A presentation by Hamilton County Coroner, Dr. Odell Owens
    - An anti-gang and anti-drug presentation/discussion
    - A role-play and discussion about what to do if stopped by the police
    - A discussion about the importance of education and career opportunities
  
  - The Partnering Center staff conducted a survey of participating youth. The focus of the survey was on their perception of crime and safety at school, home, in Corryville, and in Cincinnati. The results of the surveys have since been analyzed and a report has been completed by the Partnering Center's analyst.
  
- Hispanic Community Resources Training
  - A Partnering Center outreach worker and a CPD District Three sergeant hosted the training for Hispanic residents. The event was held at Holy Family School in Price Hill on September 17, 2005.
  
  - The focus of the training was to provide resources to the Hispanic community such as:
    - What to do if stopped by the police
    - How to decrease the risks of becoming a victim of crime
    - How to recognize and avoid scams involving prostitutes
  
  - Thirteen residents, representing various Latin American countries, attended the event. Participants, who ranged in age and gender, were receptive to the information. Some said that more people would have come but were "unsure of the motives of the police department." However, participants also stated that they felt comfortable, found the session to be helpful and informative, and would bring others to any subsequent training.

- Based on the specific feedback, there are plans to provide follow-up training.
- Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)
  - Four day training for police, citizens, and Partnering Center staff was organized and funded by the Partnering Center. The first two sessions were held on October 5 and 6, 2005 and the second sessions were held November 22 and 23, 2005. The training was held at the Tri-State Regional Community Policing Institute (RCPI). Internationally known CPTED experts, Greg Saville and Anna Brassard, facilitated the training. The training is designed to teach participants how to minimize opportunities for crime that may be facilitated by the design of buildings, neighborhoods, and public spaces.
  - Participants broke into teams of a police officer, a Partnering Center staff member, and a citizen to work on a CPTED project. In an effort to “learn by doing,” members apply learned principles to real world situations. Teams presented their CPTED projects during the November session. Thirty-five people attended the CPTED training, including ten from the CPD and nine citizens.

As of October 2005, the Partnering Center outreach workers have been engaged in 36 neighborhoods with active or developing CPOP efforts.<sup>11</sup>

- Active 19<sup>12</sup>
- Developing 17<sup>13</sup>

### **3. Assessment**

The Partnering Center and the CPD participated in, helped with, or co-hosted a number of trainings this quarter. The training provided around specific crime/disorder problems and tactics is an example of the creativity that problem solving can lead to when used regularly. We applaud the efforts underway and look forward to seeing additional training of this type, as well as continued progress in training community members in CPOP. These joint endeavors hold great potential for the success of the CA.

---

<sup>11</sup> “Active” status indicates that a CPOP team has identified a problem, submitted the appropriate paperwork to the District, and is in the process of a working through the SARA process to address the problem.

<sup>12</sup> This includes the *25 Cities Initiative* work in three neighborhoods: Kennedy Heights, Lower Price Hill, and Madisonville

<sup>13</sup> Six neighborhoods (Corryville, CUF, East End, Hartwell, Millvale, and OTR) are either in the process or likely to transition to active status this year.

The Parties are in compliance with this section of the CA.

### **1. Requirement 29(f)**

The Parties shall coordinate efforts through the Community Police Partnering Center to establish ongoing community dialogue and structured involvement by the CPD with segments of the community, including youth, property owners, businesses, tenants, community and faith-based organizations, motorists, low income residents, and other city residents on the purposes and practices of CPOP.

### **2. Status**

In the spring of 2005, the Parties participated in (and a Monitoring Team member observed) a community forum on Taser use. The forum was held to provide information about CPD Taser policies and practices, and address community concerns about their use.

Last quarter, the Partnering Center continued to host the “The Buzz” radio program once a month, with the July program focused on Tasers and the August program featuring the Executive Director of the CCA. Also, the Partnering Center and the Police Academy held a Corryville “Student Police Academy” on September 10 and 17, 2005. As well, the Plaintiffs staffed a booth at the annual Black Family Reunion at Sawyer Point, providing another opportunity to update members of the class about CA and MOA progress.

This quarter, the Parties organized a community meeting for RAND’s researchers to meet with community leaders about RAND’s work on the Evaluation Protocol.

### **3. Assessment**

The Parties are in partial compliance with this section of the CA. Full compliance with this provision would entail a plan for structured dialogue, joint promotion of events and a review of the feedback from those events. It would also demonstrate compliance if the Parties scheduled follow-up meetings, and reported on the outcomes of the discussions and meetings, descriptions of areas of agreement and disagreement in the dialogue, and next steps.

### **1. Requirement 29(g)**

The Parties shall establish an annual award recognizing CPOP efforts of citizens, police, and other public officials.

## **2. Status**

In February 2005, the Parties announced a CPOP awards process. Last spring, the Partnering Center's community analyst reviewed CPOP project data (calls for service, citizen surveys, environmental surveys) to check post-project data against project baseline data to identify CPOP teams whose projects appear to have had the greatest impact. They were encouraged to submit award applications. The Partnering Center budgeted \$10,000 to support the awards program, and Partnering Center Board President Herb Brown and Board Member Don Hardin, an attorney for the Fraternal Order of Police, pledged additional financial support towards the awards. The Parties identified five award categories, developed judging guidelines, created a selection committee, and distributed application packets in the community.

On October 27, the Partnering Center held the first annual CPOP Awards ceremony at the Cintas Center at Xavier University. The event was well-attended by police and community members and emceed by a local television celebrity exuberant about the joint efforts undertaken in tackling crime. The following awards were earned:

### **Outstanding Community Efforts in CPOP**

- Lower Price Hill CPOP Team
- Pleasant Ridge Safety and Quality of Life Committee
- Northside CPOP Team

### **Outstanding Individual Contribution in CPOP**

- I. Police
  - a. Sergeant Maris Herold
  - b. Officer LaDon Laney
  - c. Officer Terry Windeler
- II. Individual
  - a. Ben Pipkin, Kennedy Heights
  - b. Amos Robinson and Dorothy Harris, College Hill
  - c. Tori Houlihan and Dave Henry, Northside
- III. Organizations
  - a. Tender Mercies, Over-the-Rhine
  - b. Santa Maria, Lower Price Hill
  - c. District Four Neighborhood Unit

### **CPOP Partnering Award**

- Northside CPOP Team

### **CPOP Innovation Award**

- Kennedy Heights CPOP Team, "Bridge Bumps"

### **Comprehensive CPOP Initiative Award**

- Madisonville CPOP Team

### **Special Recognition for CPOP Efforts**

- Evanston CPOP Team
- Officer Steve Ventre, District Three
- Police Specialist Terry Cox, District Three
- Prencis Wilson, Madisonville

### **Friends of the Collaborative Awards**

- Community Action Commission
- Women's City Club
- Regional Community Policing Institute

The Parties reported,

“Winners were featured on the October 29, 2005 radio show, ‘The Buzz’, WDBZ 1230 AM. Several people called in to comment on how much they enjoyed the CPOP Banquet. Since the event, the CPPC has received numerous comments, emails, and phone calls from citizens, police officers, and agency representatives sharing their appreciation of the work put into the event by the CPPC and the Parties to the CA.”

Descriptions of the award winning efforts are in Appendix 4.

### **3. Assessment**

The Monitor Team attended the Awards Ceremony. The Parties all attended, including the Chief of Police, the President of the FOP, and dozens of CPD members. The Awards Ceremony was inspirational and showed the rewards of the Collaborative Agreement, fair and equitable treatment of all, crime reduction, and increased trust. The Parties are in compliance with this CA provision.

#### **1. Requirement 29(h)**

The City, in consultation with the Parties, shall develop and implement a communications system for informing the public about police policies and procedures. In addition, the City will conduct a communications audit and develop and implement a plan for improved internal and external communications. The National Conference for Community and Justice (NCCJ) will fund the communications audit.

## 2. Status

This CA section has two parts: (1) informing the public about CPD policies and procedures, and (2) conducting a communications audit and developing and implementing a plan for improving internal and external communications. With respect to the first, CPD policies and procedures are accessible from the City website. With respect to the second, the communications audit was conducted in 2002.

In December 2004, the CPD accepted (and the City Council approved) the NCCJ's offer of a "loaned executive" to help the CPD implement aspects of the communications audit. The loaned executive would serve as the CPD's Community Relations Coordinator and become the primary liaison between the CPD and the community for purposes of implementing portions of the communications audit.

The City has formed a communications council comprised of representatives from the CPD, the NCCJ, and Hollister, Trubow and Associates (HT&A), and has posted a job description for the Community Relations Coordinator. In the interim, HT&A began a number of tasks that the Community Relations Coordinator will eventually assume. The scope of services to be implemented by the coordinator serves as the CPD's communications plan.

Pending the addition of the coordinator, several components of the plan have been started with the help of HT&A:

- In July 2005, the CPD implemented a new design for the weekly Staff Notes
- In August 2005, the first edition of *The Blue Wave* newsletter arrived in the homes of officers, civilians, retirees, and their families. A second edition of the *Blue Wave* was issued this fall (containing an article supportive of Tasers as well as an article about COP Officer Princess Davis)
- HT&A continues to develop "good news" and informational news stories for the local and neighborhood newspapers, including the Cincinnati Herald.
- A document entitled *A Report to the Community* from Chief Streicher is being drafted and will be included with the Cincinnati Enquirer.

### **3. Assessment**

The CPD's policies and procedures remain accessible and available to the public on the CPD's website, <http://www.cincinnati-oh.gov/cpd>. The City is in compliance with this part of paragraph 29(h). There is also a link in the City's CPOP website (<http://cagisperm.hamilton-co.org/cpop/>) to the CPD's procedure manual. The link provides access to community members who are engaged with the police through CPOP involvement. We believe that this sends a signal to the Cincinnati public of an increased willingness to create more transparent police operations, which is essential to building trust in the community.

Concerning the second part of this CA section, the City conducted a communications audit and has developed a plan for improved communications based on the scope of services developed for the community relations coordinator. The CPD is in compliance with this CA provision.

#### **1. Requirement 29(i)**

The CPD will create and staff a Community Relations Office to coordinate the CPD's CA implementation.

#### **2. Status**

The CPD created a Community Relations Unit (CRU) in 2003. The CRU is a division of the Police Relations Section. In the fall of 2004, the CPD assigned an officer to the CRU to assist with the implementation and reporting requirements of the Agreement. She is also tasked with redefining the CPD's quarterly Unit Commander CPOP reporting process, making recommendations about the CPD's current problem tracking system, and assisting with implementing aspects of the communications audit.

### **3. Assessment**

The City is in compliance with this CA requirement.

#### **1. Requirement 29(j)**

The Parties shall describe the current status of problem solving throughout the CPD through an annual report. Each Party shall provide information detailing its contribution to CPOP implementation.

## **2. Status**

In the Annual Report, the Parties are asked to document problem-solving efforts that reflect CPOP training and best practices, specific problem definition, and in-depth analysis, an exploration and range of solutions, and assessment. The Parties should also describe continuous learning by the CPD around problem solving and best practices, and identify problem solving training needs within the CPD and the community.

The CPD submitted its first CPOP Annual Report in September 2003. The Parties submitted the next CPOP Annual Report in September 2004. Milestones documented in the 2004 Report included the establishment of the Community Police Partnering Center, the development of joint CPOP training delivered by the CPD and the Partnering Center, and delivery of training to numerous Cincinnati communities.

The Parties' 2005 annual report was issued in October 2005. The Annual Report describes in important detail a number of active CPOP Team projects, including an assessment of their results.

## **3. Assessment**

This year's Annual Report documents the progress the Parties achieved individually and collaboratively. The efforts undertaken this year are the result of significant hard work. They reflect tremendous success and can be a source of inspiration for Cincinnatians. We believe that the Annual Report offers the citizens of Cincinnati proof that change is not only possible, but an effective way to increase the level of trust and crime reduction skills of both citizens and the police. The Parties are in compliance with 29(j).

### **1. Requirement 29(k)**

The CPD District Commanders and Special Unit Commanders or officials at comparable levels shall prepare quarterly reports detailing problem-solving activities, including specific problems addressed, steps towards their resolution, obstacles faced and recommendations for future improvements.

### **2. Status**

On April 21, 2005, the Parties reached agreement on the definition of problem solving. The Parties agreed that future reporting of problem solving will have the identifying characteristics of (a) problem definition, (b) the analysis of the problem, and (c) the range of alternatives considered. This is memorialized in an ACLU correspondence with the Parties on that date.

Last quarter, all five Districts submitted problem solving reports, including the Downtown Services Unit, which is part of District 1. District 1 submitted six projects, including two from the Downtown Unit. District 2 submitted five projects. District 3 submitted one project, District 4 submitted two, and District 5 submitted five projects. In addition, the Criminal Investigations, Police Communications, Central Vice Control Section and the Traffic Section submitted reports. Also last quarter, the CPD revised its hard copy form for reporting problem solving, Form 560, including some changes suggested by the Parties and the Monitor.

This quarter, all District Commanders submitted reports, as well as Unit Commanders of the Downtown Services Unit, Central Vice (Street Corner), Criminal Investigation (Major Offenders Unit and Personal Crimes), and Special Services Unit (Park Unit, Youth Services, and Traffic Unit).

A number of the projects contained considerably more information about the problem undertaken than prior reports. Highlights include:

- An update on the drug dealing reduction project at 12<sup>th</sup> and Republic, including reference to a process and impact evaluation conducted by the Partnering Center's community analyst. Tender Mercies, located on the affected block, won a CPOP award for its contribution to the project. The project evaluation (contained in a separate section of the Parties' Status Report) shows that there was a reduction in the drug dealing problem at that corner as a result of the interventions.
- An update on drug sales and illegal rooming houses operating at 807, 813, 817, 819, 823, and 825 Dayton Street. The owners have on-again off-again promised compliance, and at several points a nuisance abatement suit was nearly filed. Finally, when the problems continued, the Dayton Street Association hired an attorney and began a community prosecution. A court settlement was finalized on October 7, 2005. It includes 17 points of agreement, and if violated the City can re-file its original claim. The District One Neighborhood Unit can use this approach again if it proves successful.
- An update on the drug dealing and prostitution problem at the vacant lot at 547 Findlay. The elderly, infirm owner was unable to keep dealers and prostitutes off his property. With encouragement, the owner sold the building and the lot to Durable Slate. The lot is now clean and the accompanying building rehabbed. Residents believe that the problem is reduced, and the CPOP Team and Citizens on Patrol believe that the problem is less likely to occur at the location. Seven Hills Neighborhood House staff agreed to conduct a survey to measure impact but budget cuts prevented its completion.

- A write-up of open drug sales, loitering and littering at the five points intersection in Evanston. Responses include extra overtime patrol, arrests, sweeps, staffing of the police substation at the corner, a Family Day event to lessen fear in area, street cleaning, and frequent emptying of trash receptacles. (Although not reported in this write-up of the project, this intersection was the focus of the recent OSCOR report about the drug market there. It provides additional details about the drug market at the location and is viewable at [www.uc.edu/OSCOR/EVANSTON.pdf](http://www.uc.edu/OSCOR/EVANSTON.pdf).)
- A write-up of a crack house at 3221 Price Avenue in East Price Hill. The house had a disproportionate number of calls for service and arrests compared to neighboring areas and most of the calls for service were either drug or vice related. The house was going through foreclosure and neither the deed owner nor the bank holding the deed was responsive to requests to seal the property. The City of Cincinnati declared the building a public nuisance and boarded it up. Police have arrested drug dealers and prostitutes for trespass at the boarded-up property.
- Cincinnati bus company, Queen City Metro, repeatedly complained about cars parking at its bus stop in front of Sayler Park School between 2:00 p.m. and 2:30 p.m. weekdays; parents parked in the bus stop waiting for the children to be released from school. The CPD previously handled this complaint by ticketing the parents, which worked for a short time but generated complaints from the parents. Instead, the neighborhood officer approached Queen City Metro to ask if the bus pick-up time for that stop could be pushed back until 2:35 p.m. when all the parents had left. Queen City Metro agreed.
- A write-up of drug activity at 2355 St. James Avenue, a rent-subsidized apartment building housing the disabled. The police received several complaints that drug dealers were providing drugs to addicts residing in the building in exchange for use of their apartments for the preparing and distribution of drugs. An officer along with the Walnut Hills Safety Committee analyzed calls and crime statistics, which provided a more in-depth perspective about the frequency of the crimes and the effect on the area. The majority of calls showed activity from 5:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m., with an increase in assaults, prostitution, robberies and disorderly conduct. The officer, with the help of the Partnering Center, and the Walnut Hills Safety Committee met with the owner and secured trespassing authority and obtained keys to access the building so officers could conduct walk-throughs. The officer asked for directed patrols and covert intelligence gathering was conducted. While efforts are still

underway, the Violent Crimes Task Force and Street Corner Unit arrested several people, developing information for future indictments.

