1215

INNOVATIVE NEIGHBORHOOD ORIENTED POLICING PROJECTS IN EIGHT CITIES: AN INTERIM REPORT

by

Susan Sadd
Michele Sviridoff
Randolph Grinc
Alexander Wright

Vera Institute of Justice
377 Broadway
New York, N.Y. 10013

September 1991

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Innovative Neighborhood Oriented Policing Projects in Eight Cities

When the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) awarded funds to eight urban and suburban jurisdictions in November 1990 under the Innovative Neighborhood Oriented Policing (INOP) program, their central objectives were to foster both community policing initiatives and drug demand reduction efforts at the neighborhood level. Although both community policing and drug demand reduction have been central aspects of emerging police agendas in many jurisdictions throughout the country, the linking of these features under the BJA INOP program is unique.

Since that time, the eight jurisdictions that received INOP funds -- Hayward, California; Houston, Texas; Louisville, Kentucky; New York, New York; Norfolk, Virginia; Portland, Oregon; Prince George's County, Maryland; and Tempe, Arizona -- have developed a variety of initiatives. Among the few components that these various programs have in common are a police enforcement component, a focus on neighborhoods and an emphasis on drug demand reduction. In addition, all eight INOP programs have either implemented or attempted to implement a broad array of partnerships with various state and local agencies and community organizations within their respective jurisdictions.

Yet in many respects, the differences among the eight initiatives are more striking than their commonalities. The eight INOP projects vary greatly in terms of the size of the locality in which they have developed -- ranging from under 200,000 in

Hayward and Tempe to over 7,000,000 in New York City. They also differ in terms of the size of the police departments that designed them -- ranging from under 200 sworn officers in Hayward to over 25,000 in New York City.

The projects differ substantially in their historical relationship to other neighborhood- or community-oriented policing initiatives within the Departments that designed them. In several sites (Tempe, Prince George's County, Louisville, Portland, Hayward), the INOP project represents the Department's first effort at implementing a neighborhood-oriented style of policing within the jurisdiction. In other sites (Norfolk), the INOP project represents a relatively small component of a larger, new city-wide neighborhood-oriented policing initiative. Finally, in still other sites (New York and Houston), the INOP projects represent small, new efforts in Departments with extensive, established community policing agendas of long standing.

The INOP projects also differ substantially in terms of their approach to the drug demand reduction effort. In some sites (e.g., Houston, Norfolk), the primary emphasis is on drug enforcement, supplemented by secondary drug prevention activities. In other sites (e.g., Hayward, Portland, New York), there is substantially more emphasis on the provision a broad array of community-based services, including drug prevention, education and treatment.

The various INOP projects also feature several additional components encouraged by BJA -- an extensive public advertising campaign in Louisville; programmatic reliance upon volunteers in

New York City; satellite offices in Prince George's County, Norfolk, Portland and Tempe; and the exploration and adaptation of new data processing resources (e.g., Portland, Louisville).

Vera's Research on the INOP Projects. In June, 1991, the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) awarded funds to the Vera Institute of Justice to conduct research on the implementation and impacts of the BJA-funded INOP projects. The Vera research is both descriptive and analytic and employs qualitative and quantitative methods.

Vera's implementation research will provide detailed site descriptions and cross-site comparisons of program structure and operations; assess factors that appear to have facilitated or impeded implementation within each site; identify common implementation issues among the INOP projects; and provide qualitative information on the expectations for and assessments of the INOP projects held by local project staff, police personnel, municipal officials and community leaders over the course of the project.

The impact analysis will examine project impacts on demand reduction, public safety and quality of life both within and across sites; examine which project characteristics contribute to program effectiveness; and develop an overview of project implementation and impact, based on across-site comparisons. The research will also compare the efficacy of the approach represented by the INOP projects as a whole to other law enforcement strategies designed to reduce local drug problems. The research will employ a variety of methods: semi-structured interviews; focus groups; observations; review of project documents; review

of local evaluation products; and analysis of pre-post statistical record data.

The research design calls for three week-long site visits to each of the INOP sites -- a preliminary site visit, designed to provide a full description of the project and its implementation; and two additional site visits over the course of the following year. The last two visits will provide both evaluative and explanatory data, including systematic observations of program operations; semi-structured interviews with project managers, staff and selected participants; and focus groups, involving participants and topics that will be defined between the implementation site visit and the second visit.

Project Descriptions. This report presents descriptions of the eight INOP projects, based on information gathered during the implementation site visit, which was conducted during the summer of 1991. During this visit, research staff, travelling in teams of two, gathered a broad array of relevant program documents (project descriptions and records, maps, departmental reports, organizational charts, project diaries, research instruments, training materials, project fliers, newspaper articles and advertising about the project). Research staff also conducted individual and group interviews with project planners and managers; project staff; supervisors of other relevant units within the Department (e.g., Narcotics); members of the community who were involved with the project; members of state and local agencies and organizations working with the project; other members of project Planning Committees; research staff working on internal

evaluations of projects; and other police officers, who were knowledgeable about, but not directly involved with the local INOP project. In addition, research staff attended, observed and/or participated in a variety of relevant events -- squad meetings, project committee meetings, home visitations, anti-drug rallies and marches, citizen training sessions, Neighborhood Watch and Business Watch meetings, planning sessions for National Night Out, drug enforcement activities, city ordinance enforcement, ride-alongs, etc.

These preliminary site visits demonstrated clearly that the various projects had reached different stages of implementation. Some were close to being fully operational, although one or two sub-components had not yet been fully implemented; others were still in preliminary stages of organization and had not yet begun neighborhood-based project operations.

To some extent, this variation in the stage of implementation may be related to the fact that the eight site visits were spaced out over the course of the summer, running from June 17th (Tempe) through August 9th (Houston and Louisville). The project descriptions presented here reflect the stage of implementation that the project had reached at the time of the site visit. Although some of the descriptions refer to scheduled events shortly after the site visit, research staff have not routinely received updates from all sites on project events that occurred after the site visits. It is reasonable to expect, however, that the implementation of all of the projects has advanced since those visits.

This report presents descriptions of the status of the eight INOP projects at the time of the implementation site visits in the order in which they were visited. Each description reviews the relationship between the INOP project and the individual department's overall involvement with neighborhood-oriented policing; the structure and implementation of the INOP project; the project's approach to drug demand reduction; other program components; and the expectations held for the project by individuals involved in its development.

TEMPE

I. The Tempe INOP Project and the Target Area

A. Introduction

Tempe, Arizona is a city of approximately 145,000 residents. The Tempe Police Department currently employs 234 sworn officers and approximately 90 civilians.

At the time of the Vera implementation site visit to Tempe in June 1991, the Tempe INOP project had completed the recruitment and training of patrol officers participating in the initiative; completed analysis of a survey of residents and business owners in the target area; established partnerships with various groups representing city government, service agencies, business associations and community groups within the target area; and, after a period of delay caused by the need to review and comply with various city regulations and specifications (e.g., zoning, Dept. of Buildings), was ready to open a mini-station in a modular unit located at the center of the designated target beat.

B. Community Policing in Tempe

When the Tempe Police Department was chosen as one of the eight INOP sites, the concept of community policing had not yet been introduced in the city. Although the Police Department had been seriously discussing the development of a community policing program since the appointment of the current Chief of Police three years before, the Department's selection as an INOP site proved central to the implementation effort. According to Department officials, before the BJA opportunity opened, no clear

model of community policing had been defined and no detailed plans for implementation had been developed.

In designing the INOP project, the Department selected from the 15 beats within the city a single beat, characterized by a high volume of calls for service and a long-standing heroin trafficking condition, as the site for a pilot community policing project (officially designated as Beat 16). Under the pilot program, one squad (consisting of a sergeant and six patrol officers, under the direction of the lieutenant for that patrol quadrant) was assigned responsibility for the beat. The assignment of a squad to a single beat represented a departure from Tempe's normal assignment system, which is temporal rather than geographic -- that is, squads are typically assigned to shifts rather than beats.[1] Members of the Beat 16 squad, in contrast, work overlapping shifts (e.g., beginning at 7 a.m., 11 a.m., 3 p.m., etc.) within the beat.

Officers in the squad continue to be responsible for calls for service within the beat itself. They differ from the rest of the patrol force in that they are not responsible for calls for

---

[1] Normally, patrol officers are assigned to one of two sectors within the city (North or South) and to a particular shift (e.g., 8 a.m. to 6 p.m.) within that sector. Although a given officer on a given shift has primary responsibility for responding to calls for service in a particular beat, the assignment of individual officers to beats within the patrol unit is affected by a number of variables. It is common for officers to be called to another beat if the officer covering that beat is busy on a prior call. In addition, officers are frequently re-assigned to other beats to fill in for absent officers. Shifts rotate every six months, based on biannual analysis of the calls for service caseload and a matching of staffing levels to that caseload.

service outside of their beat; at times, officers who are not assigned to Beat 16 are called in to assist with calls that can not be handled by the squad. In addition, Beat 16 officers, unlike the rest of the patrol force, have the right to set priorities and delay their response to calls for service -- that is, in some instances, they may postpone responding to a less serious call to respond to a subsequent, but more serious, call.

Yet, in many respects, patrol operations for officers assigned to Beat 16 do not differ radically from routine patrol operations. In part, the operational similarities between Beat 16 and the rest of the patrol force result from the decision, expressed by Department managers, to implement community policing "philosophically rather than programatically." Officers in Beat 16 were not freed from responsibility for calls for service and continued to patrol in radio cars for most of their shift.[2]

Apart from their long-term assignment to a single area, the primary difference between Beat 16 officers and other patrol units is the fact that they have received intensive training in the philosophy of community policing and the strategies of problem-solving policing, which is conceived of as an integral part of the community policing approach. They are encouraged to develop extensive knowledge of the target area and, particularly, the troubled locations or "hot spots" within the area; to inter-

---

[2] Although officers are occasionally encouraged to do foot patrol in the evening, Tempe is frequently too hot for foot patrol to be a viable approach. Thus, while foot patrol constitutes a central component of community policing in some northern industrial cities, it appears to be less appropriate in the southwest.

act frequently with the community; to attend meetings of community associations; and to become familiar with the characteristics and habits of known drug offenders within the neighborhood.

To aid in problem-solving, shortly after training was completed, Beat 16 officers conducted formal surveys of businesses and residents within the beat. These surveys had multiple purposes: they facilitated the development of a "Beat Profile"; they helped define the problems that were most important to the community itself; they helped introduce the officers and the concept of Beat 16 to members of the community; they helped squad members establish contacts for future information-gathering within the community; and they provided baseline data for future assessments of the effect of the program on order maintenance, fear of crime and the community's perceptions of quality of life within the beat.

Another central component of Beat 16 is the newly opened mini-station located in a modular unit in a park at the center of the beat. The mini-station is staffed by the squad's administrative assistant during the day and is expected to be staffed by local volunteers at other times. It is the site of a drug information hotline. It also provides a community-based setting for officers to complete paperwork during the course of their patrol shift. As one officer put it, the mini-station is designed to "bring the community to us and us to the community."

The project's Coordinating Committee, which includes representatives of community groups, local business leaders, service

providers and city officials, is a central feature of the Beat 16 project. According to Department officials, the Coordinating Committee, not the Department, is "in charge of" the project. The committee is expected to play an active role in defining the problems within the neighborhood and in identifying resources within the neighborhood, city government and private agencies which might be used to develop solutions to these problems.

C. The Target Area: Beat 16

In contrast to the rest of Tempe, Beat 16 is a relatively troubled area. Beat 16 houses a higher proportion of low income residents, of tenants in Section 8 housing and of minority residents than the other beats in the city. It is also the primary site of street-level drug trafficking in Tempe.

The size of the target area in which community policing activities are concentrated in the Tempe project was reduced during the training period from the entire beat (approximately one square mile, roughly 13,000 in population) to a subsection of the beat (somewhat more than half of the original beat) in which calls for service and local drug trafficking operations are concentrated. Although Beat 16 officers respond to calls for service in the beat as a whole, the focus of their problem-solving activities is currently a sub-area within the beat that includes three distinct neighborhoods (Escalante Park, Victory Acres and Don Carlos).

The reduced target area includes a substantial business strip, featuring motels, bars and warehouse-sized commercial outlets; a centrally-located park (the site of the Beat 16 mini-

station), which is adjacent to the local elementary school and includes a recreation center, pool and senior center; older privately owned, relatively inexpensive, single-family homes, many of which were rebuilt over that past 15 years with Housing and Urban Development (HUD) block grant funds; newer multi-family rental units; and small retail establishments (e.g., convenience stores). It is divided by a recently constructed highway which has cut off established routes to the school and park for some families (a source of concern within the neighborhood).

The population of the area is also mixed. A substantial number of families of Mexican descent have lived in the area for generations; many own their homes. Yet the beat as a whole is predominantly white (71%; hispanic, 23%). The area is also home to university students, young professional couples, working class families and residents of mobile homes. Most residents are classified as being in the low- to moderate-income range.

The surveys conducted by Beat 16 officers revealed that the primary quality-of-life concerns of residents within the area involved burglary, drugs, juvenile crime (a local youth gang of long standing in the neighborhood) and graffiti. Prostitution was also cited as a primary concern of business leaders (the prostitution problem in the area is concentrated along the commercial strip that houses motels and bars). Meetings with community groups also helped identify neighborhood concerns about specific bars and motels which had been the locus of problems within the area and a desire for streetlights and sidewalks to improve safety and quality of life within residential areas.