- Drug use and sales, and sexual activity in open areas at the Rest Inn Hotel. The Hotel, housing the mentally ill as well as sexual offenders, generated approximately 300 calls for service from 2003 until the end of September, 2005. An inter-agency inspection showed many violations resulting in a 30 day comply-and-repair order. An officer checked the property intermittently to see about progress on repairs. At this point, all sex offenders have been removed from the property. A re-inspection of the property is scheduled.
- Central Vice reviewed drug complaints which showed an 11 percent increase year-to-date from last year. Central Vice found that even with a 28 percent increase in felony drug arrests, traditional enforcement had not reduced the number of complaints nor drug activity in the city. Jail overcrowding and a reduction in the number of felony grand jury indictments added to the problem. Vice adopted a focus on buyers (Buyer Beware Program) and proposed an ordinance to civilly impound any vehicle used to facilitate the purchase of drugs. The ordinance, if passed by the City Council, will require a bond payment of \$500.00 to release the vehicle.
- Youth Services brought in traffic engineering to examine congestion problems at pick-up times at the Kilgour School on Edwards Road. Three improvements have substantially reduced the problem: allowing parents to use a playground for extra parking while they await their kids; a no-left-turn at the exit of the lot; and increasing the sequences of the traffic signal at Observatory and Edwards.

### **3. Assessment**

The number of Unit Commander quarterly reports increased again this quarter.<sup>14</sup> The Unit Commander reports submitted were not part of the new CPOP tracking system. This may be because the new system is only loaded on COP computers at this point. These reports contain more detail than those in the CPOP tracking system. A number of the problem-solving reports were more

---

<sup>14</sup> In January 2003, the Monitor advised the City that it would expect quarterly problem-solving reports from special unit officials in Street Corner Narcotics, Vice, Planning, Crime Analysis, and Criminal Investigations Section (covering activities of homicide, personal crimes, major offenders, financial crimes units), Youth Services, Downtown Services Unit, Special Services Section (covering park unit, traffic unit), as well as the District Commanders. The Monitor requested this because problem solving, under the CA, is a Department-wide approach to addressing crime. As we noted in our prior Reports, these units are integral to CPOP success. In prior Reports, we also noted that each of the units should include individual reports about specific crime/safety problems.

descriptive of identified problems than prior quarterly write-ups, and we commend the Department for the improvement. We will continue to work with the CPD to improve the reporting.

We noted in prior Reports that compliance with this CA provision will be demonstrated more clearly when all of the District and Unit Commanders prepare quarterly reports. Also, the reports should reflect an increasing use and proficiency in problem solving in the unit; a greater reliance on analysis and less reliance on unevaluated efforts; and a wide range of tactics – civil, situational crime prevention, zoning, environmental, etc. The reports also should describe the Unit Commanders’ actions and plans to involve the entire command in problem-solving and CPOP activities, rather than just the COP officers. We see the beginnings of this in the current Unit Commander Reports.

At the December 2005 All-Parties meeting, the CPD indicated that in addition to “address-specific” problem solving efforts, it is engaged in larger-scale problem solving efforts, in particular, efforts in the Over-the-Rhine neighborhood. Problem-solving does not have size limitations. We encourage the CPD to write up crime/safety problems it has identified (large or small), the substantive analysis it has completed, the range of countermeasures identified and selected based on the analysis, and the assessment measures it will be using.

The CPD is in partial compliance with this section of the CA.

### **1. Requirement 29(1)**

The Parties will review and identify additional courses for recruits, officers and supervisors about the urban environment in which they are working.

### **2. Status**

This quarter, the CPD’s training section is reviewing the training suggestions the FOP made this past spring. The FOP also now has a representative on the Training Committee. We commend the CPD for expanding the Training Committee to include relevant stakeholders such as the FOP. The Plaintiffs attended three Academy courses this quarter: Understanding Cultural Differences; Stops and Approaches; and the CPOP Tracking System training. Plaintiffs will be providing feedback on the training to the CPD next quarter.

### **3. Assessment**

For compliance with this CA provision, we look for the Parties to review and consult on curricula and for the FOP, Plaintiffs to make recommendations

on training and the CPD to consider and respond to those recommendations. Given the FOP's training recommendations and the Plaintiffs attendance at Academy training, the Parties are in partial compliance with this section of the CA.

### **1. Requirement 29(m)**

The Parties, in conjunction with the Monitor, shall develop and implement a problem tracking system for problem-solving efforts.

### **2. Status**

Late 2004, the CPD recognized that its problem tracking system required improvements and tasked its Community Relations Unit to undertake them. The CPD reviewed previous Monitor Reports and prepared a draft document for review by neighborhood area sergeants. The Parties met several times about the problem tracking system reaching agreement on the following items, which they shared with Judge Merz and the Monitor at the March 10, 2005 facilitated meeting:

1. The Parties will work on a mechanism for posting items on the CPOP website.
2. The Parties will develop an analysis process that captures and provides more detail in the problem tracking process.
3. The Parties will modify the tracking process as a result of items 1 and 2 above.
4. The Parties will reach consensus on problems to be posted on the CPOP website – i.e., District Commanders (neighborhood officers), and Partnering Center staff will have joint approval and shared responsibility to coordinate and share information about the problems to be posted as CPOP on the website.

The revised CPOP/SARA tracking system was put in use September 30, 2005. The Monitor viewed a demonstration of the tracking system in late October, and neighborhood officers, crime analysts, District Commanders, and lieutenants received training on it this quarter. The system is Windows web-based and tied directly to the City's GIS system. It is accessible to viewers at the old system's website <http://cagisperm.hamilton-co.org/cpop/review/review.aspx>. To community residents, it will have an outward appearance similar to the old system with a few more capabilities, but for the CPD and other city agencies, the system is enhanced with greater capability of accessing information from a variety of city sources.

The CPD users will be able to search the system for an address, and query it by district, neighborhood, and community officers assigned there. They will be able to access and display GIS maps, parcel numbers, retrieve owner information, and view a photograph of a property (community residents are also able to do some of the above by accessing the information through the county auditor records on the site, and once inside a CPOP tracked project, community members have access to some GIS mapping capabilities). In time, the CPD will also be able to query the system based on crime, arrest or contact information, such as FI's, as well as code enforcement, and permit activities, etc. The database contains many pull down menus and some free-form boxes (as did the old system), but the officers will be encouraged to use the free-form descriptions for specifics, although free-form descriptions and entries will not be searchable entries. The CPD expects that recruits will also be exposed to the new system over time.

The system has tools that facilitate collaboration with other city agencies, such as a message board, quick mail, even an action list. There is built-in accountability in the system: it can track whether inquiries have been followed up within specific time frames, if actions are closed out by a certain date, and the system will notify appropriate departments or individuals of the same. The system should make it easier for the CPD and the Partnering Center to manage and collaborate on crime problems.

The system also takes into consideration the protocols and legal requirements of other departments and agencies – such as notification requirements for abatement proceedings and time allowed to respond to notifications, such as ‘second notification’ requirements before action can be taken. One of the objectives (ultimately) is to enable all city services to be tracked through use of “permits plus”, a shared database, which will allow cross-referencing of all city activities, including CPOP.

The system will:

- Allow hyperlink to any report prepared by the Partnering Center concerning a specific problem-solving case in the database
- Allow participation by other departments and the Partnering Center so they can provide detail on their participation in the problem-solving process or add in details of their analysis
- Allow officers to create “virtual teams” within a problem-solving case, between other City agency employees, the CPD, and CPOP members, and offer quick mail and message boards

- Eventually link to 911 calls for service so officers can look at real time data about a location

### **3. Assessment**

Improvements to the problem-tracking system are a significant advance. The Community Relations Unit and CAGIS have worked very hard to revamp the system and offer officers, the Partnering Center, CPOP members, and citizens a more advanced and easy to maneuver system.

We are hopeful that the CPD will work diligently with CPD supervisors so they can mentor their officers in using the system effectively. Doing so will add precision to the problem-solving projects and help advance the Department's knowledge base about problem locations. With any new system there may be hiccups initially, and in fact the officers using the system may need additional mentoring and coaching during the first few months of its operation. We mentioned previously that we believe that the system, like any new information system, will only be as good as the information inputted. We believe that the CPD is committed to doing what is necessary to make the system a success. We offer our assistance if desired.

While some aspects of the system were not yet operational at the time the Monitor previewed it (call for service access, access to crime reports, arrest information, mug shot access, and FI information), CAGIS intends "progressive functionality." In other words, different data sets will come on-line inside the system over time. Access to calls for service, crime reports, arrest information, mug shots, and FI information is expected to come on line within the system by the end of next quarter. Use of these new databases within the tracking system will also require training.

Based on a review of recent projects in the tracking system, we already notice an improved level of information among the CPOP projects entered, due to greater use of the free-form entry blocks that query officers to "provide specifics." Although some of the CPOP projects still require basic information, we are hoping that this is part of the initial hiccup we noted above and we believe the CRU will resolve this quickly. We hope that each CPOP report will contain call for service, crime data, and other information, as well as some evidence of analysis of the information. The fruits of problem solving -- the ability to identify a longer term, more precise solution to a crime/safety problem -- are only enjoyed if analysis is done. We see the descriptions of the call for service information in the projects as very weak. We believe this can be easily corrected. The Monitor team sent the CRU an excerpt from one of the OSCOR reports (described in 29(d)) to show the type of sorting one can do with call for service information for a specific location.

Because the system has just been put in place, the Monitor will defer our compliance determination, but we are very hopeful about this new development.

### **1. Requirement 29(n)**

The City shall periodically review staffing in light of CPOP, and make revisions as necessary, subject to the CA funding provisions. The CA requires ongoing review of staffing rather than a review by a certain deadline.

### **2. Status**

In prior reports, the CPD has stated that it regularly reviews staffing to match workload requirements with resources. On numerous occasions (starting with our Third Quarterly Report in October 2003), the Monitor requested the CPD's staffing formula and a description of how the CPD applies it. In September 2004, the CPD provided a description, including the formula used.

In the spring of 2005, Plaintiffs suggested that the description the CPD provided of its staffing approach supplies the "mechanics of its staffing plan," but has not changed "in light of its commitment under CPOP" and the CA requirement that problem solving become the CPD's principal approach to crime and disorder. In addition, since crime analysis is key to problem solving, Plaintiffs suggested that the City should increase the budget for crime analysis capacity within the CPD because 1.5 analysts is inadequate for a Department with just over 1,000 sworn officers.

In late spring 2005, CPD announced that it would add an analyst to each of the five patrol Districts and one each to Vice Control and Criminal Investigations – for an increase of seven. The CPD put sworn officers in the new analyst positions. They attended a five-day crime analyst computer training by Alpha Group, and then followed up with 32 hours of "in-house" training.

The CPD expects the crime analysts to provide the District and CIS/CVCS Section Commanders with timely and accurate tactical and strategic crime information so that the Department's resources can be effectively deployed to hotspots identified with input from the crime analysts and the community. The CPD ordered fourteen new computers so the analysts could focus their efforts on CPOP, directing resources to hotspots as identified by the police department, the community, stakeholders, and collaborative partners. This quarter, the analysts began monthly meetings. One of the items they are working on is a list of the top ten individuals in ten identified neighborhoods who have been arrested the most.

In June 2005, Chief Streicher announced the formation of a five-year Strategic Planning Committee. The Committee includes one citizen representative from each of the five police districts (including Herb Brown, Partnering Center Board President), as well as representatives from within the Department. Altogether, the committee consists of about 20 people. Their goal is to define the Police Department's strategic organizational direction and its commitment to CPOP over the next five years. A strategic plan is due to Chief Streicher by the end of 2005. Chief Streicher met with the Committee in early September and committee members are now divided into four teams and assigned to review the CPD's vision, mission, and value statements. The CPD reports that "[t]he assignment was to determine if changes should be made based on the CPD's commitment to CPOP." Committee members met twice (October 7, 2005 and November 4, 2005) to discuss revisions to the vision, mission, and value statements. Chief Streicher is reviewing their suggestions.

The Strategic Planning Committee teams will now discuss the strategic goals of the Police Department. Each team will be assigned a goal. If more than four goals are identified, CPD reports the teams will be realigned. They hope to complete the five-year plan by the first quarter of 2006. Elements of the plan will be:

- Vision
- Mission
- Value Statements
- Strategic goals of the Department
- Operational objectives
- Anticipated workload
- Population trends
- Anticipated personnel levels
- Capital improvements
- Equipment needs
- Provisions for review
- Revisions as needed

### **3. Assessment**

First, we will address the issue of crime analysis, second we will discuss the staffing issue in light of the strategic plan.

As we noted in our last Report, the crime analyst profession is quickly coming into its own. The CPD has chosen sworn personnel and is now training them in the basics of crime analysis. We believe that the hiring and training of additional crime analysts is an important step in moving towards a more information-driven department.

The CA requirement of a staffing review in light of CPOP requires an analysis of current organization capabilities beyond just the addition of crime analysts, however. It requires an assessment of the Department's organization in light of the adoption of problem solving as the principal strategy for addressing crime and disorder problems. The Monitor recognizes that Chief Streicher has initiated a new five-year strategic planning process. The CA outlines the Department's organizational direction and should be a foundation for any new five year strategic plan. We also note that the development and implementation of a strategic plan is time consuming and requires a tremendous amount of organizational energy. The CPD should ensure that any plan supports and accelerates the move towards CA compliance so the CPD can fulfill its already defined responsibilities under the CA, which form the basis for both impacting crime and establishing trust between Cincinnati residents and the police. The Monitor looks forward to seeing a draft of the strategic plan. We believe that the strategic plan is a good place to affirm CPD's commitment to the CA and can be used to more quickly operationalize the CA.

As we noted above, much more in-depth reviews of staffing will be required to satisfy this section, but the increase in crime analysts places the CPD in partial compliance with this subparagraph of the CA.

### **1. Requirement 29(o)**

The City shall review, and where appropriate, revise police department policies, procedures, organizational plans, job descriptions, and performance evaluation standards consistent with CPOP.

### **2. Status**

In late 2004, the City and the Civil Service Commission approved new police job descriptions and performance review standards. The police job descriptions and performance review standards were forwarded to and approved by the Civil Service Commission without input from the Plaintiffs (see January 2005 Monitor Report). In our April 2005 Report, we determined that the revisions did not meet the requirements of this CA paragraph. We stated our reasons again in the July 2004 report.

On July 13, 2005, Chief Streicher approved a "performance evaluation process improvement team (PIT) to fundamentally change the current performance evaluation system the police department is using." In its September 2005 CA Status Report, the Parties acknowledged that the current performance evaluation system is outdated and that the Five-Year Strategic Planning Committee will review the current organizational plans, job descriptions, and police department standards to recommend changes consistent with CPOP. The CPD stated that "the current outdated system of

numerically scoring eighteen trait categories is purely subjective with no interaction from the evaluated member. Planning Section has received several contemporary performance evaluation systems used by other police departments throughout the country.”

The CPD noted that the PIT team is a diverse group of police department sworn members of various ranks, gender, and race. Additionally, both the Fraternal Order of Police and Sentinel Police Organization have representatives on the team. The performance evaluation PIT team met in August to discuss the change process and expects to submit a new system to the Chief before the end of the year, with plans to implement the new system in 2006.

In the current Status Report, the CPD states, “To implement problem solving as the principal strategy of the Department, the Police Relations Section will initiate dialogue with the Monitoring Team and Parties in an attempt to clearly define what full compliance with this term means in practice and how it can be attained over time.”

### **3. Assessment**

In late October, the Monitor Team met with the Planning Unit Captain who oversees the PIT team. While attending management class at the Southern Police Institute, the Captain looked into aspects of performance appraisal systems, giving him a head start on the subject. We look forward to seeing early drafts of an appraisal. We recommend that they also be shared with the Plaintiffs. This will reduce the risk of adopting a revised performance evaluation system that is inadequate by CA standards.

In earlier Reports, we noted that the performance evaluations the CPD adopted in 2004 were not adequate for compliance under this section. The CPD recognizes that its evaluation system is outdated. We have also stated in our prior Reports that the performance appraisal system should be consistent with the CA and MOA, it should support problem solving, reflect that problem solving is the principal strategy of the Department, and be a means of accountability within the Department. We believe it is important that the PIT team members familiarize themselves with problem-oriented policing, the problem-oriented policing guidebooks, information about problem solving from the Center for Problem-Oriented Policing website, and the problem solving projects contained in CPD’s CPOP tracking system. This will assist the Team in drafting a performance appraisal system that reflects the central place of problem solving as the CPD’s approach to tackling crime and other safety problems.

The CPD will also need to revise its job descriptions in light of CPOP. Clearly, this is the case for patrol officer job descriptions, but job descriptions will also be needed for police specialists, investigators, FTOs, sergeants, FTO

sergeants, lieutenants, captains, and lieutenant colonels. Revising job descriptions allows a police organization the opportunity to redefine its approach and what is expected of its employees, as well as the type of skills it seeks for different positions. It even helps clarify the types of skills sought through recruitment. If problem solving is central to how the CPD will police, then it is these skills and evidence of their use (among other things) that will be reflected in selected people who should be promoted or assigned to special assignments.

The City appears to be making progress, but is not in compliance with this section of the CA.

### **1. Requirement 29(p)**

The City shall design and implement a system to easily retrieve and routinely search (consistent with Ohio law) information on repeat victims, repeat locations, and repeat offenders. The system also shall include information necessary to comply with nondiscrimination in policing and early warning requirements.

### **2. Status**

As noted in our prior Reports, the City expects to meet this requirement through the acquisition of a new Records Management System (RMS) and Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) system. In 2003, the City developed design specifications for a Request for Proposal (RFP), and released an RFP for the CAD and RMS project in June 2004. Five vendors submitted proposals by the August 2004 due date. The Department narrowed the number of bidders to three and reviewed product demonstrations in January 2005. Vendors addressed CAD, RMS, systems integration, and product security issues, and follow-up concerns about their products and services. A full time project manager is now assigned to minimize delays, cost overruns and ensure project success. In the spring of 2005, the City selected Motorola as the vendor and began contract negotiations. The CPD has now reached a tentative contract with Motorola to develop and install the CAD/RMS system, and expects a project kick-off date before the end of 2005.

This quarter, the Monitoring Team met with CPD staff. They expect the CAD portion of the new system to be on line in 12 to 15 months and the RMS portion of the integrated system to be on line in approximately 18 months (with some modules up earlier).

In the interim, CPD staff provided the Monitor Team with samples of various types of information produced for different initiatives, including the Community Response Team, quality of life problems, and code enforcement activities. The CPD states that these types of reports/data production are

readily available now and the new crime analysts perform crime analysis functions. Even data from agencies outside the CPD is used, including adult and juvenile probation. The Planning Unit also produces reports for the Partnering Center or other community-led efforts, such as the Neighborhood Support Center. Recently, the CPD gained access to Juvenile Court Data and will expand its access among its personnel to several state databases that will be useful in follow-up investigations and CPOP assessment. The CPD believes it is in compliance because of the use these different databases and the reports the CPD generates about crime.

### **3. Assessment**

The new system the CPD has selected is expected to be capable of retrieving and linking information in the CPD's current computer information systems to enable the CPD to track repeat offenders, repeat victims, and repeat locations for use in problem solving, CPOP cases, District/Unit Commander reports, Planning and Analysis Reports, and Crime Analysis Unit reports. The system will increase the CPD's ability to identify trends and patterns and use them to undertake problem-solving efforts. While the CPD's current information systems provide some information, they are systems that are based on old models of policing, where incidents were documented typically as isolated or non-recurrent events, where pattern analysis might focus on an offender "m.o.," rather than also on repeat location, repeat location types, repeat victim, and repeat victimization locations. The CPD is not using its current system to this capacity and is not sufficiently using its systems to spur problem solving or better inform problem-solving efforts; the CA calls for systems that can do these things.

The City is not in compliance with this CA provision.

#### **1. Requirement 29(q)**

The City shall secure appropriate information technology so that police and City personnel can access timely, useful information to problem-solve (detect, analyze, respond, and assess) effectively. The CA established February 5, 2003, as the deadline for development of a procurement plan, April 5, 2003, to secure funding, August 5, 2003, to procure systems, and August 2004 to implement any new purchases.

#### **2. Status**

The Parties believe that the new RMS/CAD system will also meet the requirements of this section of the CA. The City selected Motorola and has reached a tentative contract to develop and install the system. It anticipates a project kick-off before the end of 2005. Last quarter, the CPD stated that the

CPD is concerned with the Monitor's assessment of non-compliance in this category.

“The CPD feels that progress has been made towards implementing a system as evidenced by the selection and current negotiations with a vendor. This progress should be at least an acknowledgement of partial compliance.”

The CPD added that it routinely provides information to CPOP teams for different stages of the SARA model. The CPD provides information to communities to substantiate funding for Safe and Clean grant applications. Also, the CPD collates information to be part of quality of life indicators for various city departments to targeted interventions and enhanced CODE enforcement areas. The CPD also notes that its seven new crime analysts will disseminate the information in a more timely way and so “the spirit of this requirement is being met with current capabilities.”

### **3. Assessment**

Last quarter, the Monitor noted that we had not found sufficient evidence of analysis in the projects the CPD has submitted thus far to find the CPD in compliance. In only a few projects is there mention of the number of calls for service at a location, and the projects do not include an analysis of the calls and what they suggest about the problem. Many of the problems that CPD is now undertaking in the community likely have been problems for years, repeat locations that are only recently being worked in a fashion that is somewhat different from an incident-driven response.

The CPD, as noted in the prior section, expects the CAD portion of the new system to be on line in 12 to 15 months and the RMS portion of the integrated system to be on line in approximately 18 months (with some modules up earlier). The CPD cites its use of its current systems, and the fact that the new CPOP tracking system is now on-line, as a basis for a determination of compliance. While CPD's revised tracking system is now in place, CAGIS indicates an incremental roll out of program capabilities. This “progressive functionality” for the problem tracking system suggests that the full use of the system may take some time. As well, a tracking system for individual projects does not meet the language in 29(q): “appropriate information technology so that police and City personnel can access timely, useful information to detect, analyze and respond to problems and evaluate their effectiveness.” Paragraph 29(q) will be satisfied by an RMS/CAD system that is designed, programmed, and used to identify (detect) patterns and ease analysis and assessment of problems, whether citywide or location specific. At this point, CPD has reached a tentative contract with Motorola to develop and install a system. Installation of the system is more than a year away and use of

the system as a tool in detecting, analyzing, and assessing problems will take longer than that.

The City is not in compliance with this section of the CA.

## **II. Evaluation Protocol [CA ¶¶30-46]**

### **1. Requirements**

The CA calls for a system of evaluation to track attainment of CA goals. This tracking serves as a “mutual accountability plan.” According to the CA, “[t]he term ‘mutual accountability plan’ is defined as a plan that ensures that the conduct of the City, the police administration, members of the Cincinnati Police Department and members of the general public [is] closely monitored so that the favorable and unfavorable conduct of all is fully documented and thereby available as a tool for improving police-community relations under the Agreement.”

The Evaluation Protocol must include the following components:

- Surveys
  - of citizens, for satisfaction and attitudes
  - of citizens with police encounters (neighborhood meetings, stops, arrests, problem-solving interactions), for responsiveness, effectiveness, demeanor
  - of officers and families, for perceptions and attitudes
  - of officers and citizens in complaint process, on fairness and satisfaction with complaint process
- Periodic observations of meetings, problem-solving projects, complaint process; with description of activity and effectiveness
- Periodic reporting of data to public, without individual ID, but by age, race, gender, rank, assignment and other characteristics. The data, to be compiled by the City’s 52 neighborhoods, are to include arrests; crimes; citations; stops; use of force; positive interactions; reports of unfavorable interactions; injuries to citizens; complaints
- Sampling of in-car camera and audio recordings; database of sampled recordings; study of how people are treated by police
- Examination of hiring, promotion and transfer process
- Periodic reports that answer a number of questions, including:

- Is use of force declining, and is it distributed equally?
  - Is the complaint process fair?
  - Do officers feel supported?
  - Is problem solving successful?
  - Are police-community relations improving?
  - Is progress being made on issues of respect, equity and safety?
  - Is safety improving?
- The Parties will regularly meet with the Monitor to study the results of the evaluation instruments and determine what changes, if any, in the Agreement or in their actions should be pursued in light of the evaluation results

## **2. Status**

The Evaluation Protocol calls for an extensive research effort, including four types of surveys, an analysis of traffic stops to determine whether there are any patterns of racial bias, reviews of a videotaped interactions between police and motorists during traffic stops, periodic observations of CPOP (community problem-oriented policing) meetings, and a review of police statistical data and staffing.

The RAND Corporation was selected by the Parties to be the Evaluator and to implement the Evaluation Protocol, and RAND entered into a contract with the City of Cincinnati to accomplish these tasks. On December 5, 2005, RAND issued its first annual report.

### **a. Surveys**

#### **i. Community-Police Satisfaction Survey**

RAND's community survey involved contacting a random sample of 3000 individuals living in each of the City's 52 neighborhoods. The questions relate to residents' perceptions of the quality of police services, knowledge of CPD activities, and perceptions of the professional standards of the CPD.

The results of the *community-police satisfaction survey* show that the general public has favorable opinions of the quality of police service it receives, police practices that it witnessed in its neighborhoods, and personal experiences with the police. African American residents in Cincinnati, however, have a less favorable view. Blacks expressed less satisfaction with the quality of police service, had less trust in the police than whites, and were more likely than whites to think that race played a factor in police decisions and that they had been the targets of racial profiling. They had a significantly

lower perception of being treated fairly and with respect by the CPD. Blacks were also more likely than whites to view crime as a serious problem in their neighborhoods and to witness disorder and a lack of community cohesion.

RAND reports that the racial differences in perceptions of the police and community in Cincinnati appear to be driven at least in part by “differences in neighborhood quality conditions and the style of policing in specific regions of the city [RAND Report, p. 242].” Black residents are more likely than whites to live in neighborhoods characterized by crime and disorder, and residents in high-crime neighborhoods in Cincinnati are more likely to see “proactive policing” such as aggressive traffic enforcement, and stopping and patting down individuals on the street corner. Differences in neighborhoods did not entirely account for differences in the views of blacks and whites, however, because blacks had substantially less favorable views of the CPD than whites living in the same neighborhood. One factor related to improved perceptions of the Cincinnati police, independent of the influence of race and other factors, was knowing police officers by name or sight.

#### **ii. Citizen Interaction with the Police**

For the survey of citizens with police interaction, RAND mailed surveys to a random sample of 1429 individuals. The sample was drawn from police records on traffic citations and crime incident reports, so the citizens surveyed will be persons who have been stopped, cited, or arrested by the police, or who have been victims of crime. The questions relate to the respondent’s perception of the officer’s behavior during the interaction, including questions about the perceived fairness and professional standards of the police. Unfortunately, the response rate for these surveys was not sufficient to produce scientifically valid results. For this reason, the results from the surveys cannot be used as a benchmark to measure progress in accomplishing the goals of the CA. The Parties and RAND will be meeting in the next quarter to assess how the police-citizen interaction surveys can be accomplished in future quarters with a better response rate.

#### **iii. Police Officer Surveys, Citizen Complaint Surveys**

RAND has also mailed surveys to CPD field officers to assess the officers’ perception of personal safety, working conditions, morale, organizational barriers to effective policing, fairness in evaluation and promotion, and attitudes of citizens in Cincinnati. RAND also identified 229 matched pairs of officers and citizens involved in the citizen complaint process in 2004. The surveys will assess the respondents’ perceived fairness of the complaint process, the level of input citizens and officers have in the process, and the final resolution of the complaint. Similar to the police-citizen interaction surveys, the response rate for these two surveys also was insufficient to produce scientifically valid results.

## **b. Traffic Stop Analysis**

RAND developed three different benchmarks and analyses to assess whether racial biases influence police activities in the decision to stop, cite, and search vehicles in Cincinnati. The three stages are (1) an assessment of whether there is a department-wide pattern of racial disparity in vehicle stops; (2) an assessment of whether there are patterns of racial disparity at the individual officer level, by looking at internal benchmarks; and (3) an assessment of racial disparities in post-stop outcomes including the duration of stops, searches rates, and citation rates. RAND's analysis yielded several key findings, although the reliability of the research results is diminished slightly because an estimated 20 percent of vehicle stops were not documented on contact cards.

To assess bias in the decision to stop, RAND developed a method of analyzing traffic stop data it calls the "veil of darkness" method. This assumes that if there were race bias in stops, it would most likely occur during daylight hours when an officer can more easily see the race of the driver. RAND compared stops of blacks and whites occurring at the times that are close to the change to and from Daylight Savings Time. These stops would occur at the same time of day, but would occur in daylight before the change to Daylight Savings Time, and in darkness after the change to Daylight Savings Time. Using this method, RAND found no conclusive evidence of racial bias in the decision to stop. While black drivers were more likely to be stopped during daylight when drivers' races were more visible (15% greater risk in 2003 and 19% greater risk in 2004), these results may have been due to chance rather than race bias. An additional test also concluded that there was no statistical evidence of racial bias in the decision to stop.

The second stage of the analysis examined the stops made by officers who made more than 100 stops in a year, and compared their stops to similarly situated officers. Of the 91 officers reviewed, four officers stopped a substantially larger percentage of black drivers than other officers making stops at the same times and places. These officers also were twice as likely to use equipment violations as the reason for the stopping drivers. It is not possible to determine from the data whether these officers are using equipment violations as a pretext to stop black drivers or whether their focus on equipment violations results in their stopping more black drivers. However, even after accounting for the large number of equipment violation stops, these four officers still stopped a greater share of black drivers than expected.

For the third level of analysis, RAND found that black drivers were more likely than white drivers to have stops that lasted more than 10 minutes. The RAND researchers did not find any statistically significant differences in search rates or in citation rates.

### **c. Evaluation of Video and Audio Records**

To evaluate interactions between CPD officers and Cincinnati residents, RAND analyzed 313 randomly sampled video and audio recordings of traffic stops. RAND used multiple trained coders to view each tape and make a variety of objective measurements and subjective ratings. The ratings allowed RAND to describe the objective characteristics of the stops, measure verbal and nonverbal social cues, and assess the communication between the officer and the driver. RAND analyzed differences in these measures as a function of the race of the driver and the officer.

The RAND analysis showed three key differences as a function of the officer's and the driver's race. First, the videos showed that "on average, blacks and whites experience different types of policing." (p. xxiii). RAND concluded that black motorists "experience more proactive or intensive policing than their white counterparts." (p. 75) Their stops generally took longer and were more likely to involve multiple officers. Black drivers were more likely to be asked if they were carrying drugs or weapons, be asked to leave the vehicle, be searched, or have a passenger or the vehicle searched. Second, the communication of white drivers was, on average, more positive than the communication of black drivers – specifically, they were more apologetic, cooperative and courteous. Third, the officers' communication behavior was, on average, more positive when the officer and driver were of the same race. White officers used the most positive communication when they talked to white drivers and black officers used the most positive communications when they were talking to black drivers. Because there are more white officers than black officers, white drivers get more positive communications, which for black drivers may reinforce negative racial expectations and make subsequent interactions less likely to be positive.

Another important aspect of RAND's review of traffic stop videos is the correlation between the officer's communications and the driver's actions and the correlation of the driver's communications with the officer's actions. For example, the best predictor of the quality of a driver's communications was the length of the stop, and vice versa (more argumentative drivers correlated to longer stops; a less communicative officer and longer stops correlated with lower quality of the driver's response; driver's communications were most positive, e.g. respectful, pleasant, when the stops were shorter and the officer's communications were positive).

### **d. Periodic Observations and Problem Solving Processes**

RAND examined police-community interaction and problem solving through community meetings and problem solving projects. During 2005, RAND researchers attended 16 meetings and problem solving projects and

surveyed participants in those meetings. RAND coded and analyzed the data from the observations and surveys. Because the sample size of this component was small, and the meetings and projects could not be randomly sampled, the results should be interpreted with caution. However, from the work done, RAND found that the participants in the meetings and CPOP teams generally believed the meetings were open and respectful, viewed the police as partners, and considered their relations with the police to be positive. CPOP participants judged the training they received to be fairly good and the problem-solving process to be effective. RAND did note that two elements of the CPOP process needed additional attention: problem definition and community participation. The RAND researchers state that it was not apparent that problem-solving processes were being used explicitly to address community problems. Nor was it clear that the focus on problem solving influenced CPD decisions regarding staff, organization and policy [p. 160]. Also, RAND emphasized that their analysis focused on the process of problem solving, and it would be important to also examine the outcomes, to assess the effectiveness of problem-solving efforts in problem reduction.