According to various respondents interviewed during the implementation site visit, the neighborhood is unique in terms of the residential stability of families in the older houses. Several respondents echoed the belief that "people know everybody. They've lived there a long time."[3] One Beat 16 officer remarked that local trouble-makers were generally easy to find because they always came back to the neighborhood.

The local drug problem involves a pattern of heroin trafficking and use that has "been going on for generations" and is at least partly responsible for the reputation of the area as "one of the primary trouble spots in the city." Respondents within the Department explained that for the past 20 years a series of user-dealers, often from the same families, controlled local drug markets, developed extensive rap sheets and took each others places during periods of incarceration. Although heroin trafficking in Tempe is largely concentrated within the commercial and residential streets of the target area, purchasers are reportedly drawn from neighboring communities throughout the region.

II. Drug Demand Reduction Activities

Some aspects of the drug demand reduction component of the Tempe program -- landlord training in methods of evicting drug dealers, civil abatement proceedings, expanded youth alternatives, adaptation of the Scott Newman drug prevention program for

---

[3] The neighborhood differs from other neighborhoods in the city where the "transient" population is higher. Many individuals come to the Phoenix-Tempe area from other places, stay for a few years and then move on.

parents -- have not yet been fully implemented. Yet the project has already established ties with a number of organized drug prevention groups and has targeted drug enforcement activities at local user-dealers.

A. Drug Prevention and Treatment

The drug demand reduction component of the Tempe program draws more upon drug education and prevention programs than it does upon treatment referrals. Although a few respondents expressed interest in referring arrested drug purchasers to treatment facilities and in identifying criminal justice alternatives for them, even these respondents shared the general hard-line "lock 'em up" approach to local drug traffickers.

The project has established ties with several prevention programs for local youth. One member of the Coordinating Committee, under the auspices of Chicanos por la Causa (CPLC), runs a prevention program for elementary school youth who are identified as being at "high risk" for future drug involvement.[4] The program (new this year) features home visits, a daily presence on the school campus, afterschool activities designed to enhance self-esteem, and special community events (e.g., a Cinco de Mayo festival which allowed Beat 16 officers to meet with the community as civilians). Other drug prevention programs for older youth ("Say No to Drugs and Alcohol"; "I'm in Control of my own

---

[4] CPLC also runs a drug treatment program for adults in the county and has the capacity to provide treatment referrals for drug abusers in the target area.

Life" or the "I'm Cool" program) are available through the recreation program in Escalante Park.

B. Law Enforcement Activities

The primary drug enforcement effort undertaken involving the Beat 16 initiative was "Sweep 16" -- a sustained undercover buy-and-bust operation, carried out by the Department's Selective Enforcement Unit (SEU) in early May. Sweep 16 led to the arrest of 18 local user-dealers -- a substantial proportion of known drug traffickers in the small target area. Respondents within the Department reported that SEU personnel were initially reluctant to conduct the sweep ("Why waste our time on small fry?") but ultimately agreed to the task, defined as "tactical enforcement," designed to reduce the reputation of the area as a place where outsiders could buy heroin safely.

Respondents both inside and outside the Department were uniformly positive about the short-term effects of the sweep on the target area. Department officials reported that the incidence of property crime had dropped since the sweep. Local prostitutes who had established contacts with Beat 16 officers remarked that it had grown difficult to find heroin throughout the area. In June, members of the Coordinating Committee and Department personnel reported that they had seen virtually no street drug activity or prostitution activity since the sweep was conducted, one month before they were interviewed. These statements were corroborated by the unsolicited comments of neighborhood residents at a community meeting.

The Beat 16 squad also works closely with a detective in the Criminal Investigation Division who is assigned to the area to locate and identify known offenders and to apprehend individuals in the neighborhood for whom warrants have been issued. This interaction, according to that detective, has greatly decreased his caseload ("I'm getting a whole lot of help").

Members of the Beat 16 squad also closely monitor known drug locations and known user-dealers and prostitutes within the neighborhood. They keep a running log of known offenders and maintain information about their addresses, cars and associates. A newly developed Field Investigation Card, which will ultimately be entered on the Department's computer-based management information system, helps build the squad's set of offender-based information.

III. Other Program Components

A. Recruitment and Training

The Beat 16 squad was recruited directly from the Department's patrol division. In announcing the formation of the community policing component, the Department indicated that applicants should expect to work a substantial amount of overtime on the project.[5] Of the original 12 applicants, six officers were

---

[5] A central component of the Tempe INOP budget is delegated to cover the cost of squad overtime, originally estimated to be approximately 30 hours per month per officer. It was initially expected that participation at community meetings and events, along with other efforts at community involvement, might substantially increase time spent on the job, because squad officers remained responsible for calls for service on the beat during their shifts. In practice, however, during the early months, the additional time required by these duties has been far less than the original estimate -- roughly 10-15 hours per month per officer.

selected. Many of them already had substantial knowledge of the target area.

There were several components to training. The Institute of Law and Justice (ILJ) conducted a week of training in Tempe.[6] The ILJ training covered the identification of city resources, crime prevention techniques, the philosophy of community policing, drug recognition, addiction and cycles of violence, problem-solving techniques and community empowerment. Training also featured a presentation on the nature and purpose of crime analysis, the supervision of problem-solving policing and extensive readings on community policing and problem-solving. Representatives of the Police Departments in Aurora, Colorado and San Diego, California were brought in to conduct seminars on community policing and problem-solving strategies. In addition, the Beat 16 squad went to San Diego for field training in problem-solving techniques.

Six members of the Project's Coordinating Committee also received training at the Department's Citizen Police Academy. The Academy, which is independent of the Beat 16 project, conducts a six-week course (one evening per week) for citizens of Tempe who want to receive crime and drug prevention training and learn more about the structure and operations of the Department.

---

[6] ILJ, the agency that is responsible for the evaluation component of the program, designed the survey of residents and business owners conducted by Beat 16 officers. ILJ has worked extensively with the Tempe Police Department in the past, in helping the Department qualify for national accreditation.

The training program was a central means of introducing squad officers to the strategies and goals of the developing initiative. As one officer remarked, "It made sense to me that if you work with the community,...there's got to be some benefits." Yet he also reported that, before Beat 16 was implemented, "nobody would tell anybody what community policing was. They'd give you a single example, but no one would explain." He said that he'd been told the same anecdote about solving the problem of disruptive teenagers in an empty lot by mending a hole in the fence "30 or 40 times" before the Beat 16 program was designed. Yet, he also reported that his experience in the Beat 16 training, as well as his recent experience working the beat itself, provided multiple examples of how problem-solving techniques could be applied, as well as evidence in the value of the approach in generating new information through expanding community contacts.

B. Community and Agency Partnerships

The awarding of BJA INOP funds to the Tempe project was announced shortly after the first few meetings of the developing Escalante Neighborhood Association.[7] According to a member of Beat 16's Coordinating Committee, at first the Neighborhood Asso-

---

[7] In Tempe, there are two types of community-based organizations -- homeowners associations, in which homeowners in a given area are required to pay dues and common charges for maintenance by virtue of their residence in that area, and neighborhood associations, in which membership is voluntary and financial resources are likely to be limited. The Beat 16 survey of residents revealed that relatively few residents belonged to any established community organization at the time of the survey.

ciation was characterized by "anger, suspicion, disenfranchisement, and fear of retribution from the drug dealers.... (It was so bad that) people had been slashing city employees' tires...."[8]

According to several respondents, this distrust was evident at the first meeting of the Association that Beat 16 officers attended. One squad member characterized that meeting as "a vigilante group against the cops." He reported that neighborhood residents felt that they had largely been abandoned by the Department and were skeptical about the squad's willingness to work closely with the community.

Another respondent, who works closely with neighborhood groups throughout the city, saw the timing of the project as fortuitous. She reported that, following the announcement of the initiation of the Beat 16 project, at the next association meeting "information poured out to the police (and) residents surrounded the cops...." She characterized the neighborhood association as actively involved in "reclaiming the neighborhood" from the drug dealers and defined the Beat 16 initiative as an integral piece of the reclamation process.

In fact, the involvement of Beat 16 with the developing Neighborhood Association has proven instrumental in linking it

---

[8] Respondents in the Department reported that the neighborhood was characterized by a history of hostility toward the Department. Several years before, an officer had been hit in the head by a rock thrown by youths in Escalante Park. Another respondent, who worked closely with community residents, reported that they were initially apprehensive about the location of the mini-station in the park ("Can we still drink a beer there?" one resident reportedly asked.)

with other organizations that have the capacity to address the problems identified as central to community residents who attend association meetings. The Beat 16 Coordinating Committee brings together representatives of community groups (the Escalante Neighborhood Association, the local businessman's association, a local priest) with representatives of city government (the liaison to the City Council, assigned to work closely with neighborhood associations and to provide direct feedback to the Council about them;[9] a representative of the Public Works Department; representatives of the city's Community Development Agency) and local service providers (the elementary school principal, the on-site director of the city's recreation program in Escalante Park, the Director of the CPLC prevention program). The affiliations shaped in that Committee have been influential in beginning to address specific quality of life problems identified by the neighborhood association -- abandoned vehicles, trash collection, graffiti clean-up, the need for street lights, the desire for sidewalks, the licensing of local bars and motels, problems at local convenience stores -- as well as the drug and crime problems targeted by Beat 16 officers.

In addition to groups actively represented on the Coordinating Committee, each member of the Beat 16 squad attends meetings of a specific homeowner's association or other neighborhood asso-

---

[9] In Tempe, all city council members are elected at large to represent the city as a whole. Neighborhoods like the Escalante Park area, therefore, are not necessarily represented specifically by any public official.

ciation within the beat. Together, these various local organizations will ultimately be eligible to develop small projects funded by the Beat 16 "Clean-up Fund" -- a program component that is still in the developmental stage.[10]

C. Outreach and Advertising

Although the Beat 16 initiative has been announced and featured in several articles in local newspapers since its inception, the Coordinating Committee is currently concerned about nature of the publicity received by the program. This attitude stems in part from the hostile community reactions to a newspaper article which depicted the neighborhood as "a blighted area that has long been a haven for drug dealers and other criminals." Rather than emphasize the problems of the beat in the press, the Committee is attempting to emphasize positive aspects of both the community and the program (e.g., a graffiti clean-up event, staffed by neighborhood volunteers who were supplied with free paint, donated by the Department of Public Works).

Outreach efforts made by the developing Escalante Neighborhood Association in concert with the Beat 16 project, however, have been extensive. With the assistance of the City Council's liaison to neighborhood groups, the Association distributes 600 newsletters, based on issues raised at Association meetings, to families within the target area.

---

[10] BJA asked Department officials for further specification of how the "Clean Up Fund" would be used before authorizing expenditures for this program component. At the time of the June site visit, one neighborhood clean-up had been conducted and a graffitti clean-up, using donated paint and paint sprayers, was scheduled. Volunteers were actively recruited for both events.

D. Volunteers

Although Tempe's original proposal called for volunteers to man the mini-station in Escalante Park during off-hours, it is unclear whether that component of the program will be implemented. Volunteers, however, do play a significant part in the various clean-up activities run in concert with the Neighborhood Association. In addition, it is anticipated that volunteers (possibly students from the local university) may play some role in expanding the capacity of the Department's Crime Analysis Unit to analyze information generated routinely by Beat 16 officers and to review crime complaint and calls-for-service data within the beat in more detail than is currently possible.

E. The Role of the Department's Management Information System (MIS)

The Beat 16 project draws extensively upon the Department's Management Information System in a number of ways -- to enter and analyze data from the surveys of residents and business owners; to develop an information system based on Field Investigation Reports, developed for the project; to provide periodic reports on "hot spots" within the beat; and to analyze changes in criminal activity within the beat, using the Department's new geo-mapping system. In addition, the Crime Analysis Unit is expected to provide data to ILJ to facilitate their evaluation of the project. Accordingly, some project expenditures supported computer hardware and software designed to expand the capacity of the Crime Analysis Unit.

F. Program Evaluation

ILJ will be responsible for describing the process of implementing the Beat 16 project and assessing its impacts. Findings from the baseline survey of residents and businesses, already conducted, will be compared to outcomes from subsequent surveys and will provide a means of assessing effects on quality of life and attitudes toward the police within the beat.

In addition, ILJ will compare departmental data on crime complaints and calls for service within the beat and for comparison areas for 12 months before the initiative and 12 months after the initiative began.[11] ILJ also plans to review problem-solving assignment logs; to gather qualitative data on observable differences in street drug activity; to review pre-post videotapes of problem areas within the beat; and to explore the attitudes of team members about community policing, the intervention itself and its effects.

G. BJA Funds

In Tempe, BJA funds (a total of $200,000) have been allocated to cover the cost of the project's administrative assistant; rent for the modular unit now installed in Escalante Park; officer overtime expenditures; MIS purchases; the evaluation component; training and travel; and a Clean-up Fund, established to support community-based, problem-solving activities.

---

[11] ILJ staff report that they will consider using the frequency of referrals to local drug treatment before and after the initiative as an outcome measure. They also report that they will not look at the number of drug-related hospital admissions, on the grounds that this indicator would probably not be affected by initiative focused on such a small target area.