#### **e. Statistical Compilations**

RAND's review of the CPD's statistical data shows that reported crime, calls for police service, and arrests are geographically clustered in the same Cincinnati neighborhoods, and these neighborhoods are predominantly black. Five neighborhoods comprise 31 percent of Cincinnati's reported crimes and 37 percent of the CPD's arrests. The largest share of arrests and reported crimes occurred in the Central Business District (CBD) and Over-the-Rhine neighborhoods. We do note, however, that the percent and distribution of reported crime is not always the same as the percent and distribution of arrests in a neighborhood; for example, Over-the-Rhine represented seven percent of Cincinnati's reported crime, but over twice that percentage (16%) of Cincinnati's arrests; conversely, Westwood also represented seven percent of Cincinnati's reported crime, but only three percent of Cincinnati's arrests.

RAND's report also examined use-of-force statistics. RAND found that use of force by the CPD was geographically clustered in high crime neighborhoods, with Over-the-Rhine accounted for 20 percent of the incidents involving force. Use of force was used in approximately 2.3 percent of arrests. Black residents were the subjects of 75 percent of the use-of-force incidents, and were approximately 73% of arrestees.

#### **f. Staffing**

RAND found that blacks and women were underrepresented among sworn officers, compared to their percentage in the Cincinnati population, and that their representation tended to diminish in the higher ranks. Women and

minorities among police recruits at the Academy, however, were a higher percentage than among the sworn staff.

### **3. Assessment**

The CA provisions call for a comprehensive approach to evaluation that is broader than efforts in most other cities. We believe that the efforts undertaken in this first year of the Evaluation Protocol and the results of RAND's research has provided valuable information and lessons learned, that now need to be used to improve police-community relations and advance the goals of the Collaborative Agreement. We are convinced that the results of the Year One Evaluation Report reinforce and validate the CA's approach that problem solving must be the principal strategy for addressing crime and disorder in Cincinnati.

The Parties are in compliance with the CA provisions requiring the development of a system of evaluation, and a protocol for accomplishing this evaluation (CA¶31-34). Now that the components of the Evaluation Protocol have been completed, and the RAND report has been published, the Parties are in compliance with implementation and with the requirement of public reporting of the results of the Evaluation Protocol (CA¶35-43). With the publication of RAND's first report, the Parties have a strong basis for assessing whether the CA goals are being accomplished, and have a benchmark to measure progress in 2006.

What the CA now requires is that the Parties meet with the Monitor "to study the results of the evaluation instruments and determine what changes, if any, in the Agreement or in their actions should be pursued in light of the evaluation results," as required under CA ¶30. Paragraph 46 of the CA also states that "measurement of the success of the mutual accountability process" will be based on whether the evaluation data was "fully and fairly used to assess progress toward attaining the goals" of the CA, and whether the data was used "to adjust City, police and community strategies to address problems, reduce police and citizen use of force and improve police/community interaction."

In the RAND Report, the Monitor set out several recommendations for actions that the Parties and the Cincinnati community should take. One area that has a significant prospect for improvement in police-citizen relations is communications in traffic stop encounters. As RAND states, "[s]ubstantial improvements are possible if both police and community members make the effort [p. 108]." The Monitor also seconded RAND's call for a larger dialogue about how black neighborhoods are policed. This would include discussions regarding incorporating problem solving and CPOP into hot spot/crime sweep efforts, and an examination of how and where arrests are being made and how they correlate to reported crime. Aggressive traffic enforcement may engender

greater distrust, and may not be effective in reducing crime or improving traffic safety.

The RAND citizen survey demonstrates the wide gap in perceptions between whites and blacks in Cincinnati that must be addressed. These gaps must be reduced in future years for the CA to be successful and its goals to be achieved. The RAND report, particularly the traffic stop and video analysis, suggests that the principal problem is not officer-bias and the attitudes of individual police officers. It is instead the impact on the black community of decisions about police strategy. The right police strategy is one that effectively reduces crime, makes people feel safer, and reduces perceptions of police unfairness and bias. As noted by RAND, police research has shown that proactive policing can create frustration and distrust of the police, and its effectiveness is questionable.<sup>15</sup> This is why the CA emphasizes problem solving and problem-oriented policing. Research shows that CPOP is effective policing.

### **III. Pointing Firearms Complaints [CA ¶48]**

The investigations of complaints of improper pointing of firearms from March 2000 to November 2002 were forwarded to the Conciliator, Judge Michael Merz, in July 2003. The Parties also submitted supplementary materials to Judge Merz for his review in making his decision under Paragraph 48. On November 14, 2003, Judge Merz issued his decision. Judge Merz determined that there has not been a pattern of improper pointing of firearms by CPD officers. Therefore, CPD officers will not be required to complete a report when they point their weapon at a person. The Parties are in compliance with the provisions of Paragraph 48.

### **IV. Fair, Equitable and Courteous Treatment**

The CA requires the Parties to collaborate in ensuring fair, equitable and courteous treatment for all, and the implementation of bias-free policing. Data collection and analysis are pivotal to tracking compliance, and training is essential to inculcate bias-free policing throughout the ranks of the CPD. The Monitor, in consultation with the Parties, is required to include detailed information regarding bias-free policing in all public reports. The collection and analysis of data to allow reporting on bias-free policing is to be part of an Evaluation Protocol developed with the advice of expert consultants.

---

<sup>15</sup> See *Fairness and Effectiveness in Policing: The Evidence*, National Research Council of the National Academies, Wesley Skogan and Kathleen Frydl, eds., (National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 2004) at 228-230.

## **A. Data Collection and Analysis [CA ¶¶ 38-41, 51, 53]**

### **1. Requirements**

As part of the Evaluation Protocol, the CPD is required to compile the following data to be analyzed, by percentage attributable to each of the City's fifty-two neighborhoods:

- Arrests
- Reported crimes and drug complaints
- Citations of vehicles and pedestrians
- Stops of vehicles and pedestrians without arrest or issuance of citation
- Use of force
- Citizen reports of positive interaction with members of the CPD by assignments, location, and nature of circumstance
- Reports by members of the CPD of unfavorable conduct by citizens in encounters with the police
- Injuries to officers during police interventions
- Injuries to citizens during arrests and while in police custody
- Citizen complaints against members of the CPD

Paragraph 40 requires that the City provide to the Monitor incident-based data so that the nature, circumstances and results of the events can be examined.

Paragraph 51 references Ordinance 88-2001, which identifies required data to be reported and analyzed to measure whether there is any racial disparity present in motor vehicle stops by the CPD. The local ordinance requires the following information be gathered:

- The number of vehicle occupants
- Characteristics of race, color, ethnicity, gender and age of such persons (based on the officer's perception)
- Nature of the stop
- Location of the stop
- If an arrest was made and crime charged
- Search, consent to search, probable cause for the search; if property was searched, the duration of search
- Contraband and type found
- Any additional information

Paragraph 53 of the Collaborative Agreement requires the Monitor, in consultation with the Parties, to include in all public reports, detailed information of the following:

- Racial composition of those persons stopped (whether in a motor vehicle or not), detained, searched, arrested, or involved in a use of force with a member of the CPD
- Racial composition of the officers stopping these persons

## **2. Status**

### **a. Traffic Stop Data**

CPD officers continue to collect traffic stop data on Contact Cards. The 2004 data and much of the 2005 data were forwarded to RAND for analysis. RAND's first year report noted that approximately 20 percent of the 2004 traffic stops were not documented on contact cards. It also cited other data missing on contact cards that were completed. For the 2004 data, 16 percent of stops were missing at least one of the following: stop location, time of day, stop duration, driver age, race, or sex, or whether a search occurred.

In its December 2005 CA Status Report, the CPD states that it has now implemented subsequent safeguards to ensure that high quality and accurate information is received by RAND in a timely manner. The CPD is implementing additional auditing mechanisms and oversight to ensure greater compliance with data collection requirements, and appropriate action has been taken to address officers who are remiss in submitting the required contact cards.

### **b. Pedestrian Stop Data**

The CPD has revised its Investigatory Stops Policy, Procedure 12.554, to require a Contact Card be filled out for (1) all vehicle stops, and for (2) any vehicle passenger detention that meets the definition of a Terry stop.<sup>16</sup> For consensual citizen contacts, the policy states that an officer may complete a Contact Card, if the officer believes the card will provide intelligence information and the information is provided voluntarily. However, the procedure is silent on whether officers are required to complete Contact Cards for Terry stops stemming from pedestrian encounters. Current practice leaves this up to the discretion of the officer.

The Parties had no additional information to report on this issue in their CA Status Report.

### **c. Use-of-Force Racial Data**

---

<sup>16</sup> A Terry stop is one where the officer has reasonable suspicion to believe the person is committing or has committed a crime.

Racial data on CPD was available to RAND for the evaluation protocol.

#### **d. Data on Positive Police-Citizen Interaction**

The Parties have agreed to a Report of Favorable Police Conduct form, which has been printed and disseminated. During the third quarter of 2005, the CPD received 50 reports of favorable officer conduct and 168 letters of commendation recognizing outstanding performance of CPD officers. The reports are widely available to citizens, they are at all CPD and public facilities, on the CPD website, and each CPD vehicle contains a supply. The CPD has initiated inspection of some of these places to ensure an adequate supply of reports, including CPD facilities, CPD neighborhood stations, designated public facilities (libraries, recreation centers, etc.) and designated CPD vehicles. The inspections are completed either monthly or quarterly.

#### **e. Data on Unfavorable Citizen Interactions**

The Parties have developed a protocol for the reporting and tracking of unfavorable citizen interactions. The Parties to the CA agree that:

- Rude and discourteous conduct by citizens toward police is a problem that can be addressed by community problem-oriented policing
- The conduct at issue is typically not criminal and is normally protected by the federal and state constitutions
- A protocol for tracking rude and discourteous conduct by citizens toward the police can be developed through problem solving while respecting the constitutional rights of all citizens

The Parties developed a protocol for reporting and tracking such conduct, and permitting the evaluation team (RAND) to perform statistical compilations and prepare required reports of such conduct to the Parties, pursuant to paragraphs 38, 39, 40, 44, 45 and 46 of the CA. The protocol has been entered by Judge Dlott as "Protective Order Re: Mutual Accountability Reports of Unfavorable Conduct by Citizens During Implementation of the Collaborative Agreement." The FOP will be working with the CPD to ensure the form is made available to all CPD officers in 2006.

### **3. Assessment**

#### **a. Traffic Stop Data Collection**

The CPD is collecting traffic stop data on Contact Cards, which are now being used by RAND for analysis. The CPD has implemented steps to address

concerns raised by the RAND report regarding documentation of traffic stops, including the completion of information on the contact cards. The CPD will be in compliance with these CA requirements if the 2005 data shows a significant improvement in contact card completion. The Monitor will defer our compliance determination until the next quarter.

**b. Data Collection on Pedestrian Stops**

The Parties are not in compliance with this requirement.

**c. Use of Force Racial Data**

The Parties are in compliance with this requirement.

**d. Favorable Interactions**

The Parties are in compliance with this CA requirement.

**e. Unfavorable Interactions**

The Parties have developed a protocol for reporting unfavorable interaction by CPD officers with citizens. The protocol has been approved and entered by the Court as “Protective Order Re: Mutual Accountability Reports of Unfavorable Conduct by Citizens During Implementation of the Collaborative Agreement.” Mutual Accountability Forms have been developed and will be made available at all police districts and units of assignment. The Parties will be in compliance with this CA requirement when these forms are available for completion and then collected. The Parties are not in compliance with this provision.

**B. Training and Dissemination of Information [CA ¶ 52]**

**1. Requirement**

The Collaborative Agreement requires that all Parties cooperate in the ongoing training and dissemination of information regarding the Professional Traffic Stops/Bias-Free Policing Training Program.

**2. Status**

The CPD Training Section has made inquiries around the country in reference to bias-free policing training. Information has been received from the State of Maryland, Northwestern University Institute for Public Safety, the Institute for Police Technology and Management in Jacksonville, FL, and a private program in San Jose, CA. The training section is following up on these programs. In addition, the CPD reports that bias-free policing continues to be

a part of the police recruit academy curriculum. The 99<sup>th</sup> Police Recruit Class is scheduled to participate in this training on February 23, 2006.

### **3. Assessment**

The CPD reports efforts to learn of additional training programs on bias-free policing and to enhance its current training program. We hope that in the next quarter, the Plaintiffs and the FOP can join in this effort. The Parties are in partial compliance with this provision.

## **C. Professional Conduct [CA ¶ 54]**

### **1. Requirement**

Paragraph 54 of the CA requires that when providing police services, officers conduct themselves in a professional, courteous manner, consistent with professional standards. Except in exigent circumstances, when a citizen is stopped or detained and then released as a part of an investigation, the officer must explain to the citizen in a professional, courteous manner why he or she was stopped or detained. An officer must always display his/her badge on request and must never retaliate or express disapproval if a citizen seeks to record an officer's badge number. These provisions are to be incorporated into written CPD policies.

### **2. Status**

This provision has now been incorporated into procedures 12.205 and 12.554, and put into effect. The CPD's Manual of Rules and Regulations also generally mandates courteous, fair treatment of all. In its first annual report, RAND reviewed MVR tapes of traffic stops to assess the interactions communications between officers and drivers.

### **3. Assessment**

The CPD has put policies and procedures in place in compliance with this CA provision. However, the RAND report does identify concerns with cross-racial communications between officers and drivers that could be improved by additional training.

## **V. Citizen Complaint Authority**

### **A. Establishment of CCA and CCA Board [CA ¶¶ 55-64]**

#### **1. Requirements**

- The City will establish the Citizen Complaint Authority
- The CCA will replace the CPRP and investigative functions of the OMI. The CCA will investigate serious interventions by police including shots fired, deaths in custody, major uses of force; and will review and resolve citizen complaints
- The CCA Board will consist of seven citizens; the CCA will be run by an Executive Director and have a minimum of five professional investigators; the Board must be diverse
- The Board and Executive Director will develop standards for board members, and a training program, including Academy sessions and ride-alongs
- The Board and Executive Director will develop procedures for the CCA
- The CCA will examine complaint patterns
- The CCA will develop a complaint brochure, as well as information plan to explain CCA workings to officers and public
- The CCA will issue annual reports
- The City Council will allocate sufficient funds for the CCA

#### **2. Status**

The CCA has been operating and investigating complaints since January 6, 2003. A CCA Board of seven members is in place, having undergone a training program before beginning work and reviewing complaints. The CCA has also established procedures for its Board meetings, appeal hearings, and its investigations. Richard Siegel is the chairperson of the CCA.

#### **3. Assessment**

The City is in compliance with the provisions relating to establishing the CCA and the CCA Board.

## **B. Executive Director and Staff [CA ¶¶ 65-67]**

### **1. Status**

Mr. Wendell France was selected to be the new Executive Director of CCA and started in April 2004. In November 2005, Mr. France announced his resignation as Executive Director. The City Manager appointed Mr. Kenneth Glenn, CCA's Chief Investigator as the Interim Executive Director effective December 1, 2005, and the City is now in the process of an national search for a new Executive Director.

The CCA has five investigators on staff, consistent with the minimum number of investigators required by the Agreements.

### **2. Assessment**

The Parties are in compliance with these provisions of the CA.

## **C. CCA Investigations and Findings [CA ¶¶ 68-89]**

### **1. Requirements**

- Each citizen complaint, excluding criminal matters, is to be directed to the CCA, regardless of where it is initially filed.
- Where a complaint is to be investigated by CCA, an investigator will be assigned within 48 hours.
- The CPD shall notify the CCA Executive Director immediately upon the occurrence of a serious police intervention (including, but not limited to, major use of force, shots fired, or deaths in custody), and a CCA investigator shall immediately be dispatched to the scene. The CPD shall not interfere with the ability of the CCA investigator to monitor the work of the CPD at the scene and to monitor all interviews conducted by the CPD. (CA ¶71)
- CPD officers and city employees will submit to CCA administrative questions. The executive Director of the CCA shall have reasonable access to city records, documents and employees, including employee personnel records and departmental investigative files and reports. (CA ¶73)
- The Chief of Police and the CCA Executive Director shall develop written procedures that will assure the timely exchange of

information and the efficient coordination of CCA and CPD investigations. (CA ¶74)

- The decisions of the CCA shall be forwarded to the City Manager, and the City Manager and the Police Chief “will refrain from making a final decision on discipline until after the receipt of the CCA report.” The City Manager shall agree, disagree or agree in part with the CCA’s findings and recommendations. (CA ¶78)
- Paragraph 80 requires the CCA and the CPD to develop a shared database to track all citizen complaints, the manner in which they are handled, and their disposition. The data will be integrated into an electronic information management system developed by the CPD.
- Paragraph 83 of the CA calls on the CCA to examine complaint patterns that might provide opportunities for the CPD and the community to reduce complaints. Following the identification of such patterns, the CCA and the CPD are to jointly undertake a problem-solving project to address the issues raised.

## **2. Status**

Paragraph 74 requires that the Chief of Police and the Executive Director develop written procedures that will assure the timely exchange of information and the efficient coordination of CCA and CPD investigations. A written protocol was finalized and approved last quarter. The protocol addresses the concerns from previous quarters that a number of complaints were received by the CPD and investigated, but not referred to the CCA until well after the complaint was filed, and in some cases not until after the CPD had completed its investigation.

Paragraph 80 requires the CCA and the CPD to develop a shared database to track all complaints, the manner in which they are handled and their dispositions. The CCA staff now has access to the CPD’s ETS system, and the City also compiles a spreadsheet of all complaints and their CCA and CPD status, to track their handling in the two agencies.

The Regional Computer Center and the CCA are currently in the process of finalizing the Citizen Complaint Case Management System. The Citizen Complaint Case Management System will include the following fields: CCA Case Number, CPD Case Number, CPD Date Received, CPD Date Closed, Incident Date, Allegations, Complainant Name, Sex and Race, Officer Name, Sex and Race, CPD Disposition, CCA Disposition, CCA Board action, Date Submitted to City Manager, City Manager’s Disposition, and CPD Action. This

automated tracking system will replace the current process of coordinating case status information in the current Provue database and the manual processes associated with investigative case management. The Citizen Complaint Case Management System will further enhance CCA's ability to integrate relevant case completion data. In addition, the Case Management System will ensure that any deficiencies in efficient coordination of CCA and CPD investigations are eliminated.

During this quarter, the CCA and CPD participated jointly in the Management Training Program at the Cincinnati Police Academy. The program provided an opportunity to create awareness for CPD management staff. Training objectives included helping supervisors and police officers do a better job receiving and handling citizen complaints; familiarizing supervisors and police officers with the process for handling complaints that are within the jurisdiction of the CCA; and educating CPD members about the role of the CCA.

Paragraph 86 requires the CCA to issue annual reports summarizing its activities for the previous year including a review of significant cases and recommendations. Such reports shall be issued to the City Council and the City Manager, and made available to the public. The CCA issued its 2004 Annual Report in this quarter.

### **3. Assessment**

Now that the CCA and the CPD have developed written procedures for the timely exchange of information and the efficient coordination of the CCA and the CPD investigations, the City is in compliance with CA paragraph 74. Also, with these procedures in place, it appears that the City is in compliance with paragraph 70, requiring that each complaint be directed to the CCA in a timely manner. As reported by the CCA, the City is also now in compliance with CA paragraph 71, requiring that the CPD not interfere with the ability of the CCA to monitor the work of the CPD at the scene, and monitor CPD interviews.

The coordination of the CCA and IIS procedures, and the new SOP setting out procedures for CPD action in those cases where the CCA sustains complaints has also put the City in a position to comply with CA paragraph 78, requiring that the City Manager and the Chief of Police refrain from making a final decision on discipline until after receipt of the CCA investigation and report. It appears that the City is in compliance with this provision, although there are several complaint investigations which are still awaiting a decision from the CPD or the City Manager.

## CHART OF MOA COMPLIANCE STATUS

MOA Para.	MOA Requirement	Compliance Status
10	Mental Health Response Team (MHRT)	Compliance
11	Foot pursuits	Compliance
12	Use of Force	Compliance
12a	Use of Force Policy shall use clear terms	
12b	Define force as in MOA	
12c	Incorporate force model	
12d	Individuals should be allowed to submit to arrest before force is used	
12e	Advise that excessive force will subject officers to discipline	
12f	Prohibit chokeholds	
12g	Remove term “restraining force” from policies and procedures	
13	Make policy revisions publicly available; publish on website	Compliance
14	Chemical Spray	Compliance
14a	Define terms in chemical spray policy	
14b	Limit spray to cases where force necessary to protect persons, to effect arrest, or prevent escape	
14c	Spray used only where verbal commands would be ineffective or endanger officer	
14d	Supervisory approval needed for spray on crowd, absent exigency	
14e	Verbal warning and time for compliance required, unless dangerous	
14f	Aim at upper torso and face	
14g	Guidance on duration and distance for spray	
14h	Decontamination within 20 minutes	
14i	Medical attention when needed	
14j	Don’t keep subject face down	
14k	Spray on restrained persons used only when subject or other likely to suffer injury or escape	
15	Spray on restrained person investigated with tapes;	Compliance

investigations reviewed by Inspections Section

16	Sufficient restraining equipment in cars, and officers to be trained to use	Compliance
17	In-service training on chemical spray	Compliance
18	Accounting of spray canisters	Compliance
19	Periodic review of research on choice of spray	Compliance
20	Canines	Compliance
20a	Revise canine policy; improve operations, and introduce “improved handler-controlled alert curriculum”	
20b	Policy shall limit off-leash searches to commercial buildings and search for suspect wanted for offense of violence or reasonably suspected of being armed	
20c	Approval of supervisor needed for deployment	
20d	Loud and clear announcement required before deployment, time to surrender	
20e	Canines not allowed to bite unless subject poses risk of imminent danger, or is actively resisting or escaping	
20f	1. Dog called off at first possible moment. 2. Bites of nonresistant suspects prohibited. 3. Medical treatment must be sought.	
20g	CPD to track deployments, calculate bite ratio monthly	
20h	Bite ratio included in risk management system; 20% ratio triggers review	
21	Beanbag Weapon	Compliance
21a	Define terms in beanbag weapon policy	
21b	Weapons may only be used to incapacitate subject to prevent physical harm	
21c	Prohibit use to prevent theft or minor vandalism	
21d	Prohibit use against crowd, unless specific target who poses threat of imminent physical harm	
21e	Weapon use can be inappropriate even if only option is to let subject escape	
21f	Supervisor required to approve use against crowd	
22	Enforce provision limiting simultaneous rounds against single individual	Compliance

23	Verbal warning to be given before use of beanbag shotguns, where distance makes it practical	Compliance
24	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All uses of force reported as CPD reports use of force.</li> <li>2. Report form will indicate each and every type of force.</li> <li>3. Report to contain supervisor's narrative, and taped statement.</li> <li>4. Supervisors shall have access to force reporting database.</li> <li>5. Special form for canine deployments, tracking.</li> </ol>	<p>Compliance</p> <p>Compliance with respect to revised MOA ¶24 for Taser incidents will be reviewed in the next quarter</p>
25	Gun pointing contingency	N/A
26	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Officers to notify supervisors after use of force.</li> <li>2. Supervisors to respond to scene.</li> <li>3. Supervisors involved in incident will not investigate force.</li> </ol>	Compliance
27	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supervisors will investigate force. Include description of facts.</li> <li>2. Investigation will review basis of stop and seizure.</li> </ol>	Compliance
28	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. IIS will respond and investigate incidents of serious use of force.</li> <li>2. Inspections will review canine bites, beanbags and batons</li> </ol>	Compliance
29	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prohibit investigators from leading questions.</li> <li>2. Consider all relevant evidence and make credibility determinations.</li> <li>3. No automatic preference for officer.</li> <li>4. Resolve material inconsistencies.</li> </ol>	<p>Compliance</p> <p>Unable to monitor leading questions</p>
30	All officers who witness force will provide a statement; be identified on force form; and forms will indicate whether medical care was provided, or refused.	Compliance
31	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lt. or higher will review each investigation and identify deficiencies.</li> <li>2. Appropriate corrective action taken for deficient investigations.</li> </ol>	Compliance

32	Firearms discharge investigations will account for shots, locations, and include ballistic or crime scene analysis	Compliance
33	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create firearms discharge board.</li> <li>2. Board will review all discharges.</li> <li>3. Board's reports will determine whether force was in policy, proper tactics were used, lesser force was available.</li> </ol>	Compliance
34	Firearm Board's policy requirements; return incomplete investigations; annually review patterns; 90 days for review	Compliance
35	Program to inform public of complaint process	Compliance
36	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Complaint forms available at various locations, CPD stations, in police vehicles.</li> <li>2. Officers will not discourage any person from making complaint</li> </ol>	Compliance
37	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Complaints can be made through variety of processes.</li> <li>2. Every complaint will result in written form.</li> <li>3. Every complaint resolved in writing. Complaint will have unique identifier, and be tracked by type.</li> </ol>	Compliance
38	Allegations filed with CPRP, OMI, CCA will be referred to IIS in 5 days.	Compliance
39	Complaints evaluated using preponderance of evidence standard	Compliance
40	Officers involved in incident shall not investigate incident	Compliance
41	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Investigating agency will consider all relevant evidence.</li> <li>2. No automatic preference.</li> <li>3. Resolve material inconsistencies.</li> <li>4. Consider and train investigators on credibility determinations.</li> </ol>	Partial Compliance
42	1. All relevant police activity and each use of force will be reviewed.	Compliance

- 2. Investigation not to be closed if complaint withdrawn.
- 3. Guilty plea not to be used to decide whether force is in policy.

43	Complainant will be kept informed	Compliance
44	Each allegation to be closed with one of four dispositions	Compliance
45	Unit Commanders to evaluate investigations to identify problems and training needs.	Compliance
46	IIS will investigate complaints of force, pointing firearms, searches and seizures and discrimination. IIS will determine which complaints it investigates. Only complaints not in IIS jurisdiction will be eligible for CCRP	Compliance
47	CCRP complaints will be fully investigated and adjudicated, prior to resolution meeting. Willingness of complainant to participate in resolution meeting will have no bearing on outcome.	Defer until Next Quarter
48	CCRP complaints will be handled through chain of command. Investigator will prepare report, with description of incident, summary and analysis of all evidence, findings and analysis. Investigation will be reviewed by District or Unit Commander, who will order additional investigation when appropriate.	Defer until Next Quarter
49	Thoroughness of investigations	Partial Compliance
49a	IIS investigations will have taped interviews of complainant, officers and witnesses.	
49b	Interviews of complainant and witnesses will be at times and sites convenient for them when practicable.	
49c	Prohibit group interviews	
49d	Notify supervisors of investigation	
49e	Interview all appropriate CPD officers, including supervisors	
49f	Collect and analyze appropriate evidence, including canvassing of scene.	

49g	Identify all material inconsistencies in officer and witness statements.	
50	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. IIS report will include description of allegation, summary of all evidence, proposed findings and analysis.</li> <li>2. IIS will complete investigations within 90 days absent exceptional circumstances.</li> </ol>	Not in Compliance
51	CCA will assume all responsibilities from OMI	Compliance
52	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All complaints will be directed to CCA.</li> <li>2. CCA will have jurisdiction over, and will investigate itself, excessive force, improper pointing of firearms, unreasonable searches and discrimination complaints.</li> <li>3. CCA will accept third party complaints.</li> <li>4. CCA will have sufficient investigators.</li> </ol>	Compliance
53	CPD officers will answer CCA questions. CCA will have access to CPD records and personnel.	Compliance
54	City to develop procedures re timing, notification, and interviewing of witnesses so parallel investigations are effective.	Compliance
55	City will take appropriate action, including imposing discipline or non-corrective action where warranted, regarding CCA investigations.	Partial Compliance
56	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CCA will complete investigations within 90 days;</li> <li>2. City Manager to take action within 30 days of completion of CCA investigation</li> </ol>	Partial Compliance
57	CPD to expand risk management system. Use system to promote civil rights and manage risk and liability.	Partial compliance
58	System will collect 10 data elements	Compliance
59	System will include appropriate identifying information for each officer	Compliance

60	CPD will prepare for review and approval of DOJ a Data Input Plan	Compliance
61	CPD to prepare for review and approval of DOJ a protocol for using the risk management system.	Compliance
62	Use of Risk Management System	Partial Compliance
62a	Protocol will contain data storage, retrieval, reporting, analysis, pattern identification, supervisory assessment.	
62b	Protocol will require system to analyze data on individual officer, average activity, patterns by officers, and by all officers within unit.	
62c	Protocol will require system to generate monthly reports describing data, data analysis, identifying individual and unit patterns	
62d	CPD commanders, managers, and supervisors to review system reports (at least quarterly) and evaluate individual officer, supervisor and unit activity.	
62e	CPD commanders, managers, and supervisors initiate interventions for officers, supervisors or units based on activity and pattern assessment.	
62f	Intervention options include discussion, counseling, training, monitored action plans. All interventions to be documented in writing.	
62g	Actions taken will be based on all relevant information, not just numbers.	
62h	Data to be accessible to commanders, supervisors and managers, and supervisors will promptly review data on officers transferred into their units.	
62i	Commanders, managers and supervisors will be evaluated on their use of system.	
62j	System to be managed by Inspections. Inspections will do quarterly audits.	
62k	Protocol will require regular reviews (not less than quarterly) of all relevant risk management system information to evaluate officer performance citywide, and make appropriate comparisons regarding performance of units to identify patterns or series of incidents.	
63	City will maintain officer data in system during officer's employment and five years after. Aggregate statistical data will be kept indefinitely.	Compliance

64	System to be developed on specified schedule.	Compliance
65	CPD to use existing databases for risk management until new system implemented.	N/A
66	CPD may propose future changes, subject to review and approval of DOJ	N/A
67	CPD to develop protocol for audits; with regular fixed schedule for audits.	Compliance
68	1. CPD will conduct quarterly audits of CCRP complaints. 2. CPD will conduct semi-annual audit if IIS investigations.	Compliance  IIS audit will be reviewed in next quarter
69	Regular meetings with local prosecutors to identify issues in officer, shift or unit performance.	Compliance
70	MVRs	Compliance with equipment  Implementation assessment deferred until next quarter
70a	Mandatory activation of video cameras for all traffic stops, pursuits.	
70b	To the extent practical, recording of requests for consent to search, vehicle searches, drug detection canines	
70c	To the extent practical, manual activation for incidents in which the prisoner being transported is violent	
70d	Supervisors to review tapes from incidents involving force, injuries to prisoners, vehicle pursuits, complaints	
70e	CPD to retain and preserve tapes for at least 90 days, or longer when incident is subject to investigation	
71	If officer knows camera is not working, officer will notify shift supervisor	Compliance

72	<p>1. CPD will conduct periodic random reviews of MVR tapes for training and integrity purposes. Reviews will be documented in a log book.</p> <p>2. CPD to conduct random reviews of equipment.</p>	Compliance
73	CPD will upgrade its Police Communications Section technology	Compliance
74	CPD will maintain a written protocol or checklist to guide PCS operators on responding to situations	Compliance
75	<p>1. CPD will revise its disciplinary matrix to take account of violations of different rules rather than just repeated violation of same rule.</p> <p>2. CPD will revise matrix to increase penalties for excessive force, improper searches and seizures, discrimination, or dishonesty. Revised matrix will allow CPD to impose appropriate punishment when misconduct exhibits lack of fitness for duty.</p>	Compliance
76	CPD will take disciplinary action when matrix calls for disciplinary action. CPD will consider non-disciplinary, corrective action (in addition to discipline) even where discipline is imposed.	Compliance
77.	<p>1. CPD will coordinate use of force training to ensure quality, consistency and compliance with policy.</p> <p>2. CPD will conduct regular reviews, at least semi-annually.</p>	Compliance
78	<p>Director of training academy will</p> <p>(a) ensure quality of training;</p> <p>(b) develop and implement use of force training curricula;</p> <p>(c) select and train CPD officer trainers;</p> <p>(d) develop and oversee in-service training and roll-call curricula;</p> <p>(e) establish evaluation procedures;</p> <p>(f) conduct needs-assessments.</p>	Compliance
79	CPD will provide training consistent with CPD policy, law and proper police practices; ensure that only mandated objectives and approved lesson plans are taught.	Compliance