IV. Expected Impacts

A. Community Effects

According to Department personnel and members of the Planning Committee, a number of short- and long-term objectives are held for the project. Several respondents reported that Sweep 16 has already had visible short-term effects on local drug and prostitution activities. As one respondent put it, the "problem people aren't out there." Although Project supervisors repeatedly emphasize their belief that "enforcement can't do it all," squad members point to the value of demonstrating to the community that "these guys (the drug dealers) aren't invincible." They also expect that the enforcement component of the project will ultimately change the reputation of the area from that of a place where outsiders can come in to purchase drugs.

A number of respondents also expect that the Project, in concert with the developing Escalante Neighborhood Association, will have the capacity to address specific quality-of-life issues of concern to the community -- streetlights, sidewalks, graffiti, traffic problems. By so doing, it is hoped that the Project will influence the quality of life in the area; address specific problems associated with disorderly conditions; build substantial ties to community residents, in an effort to expand the sources of information within the community; and, ultimately, empower the community in its effort to maximize its share of city resources.

Expectations of long-term effects of the prevention and education components of the project were not delineated in detail, although these program components are clearly intended to reduce

drug use among local youth. In fact, it would be difficult for the project to measure the long-term impacts of these efforts. However, the survey of residents and businesses will permit an assessment of perceived changes in quality of life, levels of fear and police-community relationships.

B. Departmental Effects

One issue raised by respondents concerns the extent to which officers "buy into" the community policing philosophy and problem-solving approach. Project directors voiced some concern that some squad members might remain unduly committed to a "lock 'em up" style of policing and may not have fully integrated their training in problem-solving methods. Although a few squad members acknowledge that they are more comfortable with a stronger enforcement orientation than is commonly associated with community-oriented policing, they report that the project's intensive focus on a single beat has enhanced their ability to control drug conditions in the area.

Expectations about the calls-for-service caseload are mixed. One respondent reported that the volume of calls for service during the daytime shift had dropped dramatically after Sweep 16 was conducted. Yet he also reported an increase in calls from individuals who previously would not have supplied information to the police. As in other jurisdictions experimenting with community policing, these countervailing influences on calls for service might, conceivably, cancel each other out.

Ultimately, Department officials expect that the pilot project will have a substantial influence on the Department's

efforts to increase involvement in neighborhood-oriented policing. On-going deliberations about ways to divide the city into quadrants, rather than sectors, may have some bearing on the way in which styles of neighborhood-oriented policing, beyond the Beat 16 target area, are introduced in the city as a whole. Although Department officials expect to expand neighborhood-oriented policing beyond Beat 16 in the near future, they are somewhat skeptical about whether such an approach will prove valuable in the wealthier, less problem-ridden beats in Tempe.

NORFOLK

I. The Norfolk INOP Project and the Target Area

A. Introduction

Norfolk is a city of 261,229 people, with a population density of 4,856 per square mile (1990 Census, as reported in The Virginian-Pilot and The Ledger-Star, 6/24/91). Its police force has 684 sworn officers and 176 civilian employees. At the time of the Vera implementation site visit in late June 1991, the INOP project budget had not yet been funded (funds were released by BJA in August 1991). The City of Norfolk submitted its original proposal to BJA in October 1990, but BJA requested that the budget be modified and resubmitted. Norfolk subsequently rewrote the proposal and resubmitted it in May and again in June of 1991. Thus, at the time of the Vera site visit, the Police Assisted Community Enforcement (PACE) project was operating solely on revenue raised from a $.03 increase in real estate taxes (which generated $1.8 million), effective July 1, 1990.

Norfolk's community policing effort, PACE, involves every branch of city government and every city agency. PACE has the full support of the mayor, City Manager, and the City Council; the program began on July 1, 1990 and was fully implemented on January 25, 1991. It operates city-wide, but efforts are focused in two to four targeted areas.

Because the INOP project had not yet been approved at the time of the Vera site visit, it is impossible to differentiate the INOP portion of the PACE program. Furthermore, police and city officials in Norfolk responded to the pre-visit requests for

information and to the site visit itself by presenting the PACE program. For these reasons, therefore, the description that follows is of the PACE program as a whole.[1] Future visits, and the reports that follow will focus on the INOP portion of the PACE program.

B. Community Policing in Norfolk

The PACE program is a city-wide program whose stated goals are "to reduce criminal activity and calls for service in targeted areas" through a three-stage process: (1) Sweeps, (2) Increased Patrols, and (3) Community Partnerships. The program is "city-wide" in that it involves every city agency, from the top down, but its activities are focused in particular areas, generally in and around public housing complexes. Like the INOP programs in general, PACE incorporates community policing to address crime and quality-of-life problems, especially those related to drug trafficking and drug abuse.

The revenue obtained from the increased real estate tax was used to provide the Norfolk Police Department with 60 new personnel, 38 sworn officers and 22 civilians. The hiring of these civilians allowed the release of 22 officers, who were performing non-enforcement roles within the Department, to patrol functions. Additional vehicles and communications equipment were also purchased as part of the PACE initiative.

The three phases of PACE are described by police department staff as follows:

---

[1]The decision to describe the Norfolk program in this way was approved by the NIJ grant monitor, George Shollenberger.

(1) Sweeps -- intelligence gathering, undercover operations, saturation patrol;

(2) Increased Patrols -- police, along with other city agencies, address quality-of-life problems, educate citizens regarding available programs;

(3) Community Partnerships -- community polices itself, assisted by the police department.

PACE target areas are selected by high-ranking police personnel from the Special Enforcement Division, Vice-Narcotics Division, with input from others, based on the level of street drug activity. Information on street drug activity comes from citizens, arrest statistics, and observation. The first two PACE target areas (Grandy Village and East Oceanview) began Phase 1 on January 25, 1991, Phase 2 on January 28, and were in Phase 3 (Community Partnerships) by March 4. The second group of target areas, Calvert Square, Diggs Town, Huntersville, and Oakleaf Forest (four housing projects in close proximity to one another), which entered Phase 1 on April 4, were in Phase 2 at the time of the Vera site visit.

The number of officers assigned to a target area varies depending on both the Phase and the part of the Phase (see Section II below for a more detailed description of the Law Enforcement Activities). During the covert operations stage of Phase 1, which lasts for two to three months, 16 officers (two undercover, four control officers, eight investigators and two corporals) and one Assistant Commonwealth Attorney are needed. When the operation moves into the "reversals/search warrants" stage (which lasts about 10 days), the personnel requirements

increase to 40 officers: 18 investigators from Vice and Narcotics, 16 officers from Metro Tact, and six officers from patrol. Then, on "Indictment Day," the staff increases to 77 officers: 55 supervisors and investigators from Vice and Narcotics, 16 officers from Metro Tact, and six officers from patrol.

Phase 2, Increased Patrols, involves personnel from all divisions of the police department; three marked units from the Special Enforcement Division are assigned to each target area from 11:00 a.m. to 7:30 p.m. and from 7:00 p.m. to 3:30 a.m., and one marked unit from each of the (two) patrol divisions are assigned to the area during the day shift. Officers from K-9, Traffic, Crime Prevention and Investigative Divisions assist as needed on both vehicle and foot patrols.

During Phase 3, two marked units from each Patrol Divisions are assigned seven days a week, between the hours of 11:00 a.m. and 3:30 a.m., and Sector Lieutenants and supervisors are actively involved with the community in problem-solving efforts. Personnel from the Special Enforcement Division and Crime Prevention Division continue to work in the area.

The PACE Support Services Committee serves to coordinate services from the police and other city agencies involved in the initiative. The committee has representatives from the Police Department, Department of Human Services, Public Health Department, Department of Parks and Recreation, Department of Planning and Codes Administration, Juvenile Court Services Unit, Norfolk Redevelopment and Housing Authority (NRHA), and Community Ser-

vices Board. The Support Services Committee meets at least monthly, and formal minutes are kept (copies of all minutes have been supplied to the research). The meeting that occurred during the Vera site visit was well attended and included reports on the Communications Workshop, the Family Assessment Services Team (FAST), the Neighborhood Environmental Assessment Team (NEAT), and a Drug Elimination grant proposal being written by staff at NRHA.

Interagency coordination in Norfolk is extensive; the FAST team is made up of representatives from NRHA, Public Health Department, Social Services, Community Services, Norfolk Police Department, Norfolk Juvenile Court, Department of Parks and Recreation, and the school system. The FAST team is designed to provide a neighborhood-focused approach to family assessment and services whose purpose is "to enhance family and individual functioning and self-sufficiency through team assessment of service needs, action planning and follow-up" (PACE Support Services notebook). The FAST team provides interagency staffing for multi-problem families and adults; information, referral and advocacy; and community involvement, needs identification, and problem-solving. Identified service needs are reported to the Support Services Committee. The purpose of the NEAT team is to address environmental problems in the neighborhood such as, abandoned vehicles, vacant lots, houses in disrepair, improper storage of trash, etc. The NEAT team has members from the Police Department, Bureau of Environmental Health, Department of Public

Works, Division of Existing Structures, Parks and Forestry, and NRHA.

Community partnerships are a central part of the PACE program and are initiated during Phase III with the "Community Service Days." Community Service Days are held in the PACE target area, in either a Recreation Center or Community Center. Each city agency (i.e., Code Enforcement, Human Services, Health Department, Parks and Recreation, NRHA, the Police Department) sets up booths, "like a job fair," according to one agency staff member. Residents are encouraged to attend to "present your concerns and express your community needs...Give members of these agencies an opportunity to address your individual concerns and assist you with solutions" (Community Service Days Flier). PACE representatives also attend civic league meetings and are present at virtually every community function. NRHA publishes a newsletter that is distributed in all the housing projects (the location of most PACE areas so far). The first FAST meeting was held in one of the original PACE sites during the Vera site visit. In addition to community members, representatives of the police department, NRHA, the Tenant Management Committee of Grandy Village, the Urban League, a jobs program for youth (Step-Up), and the Social Services Department were present at the meeting. The purpose of FAST was explained and a roster of the team's members was distributed. A questionnaire was distributed for residents to indicate problems in their housing project and make suggestions.

C. PACE Target Areas

By the time of the Vera implementation site visit, PACE had been implemented in six target areas, two on January 25, 1991 and another four on April 3. The first two areas were Grandy Village, a housing project area of approximately two square miles and East Oceanview, which is four square miles. Grandy Village (which is located in the Norfolk Police Department's 1st Patrol Division) is a public housing apartment complex of 398 units and a population of approximately 1600. Three families in the complex are white; the remainder are black. Ninety-nine percent of the households are headed by females, and 98% are on public assistance. The average monthly income for a family in Grandy Village is $460. There is one elementary school in the area and no businesses.

According to the 1990 census, the population of East Ocean View (located in the 2nd Patrol Division) was 5,235, a 2.9% increase over the 1980 population. Nearly two-thirds (63%) of the population is white, one-third (33%) is black, and the remainder are Asian (2%) or other (2%). More than half the people living in East Ocean View are under 25 years old, and fewer than half those over the age of 15 are married (43% of males and 47% of females). The median family income in the area is $14,761 (1988 figure). East Ocean View is characterized by a high degree of rental housing -- 6% of the housing is owner occupied. Only 12% of the housing units are single-family homes and over half (57%) of the housing contains five or more units.

Both Grandy Village and East Ocean View (and the subsequent target PACE areas) provide the type of setting that, according to a high ranking officer in the Vice and Narcotics Division, is necessary for open-air drug markets:

> Open street dealing is not going to go into a neighborhood that is white -- or even black -- if it's residential and has houses, because then you have property lines and people know who belongs and who doesn't belong. So it has to be a high concentration of people; it normally has to be apartments or housing projects. So we know that there are certain areas that they can go.

The major drug problems in Norfolk are crack and powder cocaine (accounting for 90-92% of all drug arrests in the past two years), primarily crack. There are clear age and ethnic distinctions between sellers and buyers: the sellers in open air markets tend to be blacks in their teens and early twenties, while the buyers are between the ages of 25 and 47, most of whom are white. Eighty percent of the buyers are employed, and 50% come from outside the city.

III. Drug Demand Reduction Activities

A. Drug Treatment and Prevention

The major prevention component of PACE is its PACE Athletic League.[2] The PACE Athletic League provides Nighthawk basketball, baseball,and flag football. Because it was summer, at the time of the Vera site visit, the active PACE Athletic League program

---

[2]Although no INOP funds had been received by Norfolk at the time of the Vera implementation site visit, the proposal submitted to BJA in August 1991 has since been approved. The major personnel component of the approved budget is for the police corporal who is to serve as the "Commissioner of the PACE Athletic League." This suggests that the PACE Athletic League will become an important aspect of future Vera site visits.

was baseball. It was reported that 60-65 youth show up for each game, and the program also provides outings (e.g., to baseball games of the local AAA team, Tidewater Tides).

DARE is also a part of PACE, although the Vera site visit team was unable to observe any DARE activities because schools were closed for the summer. Norfolk was the first jurisdiction in Virginia to have the DARE program in elementary schools as well as junior high and high schools.

The Second Patrol Division has a trailer, located in East Ocean View next to the Recreation Center. In this trailer, residents can find literature on the DARE program; a calendar of activities at the East Ocean View Community Center; information on local civic leagues; a newsletter and other information from the Ocean View Services Project Team (composed of representatives from Community Improvement, the Fire Department, the Health Department, Human Services, NRHA, Parks and Recreation, the Police Department, Public Works, Utilities, and Existing Structures). Information is also available on AIDS, drug use prevention, and drug and alcohol treatment programs. There are forms in the trailer that citizens can use to report abandoned vehicles and other nuisances.

One approach to drug prevention used extensively in East Ocean View is demolition of abandoned buildings known to be used for drug dealing. Attempts are made to evict drug dealers from apartments, and in East Ocean View (and other areas with rental housing, rental housing owners are encouraged to screen prospec-

tive tenants carefully.[3]

B. Enforcement

The PACE program is defined as having three phases: Sweeps, Increased Patrol, and Community Partnerships. The first phase is the most concentrated assault on street drug activity. Once a target area is selected, it is infiltrated by an undercover officer and two investigators from the street enforcement unit of the Vice and Narcotics Division of the police department. The undercovers are selected either from the recruit school or from the patrol division other than that in which the target area is located. The undercovers are trained and then, under the direction of the control officers, make buys from those who are selling within the target area. In addition to making buys, members of this Division do surveillance and gather information on the nature of the drug market. This first step, called "pre-sweeps," lasts for about two months. For the last week or two of Phase 1, using the information gathered during the two months, about 40 officers from Special Enforcement and the two Patrol Divisions target both dealers and users in "sweeps." Buyers are targeted through "reversals, " in which the police:

> ... take the place of the dealers on the corners and we sell placebo drugs to the users and then we arrest them. We do that, alternating between the buyers and the sellers for a period of a week, either a buy/bust where we make buys and then go in and arrest, or through reversals. We just keep a concentrated effort on that area for a week or two and then on the grand

---

[3]At the time of the Vera site visit, Norfolk Police Department staff had requested and received a copy of Portland's Landlord Training Program, which they planned to modify for use in Norfolk.

> jury date we go in with the indictments and arrest those that are still on the street.

Enhanced prosecution is a central feature of PACE drug enforcement activities. The pre-sweeps step ends on the "Grand Jury Day," when indictments are handed down. (Unlike the practice in many other cities, in Norfolk defendants are indicted before arrests are made.) Prior to this time, the case is developed, and the control officers prepare files. About two weeks prior to the indictment day (which is selected through the City Attorney's office and the court), the police take the case folders in for the Attorney's review in preparation for the grand jury. On "Grand Jury Day" one of the control officers goes through the folders in front of the grand jury. Indictments are handed down, and within an hour or two are in the Vice and Narcotics Division office

> ...we package them in our arrest folders; we have the teams there for the purpose of going out and making the arrests -- and doing much like we do with reversals, except we have a command post. We're bringing them straight in because there's no need to get notes together. Now we go out into the target area with however many "arrestings" it takes, depending on the number of people that have been indicted.

Approximately four or five hours later, there is a news conference announcing that this is now a PACE area, and the narcotics officers pull out. This marks the start of the sweeps step of Phase 1. At the time of the press release, statistics have been compiled regarding the number of arrests made, including type and severity, firearms recovered, and search warrants executed. These statistics are broken down by target area.

The next 72 hours is known as the "sweeps," which, for especially the first 24 hours, entail "zero tolerance." People who are drinking in public are warned or receive a summons. Police stop crap games are stopped, "hanging out," loud music, etc. Abandoned vehicles are towed. During the sweeps a mobile command post is set up in a trailer within a half mile from the target area. Arrest teams pick up sellers and buyers and take them to the command post, where evidence is gathered and labelled and documentation is prepared.

During this time, the traffic division is in the area doing highway safety stops on major arteries leading into and out of targeted areas. The canine unit's drug dog is used in conjunction with these stops,

> ... assisting the Vice and Narcotics unit in trying to identify these people who have not been picked up at this point on the indictments. We are out there basically to soften up the area. The worst of the bad guys are gone. They've either been arrested, or they're in hiding somewhere, or they're on the run. So they [Vice and Narcotics] do us quite a service because these guys are gone. The major dealers know something's going on, even if they haven't been picked up. So once we come in, the area's been softened up somewhat by Vice and Narcotics; then we further do that job, in an effort to get people out of their homes, to emerge out. We want them to know we're there. That's the first big impact in the sweeps, the impact on the residents.

Safety stops are usually done from the time the sweeps start (around 5:00 p.m.) until midnight, when there is no longer enough traffic to continue.

During the sweeps period, the police are there not only to arrest violators, but to identify problems such as defective traffic lights or signs. They make "defect reports" to the

appropriate agency, through the Support Services Committee. They also go door to door (to every home in the target area), handing out flyers that describe the PACE program to the residents. Residents are given phone numbers to call with any information they might have about criminal activity in the area. During these first three days of the PACE program, cars are towed; the appropriate agencies are notified regarding broken street lights, sidewalks, eyesores, hazardous areas, etc.

Phase 2, Increased Patrols then begins. Officers from Special Enforcement, Patrol and Crime Prevention talk to residents and distribute information on PACE, door-to-door in the target areas. In addition, Crime Prevention officers meet with community leaders to organize civic leagues, Neighborhood Watch, Operation Identification, or other community organizations, and also conduct security surveys. Also during this Phase, Public Support Rallies and Community Service Days are held; these include City officials, police and community leaders in open forums with area residents. An effort to clean-up target areas is initiated during this phase; this process involves a team of police, city agencies, and others (the NEAT team) who work to remove abandoned vehicles, improve trash and garbage pick-up, improve access lighting, make street repairs, code enforcement, etc. The FAST team also assesses the needs of the community to provide assistance in education, health care, recreation and referrals.

During Phase 3 the community is expected to begin to reduce the burden on the police department, and enter into a partnership with the police.

III. Other Program Components

A. Recruitment and Training

According to personnel interviewed during the implementation site visit, "all officers are PACE officers." Therefore, recruitment per se is not an issue for this program. However, one of the training officers indicated that,

> ...we have officers that do PACE every day,; that's their one assignment ... [and others who are] assisting with the PACE program as far as the enforcement aspect is concerned, but ... we're starting off slow and we eventually want to cover the entire city and get everyone involved in the PACE program.

The officers who are assigned to work in PACE areas are asked to make a commitment to stay in that assignment for a certain minimum length of time. If, however, their performance is not satisfactory or they burn-out, they will be reassigned.

As indicated above, the PACE program was implemented on January 25, 1991; prior to that time, all Norfolk Police Department personnel received PACE training, from the Chief of Police down to patrol officers. Training began in August of 1990 when four members of the force were sent to Michigan State University for a three-day seminar on community policing with Robert Trojanowicz. The officers from Norfolk felt that, because this seminar was specifically designed for police from the state of Michigan, the classes were not particularly relevant to their needs. However, they felt that they did gain insight from discussions during the break and with Trojanowicz himself.

Subsequently, all police department staff with ranks of lieutenant and above attended a two-day seminar conducted by

Trojanowicz, held at the Norfolk airport. Later, the training officers from Norfolk conducted 8-hour introductory seminars, first for all the sergeants and then for the corporals. Part of this seminar was a presentation by one of the Assistant City Managers regarding how the city officials saw the PACE program and stressing the city's support of the program and the importance of interagency cooperation. They also had video presentations from department heads in all city agencies. This was followed by roll-call training for the officers, providing an introduction to the PACE program.

After all members of the Department had received the introductory training, the cycle began again with sergeants and corporals (separately) receiving another eight hours on the specifics of community policing and PACE. An integral part of each of these sessions was a request for recommendations and comments. An additional eight hours of training was also provided to the uniformed officers (including patrol officers, investigators, all staff positions, in groups of 20-25). These sessions included two hours on community policing; one hour on PACE; one hour on sensitivity training; and two hours on drug arrests and tactics that narcotics officers use on the street. Also included was time for questions and answers and feedback from the officers. One of the outcomes of this feedback was the development of "Quality Watch Forms," which provide the patrol officers with a mechanism for receiving feedback on problems they report to other agencies. In addition to the police officers, staff from other

city agencies participated in the training sessions (on community policing and PACE, but not on narcotics arrests).

By the end of January 1991, all members of the Norfolk Police Department had received the training described above. Since that time, one of the training officers has provided regular in-service training on the PACE approach. In addition, two of the training officers are providing a four-hour training session on community policing and PACE to the current academy class.

B. Community and Interagency Partnerships

Interagency cooperation is extensive in Norfolk. Every city agency is involved and has representatives on the FAST or NEAT teams and/or participates in the Support Services Committee. The Support Services Committee represents all city departments that are involved in PACE. Initially, this was limited to human services and the police, plus a few other departments (e.g., Code Enforcements, Existing Structures, etc.). As the program (PACE) has matured, however, its scope has become broader and other agencies (e.g., utilities) have been drawn into the program.

Phase 3 of PACE is called "Community Partnerships." An important part of Community Partnerships is making city services more accessible to the communities, and this is accomplished through the Support Services Committee. According to one human services professional, shrinking resources at all levels of government and service delivery systems has resulted in human services becoming very specialized functions and less accessible

to consumers. He believed, however, that it is possible to change this direction:

> ...there's no reason we can't invent that...it's just like the police are reinventing community presence; there's no reason we can't reinvent a community presence, and that's what PACE is all about. And there's a social strategy for government; that's what PACE is all about....I don't know the exact years in Norfolk, probably 10 or 15 years, never assigned caseloads for ADC, food stamps, or any other payment program on the basis of geographic area in the sense of neighborhoods....And we tried to start to try reinventing that. Shift caseloads of an eligibility worker, a food stamp worker, an ADC worker, all have the caseloads from a set geographic area, or a number of workers depending on the size of the geographic area.

Like the law enforcement side of PACE, the human services shifts to neighborhoods are being done gradually, starting with the communities identified as PACE target areas. Thus, the PACE police officer has a social worker and an eligibility worker he knows he can work with.

Within PACE this coordination is carried out by the Support Services Committee, through its two subcommittees (NEAT and FAST). The NEAT team focuses on environmental concerns, while the FAST team deals with,

> those multiple problem families that none of us can crack individually, that maybe by working together we can have an impact on those families and the dysfunction that may exist in them....see that referral processes are developed and flow, services central clearing houses, receiving cases, assigning cases, coordinates meetings ...

Each PACE area has its own NEAT and FAST teams, which is manpower intensive, but the line level staff appear (according to their supervisors) to be happy with the arrangement. The interagency cooperation exists at all levels, from line worker through admin-

istrative staff. The first decision of the Support Services Committee was that every department would treat a PACE referral as the priority referral of the department. So, the extra time that is devoted to attending meetings is recovered by increased efficiency.

> There's no chasing anymore. It comes in as a PACE problem, as a PACE referral, it's dealt with. And because you know the people working in that community, there's usually no loss of referrals and information in the referral process in the bureaucracies of the various departments.

C. Community Outreach and Advertisements

Community outreach begins during Phase 2 (Increased Patrols) of PACE. At this time the police go door-to-door distributing fliers describing the PACE program and announcing Community Service Days. Community Service Days provide residents of a PACE target area with the opportunity to talk to representatives of city agencies. Public support rallies are held, and there is an Open Forum with Norfolk city officials, the NRHA, the police, and community leaders. In the initial two target areas, during Phase 3 (Community Partnerships) a "PACE Neighborhood Communications" session was held at the Recreation Center. The session was sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and coordinated by a police captain. Although police, community leaders, residents and staff from other agencies were encouraged to attend, the response was disappointing. Most of the participants were police officers and other city employees; very few community residents were involved.

With regard to advertising, the PACE logo appears on all police vehicles and those of many other agencies (e.g., utili-

ties, trash collection, etc.). Lapel pins of the logo have been produced and are worn by city employees and others. The Norfolk Police Department has a sophisticated video production unit which has produced tapes describing the PACE program. Media coverage of PACE events has also been good.

D. Associated Technology

As part of the civilianization of Police Department jobs associated with PACE, the 911 dispatchers were replaced by civilian "telecommunicators." In addition, a triage program was instituted through which the telecommunicator determines which of the calls coming into the 911 lines can be handled over the telephone (i.e., without sending a car), which can be diverted to another agency, and which are simply inappropriate for police response. The telecommunicators are part of the Police Emergency Services Liaison Unit (PESLU), which is also staffed by a lieutenant, a sergeant, two corporals and three police officers, and functions from the Emergency Operations Center (EOC). There is a recently installed Computer Aided Dispatch/Management Information System (CADMIS), which was not fully operational at the time of the implementation site visit.

In the budget of Norfolk's recently approved INOP proposal, are funds to purchase cellular phones, "handi-talkies" (radios), and bicycles. Because this budget had not been approved at the time of the Vera site visit, none of this equipment had yet been purchased.

IV. Expected Impacts

A. Community Effects

The hopes of the City of Norfolk are that PACE, through the combination of enforcement efforts, interagency cooperation and community involvement, will allow the residents of neighborhoods with drug problems to reclaim their community. The enforcement efforts are expected to stabilize the neighborhood, and the residents are part of the effort through the Neighborhood Watch Program and civic leagues. Calls for service are expected to go down as a result of decreased criminal activities.

As a direct result of the personal relationship developed (through PACE) between the police and the community, police officers and supervisors are attending community meetings and getting to know the residents. The goal of PACE is to

> sell to the community that it's a common interest among the police department and the city and the citizens that we all unite. That no community that's ever united and been strong has had a problem with continuing crime. It just doesn't stay where it can't operate. Without the community we're just never going to provide the kind of environment that is going to make crime [go away].