80	CPD curriculum and policy committee will review all use of force training and use of force policies on regular basis. The committee will include academy staff, command staff, cross section of field personnel, and representative of City Solicitor's office.	Compliance
81	Use of Force Training	Compliance
81a	Use of force training will include CPD's use of force model	
81b	Proper use of force decision making	
81c	CPD's use of force reporting requirements	
81d	Fourth Amendment and other constitutional requirements	
81e	Examples of scenarios on force decision making	
81f	Interactive exercises emphasizing proper force decision making	
81g	Proper amount of chemical spray, proper targets and procedure	
81h	De-escalation techniques to allow arrest without force, disengagement, area containment, surveillance, waiting out subject, summoning reinforcements, or letting subject temporarily evade arrest may be appropriate response, even when force is legally justified.	
81i	Additional training on extracting subjects from stationary cars and disabling cars.	
81j	Threat assessment	
81k	Additional training on interacting with persons who are mentally ill	
81l	Factors to consider in limiting or continuing a pursuit	
82	<p>1. CPD will provide all officers charged with accepting complaints training on handling complaints. Training on role of CCA, IIS, CCRP to new recruits and as part of annual in service training.</p> <p>2. Training on burden of proof, factors to consider in assessing credibility, to supervisors responsible for investigating complaints.</p>	Compliance
83	Leadership training for CPD supervisors. Provided to sergeants within 30 days of their assuming supervisory responsibilities	Compliance

84	Canine Training	Defer until Next Quarter
84a	Canine training will be modified: development and implementation of comprehensive training curriculum and lesson plan identifying the goals, objectives and mission of Canine Unit, consistent with canine policy as amended by MOA.	
84b	1. CPD shall purchase only professionally bred dogs. 2. CPD to ensure that all canines, handlers and supervisors shall be formally trained in the canine policy and can carry it out.	
84c	Canines to receive annual recertification and periodic refresher training.	
84d	CPD to ensure that handlers are capable of implementing policy; able to maintain control of, and contact with, the canine to ensure that the canine is not allowed to bite a suspect without legal justification.	
84e	Canine trainers shall be certified canine instructors.	
85	Training instructors engage students in meaningful dialogue regarding scenarios	Compliance
86	CPD to periodically meet with Solicitor's office concerning conclusion of lawsuits involving allegations of misconduct; to be incorporated into training.	Compliance
87	Copies of the agreement to be provided to all CPD and relevant City employees. Initial training within 120 days of implementation. Training thereafter to be part of in-service training.	Compliance
88	FTOs: 1. CPD to enhance program. Protocol to address criteria and selection of FTOs, and sets standards requiring assessment of officer's past complaint and disciplinary history. 2. FTO appointment subject to review for reappointment at Training Director's discretion. 3. District Commanders also will have discretion to remove FTO officer, in consultation with Training Director.	Compliance

89	FTOs will be reviewed at least bi-annually, with recertification dependent on satisfactory performance and feedback from Training Academy	Compliance
90	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CPD to ensure that all officers complete mandatory annual re-qualification firearms training.</li> <li>2. Increased in-service firearms training consisting of completion of re-qualification courses and a passing score on target shooting trials.</li> <li>3. Professional night training and stress training in annual in-service.</li> <li>4. CPD will revoke powers of officers failing recertification.</li> <li>5. Firearms instructors will critically observe students.</li> <li>6. CPD will create and implement a checklist identifying evaluation criteria. Checklists to be completed for each student by instructor; to include <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. maintains finger off trigger;</li> <li>b. maintains proper hold and stance;</li> <li>c. uses proper force decision making</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Compliance

## CHART OF CA COMPLIANCE

CA ¶	CA PROVISION	COMPLIANCE STATUS
<b>Interagency Collaboration</b>		
29(a)	The City, in consultation with the other Parties, shall develop and implement a plan to coordinate City departments with the CPOP focus of the CPD.	Partial Compliance
<b>Best Practices</b>		
29(b)	The Parties shall develop and implement a system for regularly researching and making available to the public a comprehensive library of best practices in community problem oriented policing.	Compliance
<b>Continuous Learning Process Through the CPD Around Problem Solving</b>		
29(c)	The City, in consultation with the Parties shall develop a “continuous learning” process through the CPD. Experiences with problem solving efforts in the field will be documented. Experiences with problem solving efforts in the field will be disseminated throughout the police department. Experiences with problem solving efforts in the field will be made available to the public. Problem solving will continue to be emphasized in (included but not limited to) academy training, in-service training, and field officer training.	Partial Compliance
<b>Research Successful and Unsuccessful Ways to Tackle Problems</b>		
29(d)	The Parties will seek out information on how problem solving is conducted in other police agencies. Research and best practices on successful and unsuccessful methods for tackling problems, and analogous processes used by other professions (e.g. conflict resolution, organization development, epidemiology, military, civil engineering, and business) will be disseminated.	Partial Compliance
<b>Joint Promotion of CPOP and CPOP Training</b>		
29(e)	The Parties, consistent with the Partnering Center, shall conduct CPOP training for community groups, jointly promote CPOP, and implement CPOP training.	Compliance
<b>Community Dialogue and Structured Engagement with Specific Groups</b>		
29(f)	The Parties shall coordinate efforts undertaken through the Partnering Center and establish an ongoing community dialogue and interaction including, but not limited, to	Partial Compliance

structured involvement between the CPD and youth as well as with property owners, businesses, tenants, community and faith-based organizations, motorists, low income residents and other city residents on purposes and practices of CPOP.

<b>CPOP Annual Award</b>		
29(g)	The Parties shall establish an annual CPOP award to recognize the efforts of citizens, police officials, and other public officials who have made substantial contributions to CPOP by addressing community problems in Cincinnati.	Compliance
<b>Informing the Public about Police Policies and Procedures - Communications Audit</b>		
29(h)	The City, in consultation with the Parties and consistent with Ohio law, shall develop and implement a system for consistently informing the public about police policies and procedures. In accomplishing this item, The City, in consultation with the Parties, shall conduct a communications audit, and develop and implement a plan for the improvement of internal and external communications. This will be funded by NCCJ.	Compliance
<b>Staff a Community Relations Office</b>		
29(i)	The Parties shall create and staff a Community Relations office that will coordinate with the CPD implementation of this Agreement.	Compliance
<b>Problem Solving Annual Report</b>		
29(j)	The Parties shall describe the current status of problem solving throughout the CPD and what is being done to improve it through an annual report. Each party shall provide information detailing what it has done relating to its role in CPOP.	Compliance
<b>CPD District Commander and Special Unit Commanders/Officials Submit Problem Solving Reports</b>		
29(k)	CPD District Commanders and Special Unit Commanders or officials at comparable levels shall prepare quarterly reports that detail problem solving activities within their districts. To the extent practicable, these reports shall identify specific problems addressed and steps taken by the City and the community toward their resolution. The reports also shall identify obstacles faced and recommendations for future improvement. Consistent with individual privacy and relevant law, these reports shall be available to the public through the CPD's Community Relations Office.	Partial Compliance

<b>Police Academy Training</b>		
29(l)	The Parties shall review existing courses and recommend any new ones that may be appropriate for the Police Training Academy in order to effectively and accurately inform police recruits, officers and supervisors about the urban environment in which they are working.	Partial Compliance
<b>Implement Problem Tracking System</b>		
29(m)	The Parties, in conjunction with the Monitor, shall develop and implement a problem tracking system that will have the goal of documenting problem-solving activities, including problem definition, analysis and response activities and information, evaluation results, and partnerships with police, government, and community organizations and individuals.	Defer until Next Quarter
<b>Update Staffing Plan in Light of CPOP</b>		
29(n)	The City shall periodically review its staffing plan in light of its commitments under CPOP and make revisions as necessary subject to funding provisions of this Agreement.	Partial Compliance
<b>Revise CPD Policies, Procedures, Organizational Plans, Job Descriptions, and Performance Evaluations consistent with CPOP</b>		
29(o)	The City shall review and, where necessary and appropriate, revise police department policies and procedures, organizational plans, job descriptions, and performance evaluation standards, consistent with its commitment to CPOP	Not in Compliance
<b>Information Retrieval Systems Consistent with Analysis Needs</b>		
29(p)	Consistent with applicable federal and state law regarding protection of personal privacy and the Ohio Public Records Act, the City shall design a system that will permit the retrieval and linkage of certain information, including that which is already collected by the CPD but may not be routinely searchable under the present system. Further, the system shall enable the tracking of repeat offenders, repeat victims, and/or repeat locations that are necessary to community problem oriented policing. Finally, the system established under this paragraph shall include, but not be limited to, that information necessary to comply with the terms in this Agreement regarding nondiscrimination in policing an early warning.	Not in Compliance
<b>Availability of Timely Information to Detect, Analyze, and Respond to Problems, and Evaluate their</b>		

<b>Effectiveness</b>		
29(q)	The City, in consultation with the Parties, shall study the options and then determine if and how to best secure appropriate information technology so that police officers, supervisors, managers, and executives, as well as other City agencies and community members, can get access to timely and useful information needed to detect, analyze, and respond to problems and evaluate their effectiveness subject to the provisions of this Agreement with respect to funding.	Not in Compliance
<b>Evaluation Protocol</b>		
30	The Parties, in consultation with appropriate experts and under the supervision of the Monitor, shall develop a system of evaluation to track the attainment of goals agreed to between the Parties in the Settlement Agreement. The Parties will regularly meet with the Monitor to study the results of the evaluation instruments and determine what changes, if any, in the Agreement or in their actions should be pursued in light of the evaluation results.	Defer unit Next Quarter
31	The Parties shall, with advice of expert consultants and under the supervision of the Monitor, develop a Protocol to accomplish the system of evaluation	Compliance
32	The Evaluation Protocol shall set forth a schedule of implementation of its terms; the cost of implementation; the individual or entity that will perform its requirements; data collection methods; guidelines for analysis of collected data and reporting; level of statistical confidence; and levels of statistical power.	Compliance
33	The cost to implement the Evaluation Protocol shall not exceed the limits of the CA	NA
34	The Evaluation Protocol shall include (1) periodic surveys; (2) periodic observations of programs in which the police are involved; (3) and annual statistical compilations of police interactions with the community and the community's interaction with the police	Compliance
35	Periodic Surveys	Compliance
36	Periodic Observations	Compliance
37	Privacy and Anonymity of Survey and Observation Respondents	Compliance

38	Statistical Compilations	Compliance
39	Statistical Compilations	Compliance
40	The City shall provide to the Monitor incident-based data so that the nature, circumstances, and results of the events can be examined.	NA
41	Evaluation of Problem Solving Processes	Compliance
42	Evaluation of Video and Audio Records	Compliance
43	Evaluation of Staffing	Compliance
44	The Evaluation Protocol will include the provision of periodic reports	Compliance
45	Annual Reports on Evaluation Protocol	Compliance
46	Measurement of the success of the mutual accountability process	Defer Until Next Quarter
<b>Use of Force and DOJ Agreement</b>		
47	The City shall abide by the terms of the DOJ Agreement (the MOA)	Compliance
48	Expedited citizen complaint process for addressing concerns based on pointed firearms. The Conciliator shall review six months of complaint and investigation determinations, and decide whether a pattern of improper pointing of firearms at citizens exists.	NA
49	FOP agrees the DOJ Agreement can be appended to the CA, so long as it reserves the right to raise issues related to the DOJ Agreement through the dispute resolution process	NA
<b>Fair, Equitable and Courteous Treatment</b>		
50	The City shall provide police services in a fair and impartial manner without any discrimination on the basis of race, color or ethnicity. The City, in consultation with the Parties, shall take appropriate action to track compliance.	Compliance
51	Analysis of the data collected to measure whether any racial disparity is present in motor vehicle stops will be reported pursuant to the Evaluation Protocol (§39).	Defer until Next Quarter

52	The Parties shall cooperate in the ongoing training and dissemination of information regarding the Professional Traffic Stops Bias-Free Policing Training Program.	Partial Compliance
53	The Monitor shall include in public reports detailed information including the racial composition of those persons stopped (whether in a motor vehicle or not), detained, searched, arrested, or involved in a use of force with a member of the CPD.	Compliance
54	In providing police services, the members of CPD shall conduct themselves in a professional, courteous manner, consistent with professional standards. Except in exigent circumstances, when a citizen is stopped or detained and then released as part of an investigation, the officer shall explain to the citizen why he or she was stopped or detained.	Compliance

#### **Civilian Complaint Authority**

55	The new Citizen Complaint Authority (CCA) will replace the Citizen Police Review Panel and the police investigations function of the OMI.	Compliance
56	The CCA will have three components: (1) a Board of seven citizens; (2) a full time Executive Director; (3) a team of professional investigators.	Compliance
57	The Board will include a diverse array of seven citizens.	Compliance
58	Applicants shall execute a signed release authorizing a background check.	Compliance
59	The Board shall select a chairperson from among its members.	Compliance
60	The Board and Executive Director in consultation with the city manager, shall develop standards of professional conduct and a comprehensive training program for Board members.	Compliance
61	The Board will not commence operations until each member of the Board has completed the training.	Compliance
62	The Board and Executive Director shall develop specific procedures for the CCA to carry out its functions.	Compliance

63	Board members shall be compensated per meeting	NA
64	The City Solicitor shall provide legal counsel on a routine basis for the CCA.	Compliance
65	The City Manager shall appoint the CCA's Executive Director.	Compliance
66	The Executive Director shall have professional experience in the investigation of allegations of police misconduct.	Compliance
67	The Executive Director shall be responsible for day-to-day operations of the CCA.	Compliance
68	All police officers and city employees are required to provide truthful and accurate information to the CCA.	Compliance
69	The CCA shall have a minimum of five professional investigators.	Compliance
70	Each citizen complaint, excluding matters involving criminal investigations, will be directed to the CCA regardless of where initially it is filed, and the Executive Director, in consultation with the Board, shall establish criteria to determine whether specific complaints are suitable for CCA investigation, or referral to the CPD's CCRP. At a minimum, the CCA shall open its own investigation upon (i) receipt of a complaint of serious misconduct, or (ii) knowledge by the Executive Director of allegations of serious police intervention.	Compliance
71	Where a complaint is to be investigated by the CCA, it will be assigned to an investigator within 48 hours of receipt. The CPD shall notify the CCA Executive Director upon the occurrence of a serious police intervention. The CPD shall not interfere with the ability of the CCA investigator to monitor the work of the CPD at the scene.	Compliance
72	The Chief of Police shall retain discretion to initiate a parallel CPD investigation of any complaint under investigation by the CCA. In addition, the CPD will investigate all complaints initiated within the Department.	Compliance
73	Police officers and other City employees will be required to submit to administrative questions. The CCA shall access to city records, documents, and employees. CCA investigations shall be consistent with professional	Compliance

	standards.	
74	The Chief of Police and the Executive Director will develop written procedures that will assure the timely exchange of information and the efficient coordination of CCA and CPD investigations.	Compliance
75	The CCA will complete its investigations within 90 days of receipt from a complaining citizen, provided, however, that the Executive Director may extend an investigation upon consultation with the Board.	Compliance
76	CCA investigations will be forwarded to the Board; each CCA report shall include proposed findings and recommendations.	Compliance
77	If the Board conducts a review hearing, its purpose shall be to confirm the completeness of the CCA investigation and approve or disapprove the Executive Director's report. Review hearing procedures.	NA this Quarter
78	Following a hearing, the Board may either approve or disapprove the Executive Director's findings and recommendations. The Board may issue its own findings and recommendations and submit them along with the Executive Director's report to the Police Chief and the City Manager. In all cases, the City Manager and Police Chief will refrain from making a final decision in discipline until after receipt of the CCA report. The City Manager shall agree, disagree, or agree in part.	Compliance
79	Reports prepared by the CCA, the CPD, or the City Manager pursuant to this process shall be publicly available.	Compliance
80	The CPD and the CCA shall create a shared electronic database that will track all citizen complaints, including the manner in which they were addressed and their dispositions. The database shall capture data sufficient for the CCA and CPD to identify officers involved in repeat allegations, citizens making repeat allegations, and circumstances giving rise to citizen complaints.	Compliance
81	The CCA shall maintain files for each investigation for a period of five years.	Compliance
82	There are two methods for reducing citizen complaints: (i) through investigation of officers charged with misconduct, and (2) examination of complaint patterns to identify at-risk	NA

officers, citizens, and circumstances.

83	The CCA will examine complaint patterns that might provide opportunities for the CPD and community to reduce complaints. At a minimum, the CCA will look for three types of patterns: (i) repeat officers (ii) repeat citizen complainants, and (iii) repeat complaint circumstances. Following the identification of such patterns, the CCA and CPD jointly will undertake a problem-solving project to determine the reason for the pattern and whether there are opportunities to eliminate or reduce root causes.	Partial Compliance
84	The CCA will develop a clear and direct information brochure.	Compliance
85	The Executive Director will work with the community to develop an information plan.	Compliance
86	The CCA shall issue annual reports summarizing the activities for the previous year, including a review of significant cases and recommendations.	Compliance
87	The City Council will allocate resources sufficient for the CCA and CPD to accomplish the foregoing.	Compliance

## **APPENDIX**

### **Outstanding Individual Contribution in CPOP – Police:**

#### **Officer LaDon Laney, District 4 Neighborhood Officer:**

Police Officer LaDon Laney has worked with members of the Avondale Community Council, the Community Police Partnering Center, Local Initiative Support Corporation (LISC) and other residents and businesses in Avondale to work on several CPOP initiatives to make the community safer. One of the most successful initiatives was the demolition of an old gas station at the corners of Burnet and Rockdale Avenues, and the transformation of this area from what was previously a hot spot for drug dealing and other crimes.

Analysis indicated that the awning left on the abandoned gas station provided shade and cover for the drug dealers who used this abandoned property. Officer Laney contacted the owner of the property and got his permission to have community members come and clean up the lot. An afternoon of clean-up resulted in the removal of broken glass, trash, abandoned motorcycle and truck parts, and other hazardous debris.

The clean-up was just the beginning of reclaiming this area, though. Officer Laney worked with Deatra Greene of the Partnering Center and Ozie Davis of LISC to organize a series of positive community events, called the Jay Street Market, at this location. These Jay Street Market events encouraged Avondale neighbors to come out of their homes, enjoy the community and support the groups' efforts to create a safer and cleaner environment at this once-drug-ridden property.

Officer Laney has also been a strong advocate for the youth of Avondale; participating with 75 males, ages 12 – 18 in a “Youth Lock In” event held at Hirsch Recreation Center to talk with these young people about problems related to drugs, violence, and sexual activity.

#### **Officer Terri Windeler, District 5 Neighborhood Officer:**

Officer Terri Windeler was newly assigned to Northside at the same time as a new CPOP team was being formed in that neighborhood. She has since been credited with “re-energizing the CPOP Process” for her work with the community on two CPOP projects – Fergus Street and the Northside Assault project. For the Fergus Street project, Officer Windeler was invaluable in providing crime information for analysis, and acting as a conduit to city departments to get things done during the team’s response phase. She has participated in area clean-ups, including the most recent Great American Clean

Up in the pouring rain, and has provided consistently valuable support to both the CPOP Team and Citizens on Patrol.

Officer Windeler's supporters in Northside identified her "valuable role as a representative of the residents' concerns and issues to the local district and entire police department" as an "asset that cannot be measured." She regularly shares information between the community and the police, and this willingness to "go the extra mile" has earned her the respect and admiration of the community she serves. According to Northside residents, Officer Windeler is an "excellent example of positive policing in Cincinnati and what a Police/Citizens team can accomplish working together."

### **Sergeant Maris Herold, District 1 Neighborhood Unit Supervisor**

For years, residents of Pendleton recognized that the high percentage of drug trafficking in their neighborhood was due to the quick and easy access route for drug buyers coming off the I-471 interchange and then entering the Pendleton neighborhood to make a drive-by purchase from street traffickers and then re-entering I-471 to return to Kentucky. One person arrested even carried "business cards" directing potential drug buyers to this area. As a result, residents were fearful that drug traffickers were establishing a foothold in this community, bringing with them violent crime, including homicides.

Sergeant Herold of District 1 partnered with neighborhood stakeholders, including Pendleton residents and the Over-the-Rhine Chamber of Commerce, and began to analyze available calls for service and drug arrest data and speak to police officers working in this area about their perception of the problem. Working with the OTR Chamber, Sgt. Herold was able to provide additional police presence in this neighborhood through the hiring of off-duty personnel paid for by a Drug Elimination Grant through the Chamber.

As the team continued to monitor the activity at this location, an idea to erect a barricade as a potential solution to reducing if not eliminating the problem of a drive-through drug market was adopted. The barricade was put in place by the City's Traffic and Engineering Department. A survey of Pendleton residents was conducted and a majority supported the barricade. One business, however, raised concerns and the barricade was eventually taken down.

Sgt. Herold worked cooperatively with residents, businesses, and various City Departments on this creative and "out of the box" response to an open air drug market. The presence of the barricade did achieve the initial goal of reducing drug related offenses and activity on 13<sup>th</sup> Street, and the University of Cincinnati completed an evaluation study that supports the CPD data that crime did go down in Pendleton as a result of the barricade.

## **Outstanding Individual Contribution in CPOP – Individual:**

### **Ben Pipkin, Kennedy Heights CPOP**

They don't call Ben Pipkin the "King of the Bumps" for nothing. Not only did Ben devise the idea for using plastic Easter egg molds to make concrete bumps that were glued to the Kennedy Ave. Bridge to deter drug dealers from sitting on it, he secured funding for the concrete mix and glue, he thoroughly tested various types of glue to determine which one worked best, he created hundreds of the bumps by himself, and participated in all of the bump parties that took place over the summer.

Beyond the bumps, though, Ben is also an excellent leader and effective communicator. He was an early ambassador for CPOP and the SARA process in the Kennedy Heights community and continues to participate on both the CPOP Team and in Citizens on Patrol. As part of his work with the 25 Cities Initiative, Ben has partnered with the Recovery Health Access Center, distributing postcards through the neighborhood publicizing a 24 hour helpline for drug and alcohol addiction.

### **Amos Robinson, College Hill CPOP & Dorothy Harris, College Hill CPOP**

As members of the College Hill CPOP Team, both Amos Robinson and Dorothy Harris shared the frustration of seeing the legal system return those arrested for drug dealing and other offenses to the streets – often within hours of their arrest – with minimal safeguards for the community. Some of these offenders have taunted Citizens on Patrol volunteers after their release, and other residents reported that the drug dealers were even more brazen when they returned to the community, sometimes with guns.

After building relationships with City prosecutors, probation officers and judges, Dorothy and Amos set out to effect change within the legal system. Working with Terry Cosgrove of the City's Law Department, the two began a very effective College Hill "Court Watch" team. They began this effort by attending the court hearings of anyone arrested on drug charges. They have since put in a minimum of 20 hours per week attending court hearings, and using the internet to follow information related to each case. As a result of their efforts, they have earned the trust and respect of judges and prosecutors, and their input on behalf of the College Hill community is taken seriously at sentencing.

However, they do not approach Court Watch as a "cookie cutter" solution. In some cases, they have asked for leniency, provided the individual meets certain stipulations such as getting their GED or simply returning to school, working with a community mentor, or securing employment. They have worked with

probation officers to ensure that individuals who were offered a second chance live up to their commitment to the College Hill community.

### **Tori Houlihan & Dave Henry, Northside CPOP**

The combined work of these two individuals – both armed with tremendous skills and resources to get things done from their years of work at Procter & Gamble – brought a professional approach to the promotion of CPOP in Northside and the level and thoroughness of analysis and responses to both the Fergus Street and the Northside Assaults projects. Dave and Tori were largely responsible for developing and then conducting a survey of Fergus Street residents that engaged residents in identifying and then prioritizing the quality of life issues that they regularly experience, such as blighted and abandoned homes, drug-related activity, litter and loitering of unsupervised youth. The results of this survey and a subsequent spreadsheet of responses assisted the CPOP team in developing a custom-made response that has led to tremendous improvements in this area of Northside. Tori and Dave’s shared work also played a critical role in getting residents who were the victims of assaults to document their experience, and in doing so, assist the police in solving these previously unreported crimes. Their “Letter To Property Owners”, which introduces CPOP, describes current projects, and invites others to participate, is a valuable outreach tool that can be replicated throughout the City by CPOP Teams and other Community Groups to help improve safety in our neighborhoods.

### **Outstanding Individual Contribution in CPOP – Organizations:**

#### **Tender Mercies, Over-the-Rhine**

At this Over-the-Rhine organization that is committed to the goals of security, dignity and community with and for all of their residents living in permanent and transitional housing, it was becoming increasingly difficult to ensure this security and a quality community when rampant drug-dealing, violence, and other disorder was occurring right outside their doors.

To combat this widespread problem, a CPOP Team was formed, and the team worked with District 1 Sergeant Maris Herold and Officer Frank McGraw to analyze the crime data from this location, which, along with observations from Tender Mercies residents and staff, provided the team with valuable information about the nature of the crimes, where they were being committed, and on what days and times they were most prevalent.

Using this information, the Tender Mercies CPOP team developed a novel response – one that was a combination of environmental change along with a series of community events to “take back” this area and demonstrate community ownership. The team erected a banner that said “Do NOT Buy or

Sell Drugs Here” across Republic Street and facing 12<sup>th</sup> Street. They hosted and recruited area residents to attend three “coffee breaks” at this location, which were held on the day and time that police data indicated was the heaviest for drug dealing. These events, along with a voter registration drive at the same location, attracted approximately 100 people each time they were held, and reclaimed this community space that had previously been claimed by drug dealers and those coming through to purchase drugs. The banner – which still hangs proudly today – broadcasts the Over-the-Rhine community’s – and Tender Mercies’ – intolerance for drug activity.

As part of this response, Tender Mercies worked with Cinergy to erect five exterior lights surrounding their building, removing “hiding places” for crimes to occur. As a result of this response, drug-related crime has decreased significantly at this location. Calls for service related to violence are also down, and Tender Mercies’ staff and residents also report less disorderly persons, groups of persons, noise complaints and other issues that had previously had a negative effect on their quality of life.

### **Santa Maria Lower Price Hill Family Center**

Lower Price Hill has a strong community; however it can be hard to penetrate if you are new to Lower Price Hill. When Partnering Center staff member Amy Krings was assigned to Lower Price Hill nearly two years ago, she was an unknown commodity. She credits much of her success to the entire staff of Santa Maria, who as she said, “took a risk to welcome me, introduced me to key stakeholders, and helped me become an effective advocate for and with the Lower Price Hill community.” The staff of Santa Maria assisted with outreach, phone calling and acting as an ambassador for CPOP in the community. They have hosted numerous community breakfasts and afternoon snacks with District 3 officers, just to give Lower Price Hill residents a chance to sit down and get to know their police officers. They have acted as trouble shooters and conflict managers in the community, and have used their contacts with various City departments to assist with abandoned buildings, recreation needs, code violations and health concerns. Amy and others in Lower Price Hill describe Santa Maria as a “helpful, committed, reliable and trustworthy” social service organization in the neighborhood – truly an asset to the people of Lower Price Hill and surrounding communities.

### **Cincinnati Police / District Four Neighborhood Unit:**

The District Four Neighborhood Unit is comprised of eleven officers – one supervisor and ten police officers – who serve the ten communities that make up this diverse District. The neighborhoods run the gamut from inner city urban neighborhoods to quiet suburban neighborhoods. Ethnic diversity in this community includes Roselawn’s Russian Jewish population, Carthage’s

growing Latino population, Hartwell's blue-collar Caucasian community to Avondale as a center of the city's thriving African-American population.

In each community and into each diverse constituency, these eleven officers' faces and names are known by residents, business owners and community leaders. They work with youth in the District by putting on youth symposiums; they mentor, tutor, chaperone, coach and even Santa when needed for the young people they have come to know, and who have come to know them as "Mr. LaDon" (Officer LaDon Laney), "Officer Hotsauce" (Alex Hasse), "Miss Julie" (Sgt. Julie Shearer) and "Miss Sandy" and "Miss Jana" (Police Officers Sandra Johnson and Jana Cruse). They have attended to medical emergencies, worked with their communities to get rid of drug activity at problem locations and provided at risk men and women with information about domestic violence, HIV, and substance abuse treatment.

### **Outstanding Community Efforts in CPOP:**

#### **Lower Price Hill CPOP Team:**

A CPOP Team comprised of Lower Price Hill residents and Santa Maria, a local Neighborhood Support Organization, came together with the support of District 3 Neighborhood Officer Steve Ventre and Amy Krings of the Community Police Partnering Center to address a problem building in the heart of a residential area that had become a safe haven for drugs, prostitution and other illegal activity. This building is located within a block of Oyler Elementary School and next door to a new drug treatment facility. A disturbing side-effect of this problem was that the prostitution and drug sales that were known to occur at this location attracted unsavory people who would then harass neighborhood girls and young women. Also, used needles and condoms were often found in the alleyway behind the building. Clearly, the management of this apartment building was "missing in action."

So the team took action – they worked with District 3 Police to collect calls for service and arrest data; they discovered through their analysis process that there were only two tenants in the building, both of whom had drug addiction issues themselves, who allowed this negative activity to occur. The team sent a powerful letter to the property owner and manager, outlining their legal obligations, and copied the City Manager, City Council members, the Mayor, and the directors of various City departments on this letter.

Within two months, the problem tenants were evicted. The appropriate City Departments worked with the team to board up and secure the building, which is now for sale, and the community plans to work with the next owner to ensure that the same problems do no return. The team also provided information about drug treatment programs to the individuals who were evicted. As a result of this CPOP Team's efforts, the drug and sex market at

this location was dismantled. Police report that calls for service and arrests at this location, which had previously included assaults, thefts, domestic violence and other crimes, have dropped to almost zero. Residents report that they are no longer finding needles in the alley, and their children now feel more comfortable playing outside again.

### **Pleasant Ridge Safety & Quality of Life Committee:**

The Pleasant Ridge Safety & Quality of Life Community began using the SARA process to address drug activity and other neighborhood crime around a 70+ unit apartment complex in this community. Working with District Two Police, the team discovered that 68% of all police calls related to drug possession and sales were linked to this complex, which was also one of the top five sources of police calls for violent crimes, including aggravated menacing, and weapons possession. Through their analysis, the team identified the new owner who had purchased the complex at Sheriff's Auction and began the process of working with them to uncover the reasons for the numerous drug complaints and to work together towards a solution. The team received Safe and Clean Grant funding through the City of Cincinnati which was used to construct fencing around the perimeter of the property, preventing drug offenders from running away from law enforcement. Additionally, the property management company worked to clean up and rehab the property, increased the number of times trash was picked up, maintained and installed outdoor lighting and hired an undercover police detail. The team also identified a resident who agreed to be a reliable and confidential "look out" for the community. This individual had the personal cell phone number for Sgt. Brian Ibold of the District 2 Violent Crime Squad and would call in any drug exchanges that were witnessed.

The group has since worked with the property management regarding better screening of tenants, and has established a Court Watch program through the City to track the cases of anyone arrested at or near this apartment complex. The team gave a plaque to District 2 Officers thanking them for their efforts, which now hangs in the lobby of District 2 Headquarters on Erie Ave. – a testament to the relationships that are strengthened by citizens and police working together.

### **Northside CPOP Team:**

This effort by the Northside CPOP Team is an extraordinary example of community residents and law enforcement working together to identify and develop a successful response to a pervasive problem that was threatening the safety, peace of mind, and quality of life for Northside residents.

Using the SARA process, the team identified a pattern of 16 similar assaults on individuals walking through the neighborhood, most of which were never

reported to the police. As a result of this under-reporting, the police were not aware of the scope and severity of this problem, which had caused people to feel like prisoners in their own home, and even consider moving out of Northside, for fear of being attacked.

The Team engaged the community to find out what prevented people from reporting these crimes to police. They did this by walking the area as a group for several weeks, spending 80+ hours speaking directly to people and gathering victim information through this activity and by utilizing the community press to reach even more people about their efforts. After a few of their evening walks, community residents would begin to join the team – first 3, then 5, then 20 new residents stopping by to ask what was going on and then joining the remainder of the walk! After gathering this information and sharing it with the police, the team then worked with the police investigative team and victims to identify the perpetrators of these assaults. The juvenile assailants were identified, and eventually confessed to being involved. The community provided juvenile court with impact statements and testimony letters to the Magistrate about the assaults and their effect on the community. The team's success in helping to solve these previously unreported crimes was documented in a segment on local television station Channel 12, and highlighted at this year's Neighborhood Summit at the Cintas Center. As a result of this cooperative effort, community-police relations improved in Northside, the assaults stopped, and a sense of safety, security and peace of mind and quality of life was returned to the residents of this vibrant community.