According to police personnel who were interviewed, the community response has been overwhelmingly positive. Residents are happy to see the police in their community and believe the program is having a positive effect.

B. Departmental Effects

As Norfolk's first experience with community policing, the effect of the PACE program on the Norfolk Police Department is enormous: Officers are developing greater contact with the

community; interagency cooperation is pervasive; officers who report problems to other agencies now receive feedback on what's being done to rectify the problem. Until the research team can observe BJA-funded portions of the PACE program, however, it will be impossible to assess the effects of INOP on the Norfolk Police Department.

NEW YORK

I. The New York INOP Project and the Target Area

A. Introduction

New York is a city of approximately eight million people, living in five counties (known as boroughs) that cover 319 square miles, with a population density of over 25,000 people per square mile (65,000 in Manhattan). In fiscal year 1990, the New York City Police Department (NYPD) has 25,869 sworn officers and 7,091 civilian employees. The INOP project in New York has three target areas, and their status varies. The success of the project is contingent upon the purchase and receipt of a large van for each site and upon the recruitment of volunteers to staff the van. Therefore, the approach used in the New York City INOP project has been to recruit and train volunteers for one target site prior to receipt of the vans, and to wait until the vans are ready before recruiting volunteers in the other two sites. At the time of the Vera implementation site visit (July 1991), some recruitment and training of volunteers had been done in one target site, the 23rd precinct in East Harlem in Manhattan, but the vans had not yet been received.[1]

---

[1] Making a major purchase through the massive bureaucracy of the New York City government is an arduous and time consuming process. According to one of the planners of the New York INOP project, the biggest implementation problem for the project has been the purchase of the van. After developing the specifications for the van, the bid process began on January 17, 1991. Only one bid was received, making the van purchase a sole source contract. City regulations require that before a purchase may be made from a sole source, there must be a second opportunity for others to bid on the item. The second round of bids yielded the same one bidder, and the vans were eventually ordered from that vendor. The process, however, cost the project several months, and delivery of the first of the three vans was expected on July 15.

While the INOP project is very much in its infancy in New York, community policing is not. Community policing, or the Community Patrol Officer Program (CPOP) as it is known in New York, began as a pilot program in a single precinct in Brooklyn in 1984. Through a gradual process, CPOP was expanded until, by 1988 it was implemented in all 75 precincts of the NYPD. The evolution of community policing in New York City is not over yet; the NYPD has recently presented a revised strategy for policing New York City in the '90s: "The dominant philosophy and strategy for policing the city will be community policing. The Department will return to block-by-block policing throughout the city" (Brown, Policing New York City in the 1990s, 1991).

B. Community Policing in New York

As was indicated above, the goals of the NYPD involve changes in both community policing and the philosophy of the NYPD as a whole. However, at the time of the Vera implementation site visit, CPOP covered part or all of every precinct in New York City. The basic structure has been to divide a precinct (or the part of it covered by CPOP) into beats, usually 10 per precinct. Each CPOP beat is assigned a walking Community Patrol Officer (CPO) for one shift; the hours worked by CPOs are flexible, determined by the CPO and his or her supervisor in response to the problems on that beat. The CPOP sergeant is responsible for supervising the 10 to 14 CPOs in his or her precinct. Training for CPOs is provided in the Police Academy. Primary responsi-

bility for responding to calls for service (cfs) remains with the radio motor patrol (RMP) units, but the CPO is also expected to take some calls (depending on his or her location relative to the call).

C. INOP Target Areas

The INOP project has three target areas, in the 23rd precinct in East Harlem, in the 44th precinct in the Bronx, and in the 72nd precinct in Brooklyn.[2] Each of these three precincts was chosen as an INOP site for a different reason: the 23rd precinct was chosen in conjunction with the Department of Health, which already had an interest in the area; the 44th precinct was chosen because it had a "Katzenbach School".[3] The INOP target sites, where the vans will be parked, are each outside of an elementary school or junior high school. The particular sites

---

[2] The 72nd precinct is the NYPD's "model precinct," where it is implementing its new departmental philosophy: steady tours, "incorporating all aspects of the concept [of community policing] into its precinct activities. This model precinct will be staffed at the level recommended in the Resource Allocation and Staffing Study. By staffing the model precinct at its ultimate level, the Department will be able to test all aspects of community policing under real life conditions" (Brown, 1991). Because a Vera Institute of Justice staff member provides technical assistance to the NYPD in its model precinct and because NIJ has awarded funds to the Police Foundation to conduct research on the model precinct, the Vera evaluation of the New York INOP project will not include the 72nd precinct target site, only those in the 23rd and 44th precincts.

[3] Katzenbach schools, named after the commission appointed by New York Mayor Dinkins to address community drug abuse problems (Katzenbach, Nicholas deB. 1990, "Report and Recommendations to the Mayor on Drug Abuse in New York City," New York), are funded to stay open 16 hours each day, year-round. Katzenbach schools are intended to provide a safe alternative for youth to playing or hanging out in the streets where they will be exposed to drug dealing and other criminal activity.

were chosen because they were schools within areas of active street-level narcotics dealing. The two blocks surrounding the schools will be designated drug-free zones.

As was indicated above, at the time of the Vera site visit, the only target site that was active was the 23rd precinct site. The NYPD intended to have the vans ready (i.e., painted, treated with anti-graffiti chemicals, equipped with telephones, etc.) by August 15, and at that time, begin the volunteer recruitment and training process in the 44th and 72nd precincts. Therefore, the rest of this report will focus on the 23rd precinct.

Each of the precincts in which the vans will be located has a substantial, well-documented drug problem; a high proportion of very poor families (incomes under $10,000: 23, 57%; 44, 59%; 72, 47%); and a high proportion of minority residents (black or Latino: 23, 88%; 44, 92%; 72, 49%).

In the 23rd precinct, the van will be parked in front of a Junior High School (JHS 117) and across the street from an elementary school (PS 83). These schools are located at 109th Street and Third Avenue, in Spanish Harlem, in an area described by the CPOs as "a supermarket for drugs." There are sometimes as many as 40 dealers in one small area near the school. The major drugs being sold are heroin and crack, primarily heroin.

The four-block area immediately surrounding the school where the van will be placed contains a substantial playground area (the site of local drug trafficking); a stretch of public housing projects; and two well-developed commercial strips containing

bodegas, mom-and-pop stores, repair shops, etc. along Second and Third Avenues.

II. Drug Demand Reduction Activities

The INOP project in New York involves several city and private agencies (in addition to the NYPD): the Board of Education, the Victim Services Agency (VSA), the Department of Health, the Department of Youth Services, and the Citizens Committee for New York City, Inc. The Board of Education will provide the school building (to be used for rest rooms and recreational activities) and will provide some volunteers to staff the van. Victim Services Agency will provide a staff member from its Domestic Violence Prevention Program (DVPP) who will work in the van at least one day per week and serve as "a liaison to resources." The Department of Health will provide an injury prevention component for the precinct (prevention of accidents and violence); a safe corridor program, using "Safe Streets" funds; and other drug and crime prevention initiatives (e.g., MacGruff). The Department of Youth Services, using money from the "Safe Streets, Safe Cities" program will provide a youth counselor who (along with the precinct Youth Officer) will conduct home visits three days each week and work in the van two days per week. A drug counselor will be available to make referrals to treatment (either from the van or a site in the community), and a youth outreach worker will work from the van, with the assistance of the CPO to identify kids with problems and try to bring them in for referrals for services. The Citizens Committee provides training for volunteers, CPOs, and anyone else who will be staffing the van.

In each of the seven patrol boroughs of New York City, the NYPD operates its Tactical Narcotics Teams (TNTs); TNT is a buy-and-bust street level narcotics enforcement program. TNT is sent into an area identified as having a high degree of street-level narcotics dealing. Because TNT was designed to be a first step in reclaiming for the residents an area of drug dealing, TNT usually stays in a target area for 60 to 90 days and then returns to do periodic maintenance. For the two to three months prior to the start of the INOP project in the 23rd precinct, TNT was in the area.

A. Drug Prevention and Treatment Activities

According to NYPD officials and interviewed staff from VSA and the Department of Health, both the van and the adjacent school will be patrolled by CPOs, who will not work inside the van, but will be available to provide drug prevention activities and referrals to treatment. There will also be crime prevention and drug prevention literature inside the van. At the time of the Vera site visit, however, the vans had not yet been delivered, and the project had not yet begun. Project planners report that they envision an "expanded role" for PAL in target areas, although this role is not yet defined.

The van. NYPD staff who designed the INOP project intend to park the van in front of the school for 16 hours each day (although at the beginning it will be there for just eight hours per day). During this time it will be staffed by volunteers and the personnel provided by VSA, the Department of Health and the Department of Youth Services. At the end of each day, a desig-

nated police officer will disconnect the telephone and electrical services and drive the van back to the police parking lot.[4] In addition to the services being provided inside the van and in the school, the two-block radius around the van and school will be designated a drug-free zone.

The hope of project staff is that people in the community will see the van as a community resource, and not a police resource. Although the van will be painted the blue and white colors used by the NYPD and will have the NYPD logo on it, it will not have "police" in the project name (Neighborhood Services Project) painted on it and no police officers will staff it. In a further effort to disassociate the van from the Police Department, police reports will not be taken in the van; rather citizens will be instructed to call the precinct or see the CPO outside.

The Citizens Committee is interested in using the van to identify residents who want to organize buildings and blocks to resist local drug dealers. To that end, the Citizens Committee is prepared to provide drug prevention training and services to community groups in the target area, and has a history of helping groups work with the CPOs against specific drug locations.

---

[4] The reason for selecting vans rather than storefront offices is that the vans can be removed to a secure parking lot when they are not being used. Personnel from the NYPD indicated that if they did not do this, they would have to patrol the van (or storefront) 24 hours a day to prevent it from being vandalized or stolen.

B. Law Enforcement Activities

Unlike some of the other INOP programs, there is not a big law enforcement component to the New York INOP project. As was indicated above, TNT has been in the 23rd precinct for some months prior to the start of the INOP project there, to reduce street-level drug dealing (however, it is possible that TNT would be in that area even in the absence of the INOP project). Once the van is in place, the CPOs will patrol the area around the van during the hours of its operation; although CPOs in New York City have fixed beats, responsibility for patrolling the area around the van will be rotated among the CPOs in the unit. The expectation is that the CPOs will ensure the safety of citizens using the services in the van and volunteers staffing the van. They will also be available to take information about narcotics locations and conditions in the neighborhood. In addition, the telephone inside the van will enable volunteers and other staff to call the precinct to report crimes or for citizens to provide information they might have about criminal activity. Until the van is actually in place, however, there is no way to know how it will be used.

III. Other Program Components

A. Volunteers

The volunteers were initially recruited through the schools, with the cooperation of the Board of Education. About 10 or 15 volunteers attended the initial training session (conducted by staff from the Citizens Committee) in June 1991. By the time the second session was held, however, the schools had closed for

summer vacation and none of the original volunteers attended that session. Instead, there was a new group of volunteers (approximately 10) from the community. These volunteers expressed concerns about security within the van and about scheduling the hours that might be required to staff the van.

The first training session was held in the 23rd precinct station house on June 18, 1991. The session was led by the Citizens Committee, and the agenda included an overview of the project, a discussion of the role of the volunteers, confidentiality, practice, and training and follow-up. The role of the volunteer was described as providing information and referrals. The importance of confidentiality was stressed. Volunteers who attended the June 18th meeting were told they would receive training in intake, developing community resources, maintaining confidentiality, entitlements, and interpersonal skills. Initial training was to begin on July 2 and involve five two-hour sessions. Also present at the initial session were staff from VSA, the Manhattan DA's office, the Department of Health, and command level police staff.

The agenda for the July 2 training session included a five-minute overview of the project and a five-minute review of the previous session, followed by training on intake and paperwork and on developing community resources. Along with the ten new volunteers, and in addition to staff members who attended the first session, CPOs and the Community Affairs Officer from the 23rd precinct attended this session. Project forms were reviewed and volunteers were instructed on how to fill them out. Volun-

teers were also provided with a skeletal list of community resources (containing the telephone number of Community Board 11 and listing "elected officials, churches, multi-service centers, New York State Department of Substance Abuse Services, phone book, other service providers and community organizations, and word of mouth").

There was some concern expressed by CPOs and higher ranking officers from the NYPD that residents would be afraid to volunteer to serve in the van. According to the CPOs, local drug dealers have threatened residents that they would "kill them if they snitch," and some citizens are afraid that if they were seen going in the van, dealers would think it was to provide the police with information. If, in fact, the number of volunteers is insufficient, NYPD staff intend to use either Police Cadets[5] or Auxiliary Police officers to staff the van. Neither the cadets nor the Auxiliary Police wear the uniforms of the NYPD; it is, therefore, hoped that they would not be seen as police officers.

B. Interagency Partnerships

The interagency partnerships are limited to the NYPD, VSA, the Manhattan District Attorney's Office, the Department of

---

[5] The NYPD has a Police Cadet Corps made up of individuals who have completed at least two years of college. Cadets are students who are interested in police careers and who receive tuition reimbursement and pay for their work in the Corps. They have flexible assignments and often work with the CPOs. A benefit of being a Cadet is that they are placed at the top of the list when they pass the police exam. In return, they owe the Department four years of service (and must reimburse the tuition paid if they drop out of the Cadet Corps or fail to join the NYPD).

Health, the Board of Education and the Citizen's Committee. The police will provide the van and CPOs to patrol the area around the van and to make referrals to the van for services. Victim Services Agency will provide referrals to its Domestic Violence Prevention Program (in the 23rd precinct only) and to other programs (e.g., shelters for battered women, legal services, etc.). The Manhattan DA's office plans to educate volunteers regarding the criminal justice system so that they can provide this information to members of the community. The DA's office also runs a Domestic Violence Center, located in the New York State Office Building in Harlem. Meetings of the staff members from the involved agencies are held on alternate Wednesdays at the 23rd precinct station house.

C. Community Outreach and Advertisements

At the time of the Vera site visit, community outreach was limited to the volunteer recruitment efforts of the Board of Education and the Parent Teachers Association (PTA) in the school. During July, CPOs in the 23rd precinct distributed 7,000 copies of a letter (in English and Spanish), signed by the Commanding Officer of the 23rd precinct, describing the Neighborhood Police Services Project[6] and inviting residents to serve as volunteers

---

[6] There has been a history of internal debate among project planners about whether the van would be explicitly designated as a project of the NYPD. Although interviewed NYPD personnel indicated that the word "Police" had been dropped from the name of the project, the letters that were distributed were on City of New York, Police Department stationery. The letter identified the name of the project as the Neighborhood Police Services Project and indicated that for additional information, residents should call the CPOP sergeant or one of two CPOs at the CPOP telephone number.

and/or to use the services provided in the van. (No date for project start-up was given in the letter.) In addition, project staff expect local newspapers to donate advertising space (particularly in the local Spanish-language paper) and hope that local churches will print information about the project in their bulletins.

D. Program Evaluation

According to INOP project planners, the program evaluation will be conducted by NYPD staff. They plan to use pre/post data provided by the NYPD (on crime complaints, arrests, drug-related activity, drug-related homicides, etc.); the Department of Health (on injuries in the target area, drug-related hospital admissions, children born addicted to drugs, etc.); the Board of Education (on school attendance and truancy rates), and from a community survey (administered by Police Cadets or college interns to 50 residents in each precinct within the target area and 50 residents outside the area). The community survey would measure residents' perceptions of quality of life changes, drug-related activity, police presence, and use of the van. In addition, NIJ operates its Drug Use Forecasting (DUF) in Manhattan (the borough in which the 23rd precinct is located) and those data will be available for the evaluation. The New York City Department of Youth Services will provide data on the number of youth contacts and referrals, youth involvement in INOP project-related recreational and educational activities and number of referrals to drug treatment programs. At the time of the Vera site visit, however, no work had been done on the evaluation.

E. BJA Funds

The major use of BJA funds on the New York INOP grant is to purchase the three vans. In addition, site preparation (e.g., telephone hook-up) and equipment for the vans (e.g., telephones, telephone usage, typewriters, etc.) is paid for out of grant funds. Jackets with a project patch will be provided for the volunteers through BJA funds. There are also contracts with VSA to staff the van and with the Citizens Committee to provide training.

IV. Expected Impacts

The goals of the New York INOP project are to reduce crime, violence, and drug usage; increase school attendance; develop a network of services; increase resident involvement in their community; increase youth involvement in activities; increase community knowledge of resources and create a "Resource Directory"; and increase interagency cooperation. Reductions in crime, violence and drug usage would be produced first by the enforcement activities of TNT prior to the vans being in place, and then maintained by the activities of the INOP project (e.g., developing rapport with the community which might increase the likelihood of citizens providing the police with information on narcotics activity). According to one of the program planners, the mere presence of the van should have an impact on school attendance: "... And that's one of the logical things we can expect. The police station is going to be in front of their school. There's a good chance that more parents will encourage their children to go to school." The involvement of the youth

officer and youth counselor is expected to increase youth involvement in recreational activities. This involvement in recreational activities and the referrals to drug treatment programs are expected to reduce drug usage among youth.

In contrast to the expectations expressed by project planners, the CPOs from the 23rd precinct were less optimistic. While they indicated that they hoped the project would be successful, they were skeptical about its chances because of its reliance on the van and volunteers. The CPOs believed that many area residents would be afraid to volunteer to work in the van because of the threats of drug dealers and the fear of traveling home from the van at night. They expressed the belief that people in the neighborhood who might be willing to volunteer had neither the knowledge nor the skills to do the job, and would require extensive training. In addition, they felt that the people being tapped to be volunteers were those who already work for other programs and therefore would be unavailable to volunteer for the INOP project. The CPOs' recommendation was that auxiliary police officers (in plainclothes) be used to staff the van.

In addition, the CPOs expressed their concern that, even if volunteers could be found, people in the area would be unlikely to use the services offered in the van. The reason, again, was fear. They said that, with the exception of a few "buffs," people who like cops and would like to be cops, people will not want to be seen going in the van. This, in turn, the CPOs feared would be a disincentive to the volunteers -- "if there are three

or four volunteers in the van and only two or three people come in during the day to use its services, why should they stay?"

The CPOs expressed the belief that the project could not possibly succeed in its efforts at drug demand reduction, that a drug-free zone in that area would be impossible unless "you have 50 cops around it, 24 hours a day." According to CPOs, they can't even keep the local branch of the Public Library drug-free. The dealers in the area will adjust their hours to avoid the police, but they will not leave. "These guys have no morals -- they deal right in front of the community center where old people go for meals." The local housing projects pose additional problems for drug demand reduction because (according to the CPOs) it is difficult to get cooperation from the Housing Police Department.

HAYWARD

I. The Hayward INOP Project and the Target Area

A. Introduction

Hayward is a city of approximately 120,000 people that covers 39 square miles. The Hayward Police Department (HPD) employs 156 sworn officers. The target area for the Hayward INOP project is the entire city, although one area (Tennyson-Harder), with a pervasive drug problem, receives more attention than other areas of the city. The cornerstone of the INOP project is a large van, intended to be used as a mobile office and meeting space for community groups; however, at the time of the Vera implementation site visit, this van had not yet been purchased. Community oriented policing is also new to Hayward. The City of Hayward Police Department unveiled its Community Oriented Policing and Problem Solving (COPPS) Implementation Plan in March, 1991, and the implementation process which is expected to take five years began on July 1 (just two weeks before the Vera site visit).

B. Community Policing in Hayward

The introduction of community policing to Hayward can be attributed directly to the appointment of a new Chief of Police in January, 1990. In his former position in Santa Ana, California, the Chief was actively involved in the development and implementation of community policing in the Santa Ana Police Department, and he came to Hayward firmly convinced that community policing was a philosophy of policing that could more effectively address community concerns than could traditional

policing strategies. Planning the COPPS program began in August 199[1] and resulted in the COPPS Implementation Plan, dated March 1, 1991.

The organizational structure of the police department was changed to accommodate community policing; the patrol function for the city was divided into three area commands, each managed by a lieutenant who functions as the "Chief of Police" for that area. The patrol staff are assigned to these areas and report to Watch Commanders for their particular shifts. All officers are expected to be community police officers and to meet the citizens on their beats.

C. The INOP Target Area

The target area for the Hayward INOP grant is all of the city, with BJA funds paying the salaries of one police officer and one Community Service Officer[2], and paying for the purchase of the van. Nearly half (approximately 45%) of the housing in Hayward is renter occupied, substantially higher than in the rest of the Bay Area. (The Tennyson-Harder area has the highest proportion of rental and Section 8 housing in the Bay Area.) Although nearly two-thirds of the residents of Hayward are white (65%), racial composition does not accurately describe the city's population. Hayward is characterized by tremendous ethnic

---

[1]August 1990 was the date INOP project planning staff gave as the start of planning for the COPPS program. However, the original Hayward proposal to BJA for the INOP grant is dated June 1990 and makes reference to the COPPS program. Therefore, it is unclear just when the COPPS planning process actually began.

[2]Community Service Officers in Hayward are sworn police personnel who perform in the same capacity as police officers, but do not carry guns.

diversity -- some 40 languages are spoken in the City, including Spanish, Korean, Farci, Russian, etc. According to INOP project planners, Hayward neighborhoods are not ethnically divided; that is, people from these diverse cultures live side-by-side throughout Hayward. The people are relatively poor (39% of the households were classified as lower income in 1980), and the city lags behind the rest of Alameda county in education (71% of the adults in Hayward have high school diplomas as compared to 77% in the county as a whole). The major problem in the area, identified by community leaders, is drugs.

D. Project Goals and Objectives

Three major goals for the INOP project were articulated in Hayward's proposal to BJA:

1. Increase community participation and responsibility for neighborhood problem solving;

2. Increase the public's safety in our neighborhoods by reducing the level of drug abuse and trafficking through exposure to law enforcement and community programs; and

3. Facilitate and support the efforts of community based service organizations in their neighborhood drug reduction and problem solving efforts.

To attain each of these goals, several objectives were enumerated and associated activities were described. Some of these are dependent upon acquisition of the van and, therefore, have not yet been initiated. Others began prior to the official start of the COPPS program (7/1/91).

II. Drug Demand Reduction Activities

A. Drug Prevention and Treatment Activities

The Van. The van, or Neighborhood Access Vehicle, is the cornerstone of the INOP project in Hayward, and because it had

not been received at the time of the Vera site visit, much of the project was not really operating yet. According to HPD staff, the van will be a "moving storefront," and will contain brochures and other information about available services, serving as a consolidated source of referral information. It will also contain meeting space that will be available to community-based organizations and treatment programs, to use for referral counseling.

The van is expected to enhance the relationship between the community and the police by making the police more accessible to the community. This would enable citizens to make crime complaints and requests for service without having to visit the HPD. At the same time, the van could be used to provide high visibility and a police presence in problem areas.

Increase community participation. One of the approaches to increasing community participation in problem solving was to form (25) new Neighborhood Alert groups. According to INOP project planners, Neighborhood Alert has been ongoing in Hayward since the early 1970s, and there are some 132 listed Block Captains, 66 of whom are active (although there may be only 20 groups that meet regularly). While the files kept by the officer funded by BJA contain log sheets indicating that 22 Neighborhood Alert meetings had been held since November 1990 (the start of the BJA grant), it was not possible to tell which of these (if any) were new groups. On average, 14 people attended each meeting (six to 64 people had signed each log). Neighborhood Alert groups were encouraged by the Community Service Officer (funded out of the

INOP grant) to purchase (for $20 each) and have the city erect "No Drugs Allowed" signs in their neighborhoods. At the time of the Vera site visit, eight requests for these signs had been received since March 1991.

Some interviewed members of the HPD indicated that the police found it somewhat difficult to deal with the Afghan community. This was attributed only partially to the language barrier; although none of the officers speak Farci, they felt that cultural barriers posed a bigger problem. Both the police and an interviewed Afghan community leader cited cultural differences in the definition of spouse or child abuse. In Afghanistan, for example, wife-beating is an accepted practice. Similarly, it is common "back home" to settle disputes with neighbors without involving the police, through acts of retribution. The first order of business with the Afghan community, therefore, was introducing them to the police and explaining how to deal with domestic disputes and problems in the neighborhood. According to a leader from the community, the police officer funded under the INOP grant contacted her in an effort to involve the Afghan community. The last meeting for the Afghan community and the police was held in June at a school; this meeting was attended by about 25 people, religious leaders and residents. The next meeting was to be held in September, after school resumed.

Beat Health Abatement. Even prior to the COPPS program, Hayward had a Beat Health Team consisting of representatives from the Fire Department, Buildings Department, Community Preserva-

tion, City Attorney's Office, Police Department, Vector Control (deals with rodents), Pacific Gas and Electric Loss Prevention and the Department of Public Works. There are no established meeting dates and a police sergeant coordinates the team. Although this team had been in existence since 1989, according to one of the project planners, the INOP project helped mobilize it and solidify relationships among the agencies involved.

The Hayward grant proposal to BJA lists as one of its objectives conducting 25 Beat Health abatements (e.g., cleaning up vacant lots). The project files contained a detailed memorandum regarding Beat Health abatements, but this was the work of one officer (not funded under the INOP grant) and covered the period from January 1990 through April 1991. Thus, the level of activity of the Beat Health Team is unclear.

Juvenile Diversion. Juveniles arrested for certain first-time drug offenses are eligible for diversion to Project Eden and project planners envisioned diverting 50 percent of those eligible. According to project files, between September 26, 1990 and March 27, 1991, eight such diversions were made.

B. Law Enforcement Activities

The project planners intend to staff the Neighborhood Access Vehicle with the police officer and Community Service Officer funded by the BJA award for 1500 hours per year, and use it to provide a highly visible police presence in various neighborhoods. However, since the van has not yet been obtained, this objective has not been implemented.

By January 1991, a Building Security Standards ordinance had been drafted; this ordinance was intended to improve target hardening for residences and business and thereby, reduce losses attributable to burglary.

Another stated objective of the INOP project was to have the administrative/supervisory staff of the Youth and Family Services Bureau (YFSB) of the HPD meet with the principals of all 10 high schools and intermediate schools in the district annually to discuss and plan for appropriate on-campus drug enforcement activities. At the time of the Vera site visit, project files contained a list of participants from the August 1990 (prior to the start of the project) "School Kick Off" luncheon and memoranda describing the purpose of the luncheon. There were approximately 120 representatives of the Hayward Unified School District, HPD, Project Eden (a drug education and counseling program), the Alameda County Juvenile Court, the Alameda County Juvenile Probation Department, and Moreau High School in attendance. According to materials in the files, the purpose of the luncheon was to "introduce and facilitate communication between the administrative staff of the School District, the School Resource Officers, the DARE instructors, Probation Officers, Project Eden, the Probation Department and the Juvenile Court." The 1991 "School Kick Off" luncheon had not been held at the time of the Vera site visit, nor was there any reference to it in the project files.