### **CPOP Partnering Award:**

#### **Northside CPOP Team**

For some time, Fergus Street in Northside has been widely recognized by the local community as a major crime hot spot, creating a downward spiral for the residents of that street, and spreading fear and a sense of hopelessness.

During their analysis phase, the Northside CPOP team uncovered that Fergus Street has suffered from a lack of individual home ownership and occupied dwellings on the street, with fewer than 20 percent of people owning their homes, and 40 percent of the homes on this street vacant. These abandoned and blighted properties at and around 4200 Fergus Street were identified as the source of a variety of problems for the community, including litter, trespassing, drug activity and arson. Additionally, police data for 2003 and 2004 revealed that Fergus Street had more calls for service and reported crime than any other street in Northside.

In addition to the number of abandoned buildings, a "Children's Park" at the beginning of the block was not being used by the community because of the

drug dealers, litter and unsupervised youth that had taken over this location. A neighborhood carry-out store had also been a source of trouble for the neighborhood.

In an effort to get current and meaningful feedback from the residents and the property owners on Fergus Street, two surveys were distributed, collected and analyzed. Both surveys revealed that litter, drug dealing, and youth loitering were paramount concerns of Fergus Street residents.

Supported by this data and the residents, the CPOP team partnered with Keep Cincinnati Beautiful and organized a series of three community clean-ups in the area to address the problem of litter and blight. Rather than just focusing on the street, which is where most traditional community cleanups are done, CPOP Team member Dave Henry solicited and received permission from several property owners to go on their property and haul out trash, cut trees, grass and weeds, and generally “spruce up” the area.

The CPOP team has also held outdoor events on Fergus, including cookouts and marshmallow roasts to try and engage residents in a meaningful manner. In another attempt to foster relationships and trust with Fergus residents, a faith-based group, Churches Active in Northside (CAIN), has invited them to be a part of an interactive program called CommUnity Bridge, which is designed as an inter-racial outreach and dialogue to voice and address relevant issues and concerns.

Besides the abandoned and unoccupied buildings, many houses on Fergus are in violation of city code. To respond to this, the Team formed a very productive partnership with the city, Terry Cosgrove of the City Law Department, Neighborhood Officer Terri Windeler, and the Code Enforcement Response Teams, to address these issues. Additionally, the team has partnered with Working In Neighborhoods (WIN) to purchase and re-hab several houses and return this housing stock to responsible owners and landlords. A Community Development Corporation (CDC) has re-emerged on Fergus Street, and additional properties are in the pipeline to be redeveloped. The team worked with the problem store, who voluntarily gave up their liquor license. The Children’s Park is also scheduled to be refurbished in early 2006 with assistance from a City Safe & Clean Neighborhood Grant.

### **CPOP Innovation Award:**

### **Kennedy Heights CPOP Team:**

When residents were asked to identify the most pressing safety concern in Kennedy Heights, more often than not, the answer would be “Drug sales on Kennedy Avenue.” To begin to tackle this “elephant in the room,” a team was formed and trained in the SARA process. The team worked with Officer George

Engleman and found that police calls for service were concentrated in the same area between Woodford Ave. and Northdale Place. Having narrowed down the problem area on Kennedy Avenue, the team began to collect information through citizen observations, window surveys and by interviewing the owner of a drive-through convenience store located at the corner of Kennedy and Woodford. The owner of this store shared some very valuable observations, one being that the drug dealers sit for hours on Kennedy Bridge, and use the cracks below the bridge to hide their drugs, instead of keeping them on their person. When a buyer would come around, the dealer would retrieve the drugs from beneath the bridge and make the sale.

Armed with this information, the team employed an innovative approach called “CPTED” to solving their problem. CPTED, which is an acronym for Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design, provided the team with their idea to “take back the bridge.” First, they communicated the methods of drug sales to police officers working in the area so they would have an understanding of what behaviors to look for. District Two police and Citizens on Patrol then implemented direct patrols of this area. Next, they worked with the City to trim back trees that were providing comfortable shade spots for the drug dealers sitting on the bridge. Then they worked with the City’s Transportation and Engineering Department to have the city install a fence underneath the bridge and clear out the debris that was providing cover for the illegal activity. The Team also worked with Specialist Kelly Raker from the Street Corner Unit to hold training for landlords about how to prevent and remove drug sales from rental properties.

The centerpiece of this CPOP initiative were the concrete bumps that were created using plastic Easter egg molds and then glued to the bridge, creating a very uncomfortable bridge for those used to sitting on it. This Kennedy Heights CPOP effort is notable for the resolve of those citizens who were determined to take back this bridge that had been a problem for the community for so long. They would put up the concrete bumps, the drug dealers would knock them off. But they kept coming back and re-applying more bumps. This activity was about a lot more than just bumps, however – the team used their “bump parties” as a community building exercise – grilling hamburgers and hot dogs, passing out lemonade, handing out drug treatment and prevention materials to vehicles passing by, writing drug free messages on the bridge in colored chalk, and in all, demonstrating that there is power in numbers. As a result of this effort, Kennedy Heights citizens built a better relationship with the management of the corner carryout store; people who were previously afraid to simply catch the bus at this location are now feeling safer to do so again, and most importantly, the Kennedy Bridge is now free of drug activity.

## **Comprehensive CPOP Initiative Award:**

### **Madisonville CPOP Team**

As one of the neighborhoods chosen to pilot the CPOP initiative in Cincinnati, Madisonville was one of the first communities to receive training in the SARA problem solving method which was jointly presented by the Cincinnati Police Department and a representative of Cincinnati CAN. Following a very well attended SARA training that included neighborhood residents, businesses and organizations, a team was formed and the process of “Scanning” began.

After several problems were identified, the one that the group prioritized was that of drug dealing, littering, and disorderly youths loitering at and around the intersection of Bramble & Whetsel, a situation that was creating fear and intimidation for neighborhood residents.

As the team began to analyze this problem, they discovered that people walking or driving in the area were very intimidated by this activity. Parents of neighborhood students also reported their children being harassed as they traveled to and from school. Some businesses at this location were identified as allowing illegal and disorderly behavior to take place outside of their business. Prior responses from surrounding residents were to call the police. Residents reported that they felt unequipped to handle the problem. Overall, the problem was viewed by citizens and businesses alike as something that the police should handle.

The team developed and conducted a series of surveys that included residents, businesses and the individuals that had been identified as the source of the problem – those hanging out on the corner. Those people hanging out on the corner provided valuable information to the team, saying that they felt that “no one minded” their hanging out on this corner. Those who admittedly were engaged in drug dealing at this location said they viewed this activity “as their livelihood”, and they felt that “no one really cared” about them. They also shared that they felt that the police could not arrest them for standing on the corners and they had some one looking out for the police, so they would not be caught holding drugs. This information from the perceived offenders was invaluable to the team’s eventual response. The team determined that there were a number of factors involved in solving this problem, some of which were “root cause” issues such as a lack of jobs, lack of recreation, and a lack of parental control. However, having interviewed area businesses, the team was aware that the activity results in a loss of business, increased violent incidents and affects the overall quality of life for the entire community.

The team began their response by working with stores in the area to encourage them to stop selling products that were used as drug paraphernalia and single cigarettes, to discourage loitering and to begin taking better care of the area

outside of their store. The team also ordered nine additional trash cans to help curb the litter problem at this location.

To begin demonstrating community ownership of this area, the team requested and received donated plants from Home Depot, which were planted in large flower pots in the area. They then solicited volunteers from the area businesses and residents to assist with watering and maintaining the plants. CPOP also participated in a series of clean-ups to show how the area could look while attempting to reduce crime by improving the environment. After this effort, one business applied a fresh coat of paint to the outside of their building. They also worked with the city to replace a street light that had been shot out for quite some time.

To offer some positive activity in the community and begin to address some of those “root causes,” the CPOP Team partnered with UMADAOP to sponsor Black Family Day at the Madisonville Recreation Center. This day-long event included residents, the police, free child care, food, door prizes and entertainment. Seminars were held throughout the day to address community concerns, and provide an environment for neighbors to talk to each other, as well as the police.

After their response was implemented, loitering at the target location was reduced. Store owners refrained from selling certain items that were popular with drug dealing. Many of the businesses in the area began keeping their areas litter-free. The additional nine trash cans reduced litter significantly as individuals used the cans more instead of dropping litter on the streets. And as a result of interviewing individuals standing on the corner, both resources and community expectations were shared with these young people. The whole team also reported feeling less intimidated by youth hanging out on the corner than they did before participating in this CPOP effort. The team did a follow up survey, and 55% of those who responded said that improvements in the focus area were either “excellent” or “good”. Fifty five percent of those surveyed also said they noticed a “significant reduction” in the number of drug deals, and the number of people loitering in the area. They also reported that the area was cleaner, and that they felt less intimidated while in the area of Bramble & Whetsel.

The Madisonville CPOP Team has since moved on to new problem solving efforts in new target areas. They have adopted a “Mission Statement” that they live by. It says in part that “Madisonville citizens and officers will work together to implement the SARA problem solving method to resolve existing or emerging crime and safety issues in the Madisonville community, while always being mindful of the needs of troubled youth. The CPOP Team ensures that safety problems are addressed and resolved thoughtfully, taking time to truly understand the issue, and with an openness to creative solutions that may include, but not be limited to, elements of traditional policing. “

## **Certificate of Achievement/Special Recognition:**

### **Officer Terry Cox:**

Police Specialist Terry Cox worked with the community in South Fairmount to implement a CPOP response to increased traffic congestion and safety concerns around a newly opened school. The opening of this school created a rush hour hazard for students boarding the school buses that were parked in a no parking zone in front of area businesses. Businesses were complaining that the school buses were blocking the front of their businesses; citizens complained that they were caught in the backup while buses were loaded, and school age children were at increased risk for an accident.

Specialist Cox arranged a meeting with representatives from the community council president, the Cincinnati Public Schools Transportation Office, the Principal of Orion Academy, CPS Security Office, the City's Traffic and Engineering Department and Peterman Bus Service. By working together, this team provided Safety Guards at student dismissal times, altered the location for entry and exit for the buses during rush hour, and wrote letters to parents telling them about the new traffic patterns. Not only did Specialist Cox help initiate this project, but he volunteered to monitor the dismissal each day to handle any difficulties that arose as the changes were implemented. Eventually, the changes that were made resulted in a smoother dismissal for students, minimal discomfort for motorists, fewer complaints from businesses and a safer community for the students of Orion Academy.

### **Officer Steve Ventre:**

A strong advocate for Lower Price Hill residents, agencies and organizations, Officer Steve Ventre has built a relationship of trust and mutual respect with the community he serves. Those who nominated him describe Officer Ventre as accessible, a strong partner, and a valuable conduit to getting things done with the various City Departments. Regarding the CPOP Team's work on a problem apartment building in the community, Officer Ventre is recognized by his citizen partners for his "constant daily vigilance, and his follow up with tenants in need of drug rehab, all of which led to the eradication of the drug and crime problem at this location." Officer Ventre truly considers himself part of the Lower Price Hill Community. He has watched children grow up in the neighborhood, and has a sincere desire to see them grow up in a healthy and safe environment.

### **Prencis Wilson, Madisonville CPOP Team:**

Prencis Wilson became involved in the CPOP during the early days with Cincinnati CAN, in one of CCAN's pilot communities – Madisonville. Reluctant

at first, one of her sisters encouraged her to “get out of the house and get involved” – and there has been no stopping her since.

Not only did she become involved, but she assumed a leadership role with the CPOP Team, agreeing to serve as the Chairperson and Convener of meetings. Precis embodies what the Collaborative Agreement and CPOP is all about. As an African-American resident in a neighborhood that is predominately African-American (60%), she admits to having some distrust of the police in her community, about which she was quoted in the 2005 CPOP Annual Report.

“Prior to CPOP Training, I did not like Police Officers,” Precis said, “I thought they were arrogant, uncommunicative with citizens, and unapproachable.” But after the SARA Training, “I began to see that Police Officers are just people.” One only has to ask Neighborhood Officer Dwayne Dawson – who works with the Madisonville CPOP Team – if Precis’ feelings about the police has changed. Precis and the CPOP Team keep Officer Dawson plenty busy, and Officer Dawson has become a true partner to the CPOP Team in every sense of the word.

In addition to working with CPOP, Precis serves on the Community Committee of the Keep Cincinnati Beautiful Board, the Board of Madisonville Mission Ministries, and the Advisory Board of the Second Chance Program, and the Collaborative Agreement Action Group of the Woman’s City Club. At all times, and in every venue, Precis has been a champion for CPOP and the Collaborative Agreement, both in spirit and in practice.

### **Evanston CPOP Team:**

Evanston is one of the neighborhoods where CPOP was first piloted with the support of the Cincinnati CAN Commission and with a strong partnership with then-District 2 Captain, now Assistant Chief Michael Cureton, and the District 2 Neighborhood Unit. As such, this team was one of the early neighborhoods to “shine a light” on CPOP, and the positive results that can come about when citizens and police work together to resolve neighborhood problems.

In 2004, the Evanston CPOP Team was granted funding for their “Shine A Light on Crime” campaign, which engaged neighborhood residents in reducing thefts from autos, particularly around the holiday season. The team developed door hangers that encouraged residents to turn their porch lights on after dark, and included contact information for District 2, the CPOP team and Cinergy. They also handed out “goodie bags” which contained light bulbs, magnets with police contact information, and hot spot cards, which encouraged residents to report drug and other illegal activity in the neighborhood.

### **Friends of the Collaborative Award**

The Friends of the Collaborative is a group of committed individuals and organizations who volunteer their time and expertise to support the Collaborative Agreement, and the formation of CPOP Teams in Cincinnati's neighborhoods. The growth and visibility of CPOP Teams over the past three years would not been achievable without the assistance and guidance of the Friends of the Collaborative, both formal and informal. Three Friends organizations in particular are being honored for their outstanding work in support of Community Problem Oriented Policing.

### **Woman's City Club**

In November of 2002, WCC made a conscious decision to support the Collaborative Agreement by forming an Action Committee (Collaborative Agreement Action Group – CAAG) whose mission is to encourage city-wide community participation in implementing the goals of the Collaborative Agreement. Prior to the formation of CPPC, WCC convened a forum at the Hebrew Union College to update the community on the Collaborative Agreement. WCC submitted their workplan to the board of CPPC on October 4, 2004 to become a formal Friend of the Collaborative. WCC continues to support CPPC and the Collaborative by sponsoring Community and Youth forums, such as "Partnering for Change: A Tool for Building Bridges" and "Woman's City Club Celebrates Cincinnati with Community Conversations."

### **Cincinnati-Hamilton County Community Action Agency**

The Cincinnati-Hamilton County Action Agency, known throughout Cincinnati as "CAA", submitted a workplan and become an official Friend of the Collaborative in September, 2004. Since that time, CAA has continued to provide supporting arms and invaluable assistance to the Partnering Center and to advance the work of CPOP throughout the City. In addition to providing meeting space anytime they were asked for various group meetings and trainings, CAA also worked with CPPC staff to provide much needed input and suggestions that led to successful outreach to area Social Service Community and Faith-Based Organizations. Ms. Gwen Robinson, President and CEO of CAA, has also appeared as a guest on the Center's radio show on WDBZ, the "BUZZ of Cincinnati" and has graciously offered assistance from her staff with Community Outreach in several neighborhoods through the CAA's Head Start Program.

### **Tri-State Regional Community Policing Institute**

The Tri-State Regional Community Policing Institute, or "RCPI", has been at the forefront of supporting the Partnering Center, the Cincinnati Police Department and neighborhood CPOP Teams since CPOP first began to be implemented in

Cincinnati. As a supporter of the CPPC, it has provided training for both staff and community members in SARA and other Crime Prevention methods. RCPI has assisted CPPC by allowing us to check out and use its audio-visual equipment as needed for various community meetings and trainings, as well as providing our staff with unfettered access to its vast array of “Best Practices” books, DVDs and videos to enhance our knowledge, and share with the communities we serve.

RCPI was the first organization in February 2004 to submit a workplan to participate as an “official” Friend of the Collaborative. The organization has also shown its support by attending all of the quarterly meetings of the Friends of the Collaborative, including a workshop held for area social service agencies. Most recently, RCPI offered its facility as the host location for a Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design - or “CPTED” - training for citizen volunteers, CPD personnel and CPPC staff, which included food and beverages needed for the entire 4-day training program for the 35 attendees.

**President’s Award (presented by CPPC Board President Herb Brown) to Urban League of Greater Cincinnati President & CEO Donna Jones Stanley**

DELIB:2695023.1\099999-90030