Until the COPPS plan was implemented in July, the HPD had a Tactical Narcotics Team (TNT) which was responsible for "breaking

the drug dealer to drug buyer relationship." TNT accomplished this by arresting drug users (for possession and under the influence) and by arresting drug dealers through buy-and-bust operations. Between the time the INOP grant was funded (November 1990) and the time the TNT unit was disbanded (7/1/91), monthly statistics of the number of TNT school sweeps, drug influence arrests, and buy-and-bust arrests were maintained. After July 1, the TNT activities continued, but rather than being "permanently" staffed by narcotics officers, any police officer who was available on a given night might be drafted for "TNT" duty.

III. Other Program Components

A. Recruitment and Training

During March and April of 1991, COPPS training sessions were held for police supervisors and officers. Every Police Department employee received 40 hours of community policing training, taught by police personnel who had been involved in the COPPS planning. In addition to police department training on community policing, the Building Inspection Department, Community Preservation Department, City Attorney's Office, Department of Public Works and Planning Department each presented modules designed "to increase our officers' understanding of the usefulness of city-wide resources and how city departments can work with each other to solve community problems."

During late May, a one hour introductory training session was provided to Block Captains (of Neighborhood Alert groups), followed in late June with an hour on civil abatement procedures. At the time of the Vera site visit, four additional hour-long

training sessions had been scheduled to deal with problem-solving strategies, an overview of symptoms of drug use, a display of drugs and drug paraphernalia, and drugs and youth.

Using a curriculum developed in San Jose, the HPD planned to work with the Eden Council for Hope and Opportunity (ECHO Housing) to provide training to rental unit managers. The purpose of this training was to teach rental unit managers how to identify drug trafficking and abuse, and to inform them of their rights and responsibilities.

Using the Landlord Training manual developed for the city of Portland (by John Campbell Resources) as a guide, the police officer paid for under the INOP grant and the City Attorney's Office drafted a Landlord Training program for Hayward.[3] Adaptation of the program for Hayward required amendments to fit the rental laws of that city. In addition, the officer added a section on security and barrier plantings appropriate to Hayward's climate.

B. Interagency Partnerships

Another task for the officer funded under the grant was to develop a comprehensive information and referral resource document to facilitate citizen referrals. A Resource Guide was produced by the HPD, dated April 1991, which lists federal, state and county agencies; city offices; courts; hospitals; human services; public safety/investigative agencies; schools; etc. The BJA-funded officer is responsible for dissemination of this

---

[3]At the time of the Vera site visit, the manual was in draft form.

Guide. (An additional guide to alcoholism, drug abuse and family support resources is available for police officers to use when making referrals.)

A graffiti hotline (29-ERASE) was set up and went on-line on July 9, 1991. The purpose of this hotline was to allow citizens to report the presence of graffiti for rapid removal by City paint crews. The existence of this hotline was to be advertised in the July Neighborhood Alert bulletin.

C. Community Outreach and Advertisements

Neighborhood Alert Block Captains have the greatest degree of interaction with the police. In addition to their local Neighborhood Alert meetings, the Block Captains attend monthly meetings held at the Hayward Police Department. According to interviewed Block Captains, the meetings at the HPD are attended regularly by 10 to 20 people. These same respondents indicated that the COPPS program is getting attention in the newspapers and that people who are not involved in community organizations hear about it through the press.

D. Program Evaluation

An evaluation of the COPPS program as a whole is being conducted by the HPD, coordinated by a sergeant. This evaluation includes performance evaluation of HPD personnel and a community survey to be conducted annually for five years. At the time of the Vera site visit, the development of parameters for performance evaluation was in its infancy. But data collection for the first community survey was well underway.

The survey was constructed, in consultation with the Chief of Police, by an outside contractor associated with the Univer-

sity of California, Hayward, who also selected a random sample of all Hayward residents. The original plan was to use volunteers to do the door-to-door administration of the survey. Thirty volunteers were recruited, but their interest soon waned when they discovered how difficult it is to get respondents to cooperate. As a result, police personnel are administering the survey.[4] Estimates of how many interviews had actually been completed varied, but ranged between 400 and 600. Data collection began in late June and was expected to be completed in July; the contractor who designed the survey expected to have the data analyzed and a report on the results completed by September or October.

E. BJA Funds

The official start of the INOP grant, i.e., the time the funds were released by BJA, was November 1, 1990; however, the Hayward INOP project did not begin until January 1, 1991. BJA funds are being used to buy the van and pay the salaries of one police officer and one Community Service Officer. In addition, these funds allow the Department to leverage other resources:

---

[4]When questioned about the possibility that bias was introduced by having police officers administer a survey about police services, interviewed police personnel responsible for survey administration and the independent contractor both indicated that they believed their procedures would minimize such bias. Officers administering the survey are in plainclothes and identify themselves as representatives of COMFAX (the private consulting firm); unless pressed by the respondent, they make no mention of being police officers. When asked about validity checks on the responses, the contractor indicated that these were not routinely done, but that he planned to periodically send someone to check on whether the interviews had been administered at all.

community partnerships with COMPRE, the South Hayward Parish,[5] the Apartment Owners Association, the school district and an enhanced relationship with Project Eden. According to project planners, the BJA grant focussed efforts at the community level sooner than would otherwise have occurred.

IV. Expected Impacts

According to the proposal submitted by Hayward to BJA, the most immediate impact of the project will be that of the van, which is expected to increase the visibility, accessibility and the dissemination of information. Aggressive street-level enforcement in neighborhoods plagued by drug trafficking is expected to lead to an increased number of narcotics arrests; the ability of officers to make such arrests is expected to be enhanced by improved relationships with the people of the community.

Over the longer term, drug arrests are expected to decrease as a result of prevention efforts initiated under the project. The Beat Health programs are expected to improve the appearance of these neighborhoods, and Neighborhood Alert groups are expected to play a active role in improving lighting, reporting graffiti (using the hotline established as part of the project), and other environmental issues. The availability of referral and counseling for drug problems (through the Neighborhood Access Vehicle) is expected to reduce the demand for drugs in the area.

---

[5]COMPRE is a community prevention project, funded by Alameda County to reduce alcohol related problems in the area. The South Hayward parish is an inter-faith group that runs a food pantry, an emergency shelter for families, and works with people to help them solve their housing problems.

PORTLAND

I. The Portland INOP Project and the Target Area

A. Introduction

Portland, Oregon is a city of 145 square miles and approximately 418,000 people. The Portland Police Bureau (PPB) currently employs 1100 people -- 850 of them are sworn officers.[1]

At the time of the Vera Institute's implementation site visit to Portland in July, 1991, the Portland Police Bureau's "Iris Court" INOP demonstration project had opened the "Iris Court Community Policing Contact Office"; assigned two police officers to the Iris Court "Neighborhood Response Team"; completed the recruitment and training of a civilian project coordinator and community health nurse; completed a survey of Iris Court residents and police officers in the North Precinct; established a residents' council and tenant association to aid in problem identification and problem-solving; and established partnerships with a number of city, county, state and private non-profit agencies in an effort to coordinate the delivery of social services to the residents of Iris Court.

B. Community Policing In Portland

By the time it had received its INOP grant, the Portland Police Bureau had completed its first year of a five-year commu-

---

[1]Information on the number of Portland Police Bureau employees and sworn officers was obtained through conversations with a deputy chief. The last Portland Police Bureau Annual Report (1988) lists 1067 total employees, 749 of which were sworn officers.

nity policing transition plan. The transition to community policing began in May-June, 1989, when a series of five community meetings were held to introduce the concept of community policing to the residents of Portland and involve them in the problem-solving process. These meetings resulted in the creation of the Portland Police Bureau Community Policing Transition Plan which was later adopted by the Portland City Council in January, 1990. Year one of the transition focused on building community-police partnerships; increasing community involvement in the problem-identification/solving process ("empowerment"); training officers in problem-solving strategies; and developing an overall management process for the transition to community policing. The first year of the transition also included implementing one community policing demonstration project in each of the city's three precincts.

One of these initiatives is the INOP-funded Iris Court community policing demonstration project in Portland's Northeast precinct. The Police Bureau selected the Iris Court housing project as its INOP site primarily because of its high levels of open air drug-dealing (especially crack cocaine), calls for service, and gang-related violence. Iris Court also appeared to be a good location for the demonstration project because it is a small community in which the police believe they can foster active resident participation in the project and reduce drug trafficking and drug-related crime with the resources available through the grant.

The Iris Court project is based on a two-year-old community policing effort at Columbia Villa (Portland's largest public housing development -- 1,600 residents at full occupancy) conducted by the Housing Authority of Portland (HAP) and the Multnomah County Sheriff. The Columbia Villa program was a response to high levels of drug trafficking, gang activity, and Portland's first drive-by drug-related shooting that left one dead and two wounded at the development. HAP utilized HUD Comprehensive Improvement Assistance Program funds to create a "Safety Action Team" for Columbia Villa. The Safety Action Team consisted of one Lieutenant, three Sheriff's deputies and two civilian community service officers (who do everything deputies do except carry firearms and make arrests). The Team is permanently assigned to the Villa; team members make their work hours coincide with the needs of the residents. Office space for the Team and for a number of social service providers (e.g., the State Employment Division and Adult and Family Services) was provided by HAP in the housing complex.

The sheriff's deputies did not replace the Portland Police Bureau's normal patrol activity at the Villa, however. Rather, the city police continued to handle priority calls while the sheriff's team focused on problem-solving policing in an effort to keep problems (both crime and quality-of-life problems) from recurring.[2]

---

[2]According to several respondents interviewed by Vera research staff, the Housing Authority of Portland first requested that the Portland Police Bureau take on the community policing role at Coulumbia Villa in 1988. The Portland Police Bureau refused, citing a lack of resources. The PPB also expressed concern that

C. The Target Area: The Iris Court Housing Complex

Iris Court is an entirely residential public housing project, owned and managed by the Housing Authority of Portland. Although the Portland Police Bureau refers to their INOP project as the "Iris Court Community Policing Demonstration Project," the target site includes the Iris Court development, Royal Rose development, Royal Rose Annex and Sumner Court developments. The exceptionally well-maintained two-story brick apartments are clustered around small courtyards with each block of apartments having its own play area for children. The complex consists of 108 units (54 family units at Iris Court and 54 family units at the Royal Rose, Royal Rose Annex, and Sumner Court developments), 85% of which are occupied by lower-income minority women with young children. The housing development as a whole is home to 159 people with 61 of the residents being children (all but seven of whom are younger than 13). About 85% of all adult residents are single women.[3]

The most recent figures supplied by the Police Bureau show that 39 of the 43 occupied units in the Iris Court development are "single parent head of household" units. Twenty-nine (67%) of the units were occupied by minority residents. Twenty-three

---

once funding ran out officers assigned to the Villa would have to be withdrawn, thus causing residents to feel abandoned. The Housing Authority then contracted with the Multnomah County Sheriff's Office to provide full-time staff to Columbia Villa.

[3]These data were supplied to the Portland Police Bureau by the Housing Authority of Portland in May, 1990. Data on the number of residents and children in the development are current and were supplied by the coordinator of the Iris Court project.

of the head of household residents (53%) have incomes of less than $5,000 per year and 16 (37%) have incomes between $5,000 and $9,999. Only five residents have wages as their source of income. Eighty-one percent of the residents rely on Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) as their major source of income.

The Royal Rose, Royal Rose Annex, and Sumner Court developments also contain 54 housing units (49 occupied), reserved primarily for the elderly (only 9 units are occupied by persons under 50 years of age) and disabled (16 units). The residents of these housing developments have incomes that are generally lower than those residing at Iris Court. Thirty-five of the 49 resident heads of household (86%), for example, had incomes of less than $5,000 per year. Only 12 residents had incomes falling between $5,000 and $9,999. Sixty-one percent of the residents have social security as their primary source of income. The percentage of minority residents is only slightly lower in these developments than at Iris Court (60% vs. 67%).

A Community Policing Problem Identification Survey conducted by the Housing Authority of Portland prior to the INOP grant project found that Iris Court residents included "the chronic poor; the undereducated; at-risk youth; young, single women with children; and people with special needs. A large number are drug dependent -- possibly as many as 50 percent." The survey also found that a majority of residents were "somewhat or very afraid" of criminal activity occurring in the housing development. The most frequently cited problems, according to respondents inter-

viewed by Vera researchers during the implementation site visit, were open-air drug markets and gang-related violence. Respondents also complained of unauthorized visitors, often gang members, illegally living in the apartments of girlfriends who were residents of the housing development. It is within this context that the Portland Police Bureau has chosen to implement one of its first community policing demonstration projects.

II. "Community Partnerships": The Iris Court Community Policing Demonstration Project

A. Goals, Objectives and Strategy: Drug Demand Reduction

The goals of the Iris Court project are to: (1) improve the quality-of-life and health of the 159 residents of Iris Court; (2) reduce the fear of crime; and (3) reduce the incidence of actual crime in the development. The Police Bureau believes that for any drug demand reduction strategy to be effective in the long term it must coordinate the delivery of law enforcement and social services into "a single service delivery network." The reasoning behind this strategy is that law enforcement alone cannot respond effectively to the drug problem. It is more effective, argue those involved in the planning and implementation of the project, if the police aid in facilitating the delivery of necessary social services to those who are most at-risk for drug abuse or those whose communities are plagued by drug trafficking. The PPB thus intends to achieve their project goals through: (1) Problem Solving Policing -- interfering with those activities that make drug trafficking or use easy or attractive; (2) Empowerment -- soliciting active citizen participation in the problem solving process; and (3) Creating Partnerships between

proactive social service providers, the residents of Iris Court and the PPB.

The Iris Court project consists of several interrelated components which focus on increasing public safety and the social, economic, educational, and physical/mental health of Iris Court residents: (1) a street enforcement/high-visibility patrol component; (2) a "Neighborhood Response Team" consisting of two uniformed patrol officers; (3) a civilian project coordinator (funded under the BJA INOP grant); (4) a community health nurse (funded under the BJA INOP grant); (5) a landlord training program that instructs landlords in how to keep drug activity off of their rental properties; (6) a community policing contact office located in Iris Court; (7) community partnerships established with the residents of Iris Court and various social service providers from the city, county, state, and private organizations; (8) the use of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED); and (9) resident organizing and empowerment.

The project was originally directed by the Metro Life Enhancement Team (MET) which was closely modeled after the "Safety Action Team" created for the Columbia Villa project two years ago. The function of MET (coordinated by the PPB) was to form an interdisciplinary service delivery network which would work closely with the residents of Iris Court, local government agencies, businesses and schools to have a positive impact on drug use and other quality-of-life issues affecting the residents of the development. According to one key organizer of the MET group, "Their [MET's] function was to try to sit down and iden-

tify all of the various people and groups who might have a role in implementing the various action plans for the project."

Unfortunately, according to key participants in the project, the structure and functioning of the MET team did not develop as expected. In particular, the MET group stopped meeting on a monthly basis (after "three or four" meetings off-site). As one participant explained: "I think people lost interest. Things were going well at Iris Court and, just like a lot of neighborhood groups, they are crisis driven, and if there is no crisis they move on to the next thing." A popular interpretation of the demise of regular MET meetings was that once the team had created a functioning service delivery network, and the project coordinator had been hired to coordinate delivery of those services to Iris Court residents, MET ceased to function. After the demise of MET, an implementation steering committee was created (made up of some of the MET members) to advise the group on an "as needed" basis. However, while acknowledging that MET had ceased to function, one member said, " ... if there were some meat and potatoes issues to deal with, then they know where to find us, and we will come out when it is important to do so."[4]

B. Enforcement and the Neighborhood Response Team

Enforcement. The Iris Court demonstration project does not emphasize law enforcement as a means to reducing drug demand. Its primary means to drug demand reduction lies in the coordina-

---

[4]That the MET team function ended is made clear in a June, 1991 memo from the Community Policing Division inquiring about whether MET was still functioning and involved in the Iris Court project.

tion and provision of social services aimed at improving the quality-of-life for the residents of Iris Court in an effort to make drug use less attractive to at-risk youth. In this sense, it is unique among the eight INOP-funded demonstration projects.

Prior to the INOP project "kick off" in July, 1990, the PPB targeted Iris Court for strong police presence and enforcement (February -- May, 1990). One high-ranking officer associated with the project explained:

> ... there was quite a bit of law enforcement that took place within the complex itself simply because we felt like we had an obligation at the Police Bureau to prepare the people in the complex for this invasion of social service people. We had to impress on the [residents and social service providers] that it was a safe place to be ... We served quite a lot of search warrants on drug houses and gang houses. The Housing Authority was very cooperative with evictions and that is why we had such a high vacancy rate at the time.

One important aspect of the enforcement effort was the attempt (beginning in May 1990) to "stabilize occupant patterns" in the Iris Court development. The primary means of achieving this was through evictions and the enforcement of a trespass ordinance. Both the Housing Authority and Police Bureau reasoned that before residents of Iris Court would take advantage of the social service providers and the community contact office that would eventually be located in the development, they would have to feel safe. According to a Housing Authority official, one of the biggest problems at Iris Court had been "unauthorized guests" of single women using apartments to carry on illegal activities like drug trafficking. Most often, these men were gang members and the boyfriends of single women living in the development. A partial solution to the problem was the use of evictions of ten-

ants who allowed non-tenants to live in their apartments (a violation of the HAP lease). Approximately 10 tenants were evicted during the stabilization effort. No one has been evicted from the development during the past year.

A second technique employed by the PPB and HAP was the use of a state criminal trespass ordinance to keep the complex free of non-residents intent on criminal activity.[5] Under an agreement with HAP, police officers may act legally as "persons in charge" for the purpose of enforcing trespass laws upon Housing Authority Property (that is, private, common property) at Iris Court. Thus, when police officers have probable cause to believe that a non-resident has violated any criterion for exclusion from the Iris Court development, the officers are empowered to approach the non-resident and notify him/her of the violation. Officers then fill out an exclusion form detailing why the person is excluded from the property and provide the person with a map of the property that he/she is excluded from entering. Finally, the officers will take a photograph of the person and attach it to a copy of the exclusion form (for the on-site manager). The officers then explain to the violator that he/she has the right to appeal the exclusion with a Trespass Control Officer who is a private party designated by the Housing Authority to process all trespass complaints.[6]

---

[5]Evictions and the trespass ordinance were used successfully during the Columbia Villa community policing demonstration project -- the project on which Iris Court is based.

[6]Only patrol officers and commanding officers in the patrol area including Iris Court were trained in the trespass procedure. The training was conducted by the Housing Authority in February, 1990.

The criteria for exclusion from HAP housing developments include: making unreasonable noise; fighting; commission of criminal offenses; drug use or trafficking; destruction of property; littering; reckless driving; engaging in gang activity including claiming gang membership or wearing clothing or tattoos unique to gang affiliation. Anyone who refuses to leave HAP property when requested to do so, or returns to the property after exclusion, may be arrested by the police under the criminal trespass ordinance. According to most respondents, the trespass enforcement was a particularly valuable tool in reducing fear and decreasing criminal activity in Iris Court because most of the criminal activity at the complex was carried out by non-residents. The constant harassment of non-residents who had made Iris Court their hang-out has, according to residents and police officers, made a substantial improvement in the quality-of-life at the development. As one officer involved in the trespass enforcement argued:

> ... it [trespass enforcement] made for a great police presence. There would be two or three [police] cars that would go in to target chronic non-residents or persons that we knew had been excluded ... It [times for enforcement] varied and we wanted to give the impression that this procedure had some meat in it ... In fact, there was one person who was arrested some 35 times on the property. ... He was transported to jail every single day. ... He would get a citation but he would go to jail also and be booked. The point there was to inconvenience all non-residents to the point where it would be unattractive to be back on the property that they would go elsewhere. HAP backed us up a great deal by signing all the complaints for trespass and they went after a lot of the residents who were housing excluded non-residents or letting them back on the property. So HAP was sending those residents notices that they were in

> violation of the lease ... some complied, others did not and they were evicted by the Housing Authority.

According to one commanding officer, 95 persons were excluded from the property in the first five months of enforcement.[7]

The Neighborhood Response Team. Two patrol officers from the North Precinct form the "Neighborhood Response Team" (NRT) currently assigned to the Iris Court project. One of the officers was assigned in November, 1990, and the other in February, 1991. These officers make the housing complex a "priority" but do not spend their entire shift there. The officers worked the Iris Court complex every day from November, 1990 through February, 1991 and their duties included high visibility foot patrol in an effort to disrupt open-air drug markets and gang activity and a great deal of community outreach, particularly with young children.

The NRT's primary role is community outreach and problem solving. The officers thus attend the regularly scheduled tenants' association meetings at Iris Court and take note of residents' complaints and concerns. They have also been instrumental in the Iris Court residents' council that plans special events like the annual job/health fair and various activities for children in the complex. The officers also use (for about a half hour per day) the Police Bureau's "Contact Office" which is located in the housing complex. The contact office allows the officers to interact with community residents who may wish to

---

[7]More detailed official data on trespass enforcement was unavailable from HAP or PPB at the time of the site visit but will be included in future reports.

register complaints or make specific concerns known to the police department.

The NRT's proactive enforcement activities included the implementation of the trespass ordinance and general street-level drug enforcement.[8] During their full-time assignment to Iris Court, however, the officers were freed from responsibility for answering 911 calls.

According to respondents, the NRT officers received no particular training (other than instruction in the trespass ordinance from the Housing Authority) for their assignment to Iris Court. Because the Portland Police Bureau is only one year into their community policing transition plan, the officers had not received any general training in community policing prior to their assignment to Iris Court, but were selected on their demonstrated abilities in problem-solving and their ability to interact constructively with members of the community.

C. The Project Coordinator

Part of the Portland Police Bureau's INOP funds pays for a full-time, on-site project coordinator for the Iris Court project. The coordinator was hired in January, 1991 and has been working in the Iris Court development since February, 1991. The coordinator is a full-time civilian employee of the Police Bureau and works in the Community Policing Contact Office located at Iris Court.

---

[8]The assignment of the Neighborhood Response Team to the Iris Court complex and much of their work in enforcement and community outreach activities occurred in May, 1990, before the official start of the INOP project.

The primary function of the coordinator is to act as a link between the eight service providers recruited by the Police Bureau (see, "Partnerships" below) and the residents of Iris Court. The coordinator's office conducted a survey in February, 1991 in an attempt to determine what services residents were interested in obtaining. The survey also provided the project with the opportunity to inform residents about programs available to them. The survey also asked residents if they were employed, how many children they had and their ages, etc. Such information would allow the coordinator to supply service providers with a list of potential clients. Thus, from the survey, it was determined that many residents had children in the 1-3 year-old range. As the coordinator explained:

> I sort of see my role as a facilitator but I also strive to encourage service providers to get involved with the residents, especially from the standpoint of recruiting them. What I now try to do is provide the service providers with a list of people that meet their selection criteria. I'll give them a list and say, "Here's 20 people that have children from 1-3 years-old." That's the criteria for the "Great Start" parenting program. I and my staff will get with the Great Start people and do some canvassing and talk to residents about getting involved in the program. I try to encourage them to stay in contact with the residents who sign up for their programs ... they need to identify one or two volunteers and use them as go-betweens with the other residents who have not signed up. Being one person, it's hard for me to recruit on a custom basis for all of the service providers. We try to do that as much as possible, but I try to get them involved in their own recruitment.

In addition to his responsibility for linking service providers and residents, the project coordinator makes referrals and coordinates outreach activities. The coordinator is also responsible for maintaining records for the project and writing reports to document the project's progress.

D. Community Health Nurse

One of the most unusual aspects of the Iris Court project is its Community Health Nurse. The nurse, a specialist in chemical dependency, was hired in April, 1991 under a Police Bureau contract with the Multnomah County Health Division. She works 32 hours per week (Monday through Thursday, 7:30 a.m.- 3:30 p.m.) at Iris Court exclusively in an effort to intervene in family health issues. The nurse's office is located on-site at the Iris Court Contact Office, but she does home visits for the purposes of individual and family assessments and provides short-term care where appropriate.

The nurse's primary focus is on the prevention of health problems among residents. She has opened 10 case files since April. Although people from the development come to her office for consultations or referrals, the nurse believes that the best way to care for the residents is through active outreach. She thus spends a portion of her day walking through the Iris Court complex and speaking to people informally about what their health care needs are. She does not do door-to-door canvassing because she has not found it to be an effective form of outreach. Instead, she employs creative outreach strategies which she has found to be more effective. For example, if she sees some older people sitting on their front porch, she will introduce herself and offer to take their blood pressure. She has also targeted the children of the community for outreach and finds that to be an effective mechanism for gaining access to their parents:

> ... what has happened, in establishing rapport with the kids, is that I get to meet their parents. I believe that

> the outreach portion of my job is directly related to drug and alcohol demand reduction. There are many ways to go with outreach, but I started with the kids because they are the ones that will be trying drugs if they have not already tried them. All these kids love bikes, and I began meeting them when I started fixing the kids' bikes for them. What has happened is that the parents have started coming out of their homes to thank me for fixing their kids' bikes.

The nurse's outreach efforts have also focussed on referring residents to programs offered by other service providers. Her most common referrals to date are the "Snack Attack" program, which teaches children and adults about good nutrition, and the "Women's Strength" classes for women's self-defense.

Despite her specialty, the most common cases handled by the nurse are prenatal and post-partum care, and care of elderly patients with chronic health problems. To date, she has not handled any cases related to drug and alcohol abuse. She is, however, developing plans to bring drug and alcohol support groups like NA and AA on-site and is confident that residents will come to her with alcohol and drug-related problems when she has had more time to establish trust and credibility.

E. Human Service Partnerships

The Portland Police Bureau believes that drug demand reduction at Iris Court can be accomplished best by providing necessary social services to the residents and it is this emphasis on human services partnerships that makes this project unique among the eight INOP-funded research sites. The Police Bureau believes that effective demand reduction strategies must provide both short-term effects and a foundation for long-term prevention by helping to alleviate some of the underlying social problems that

make drug use attractive. Thus, by providing residents with on-site job placement assistance, a community health nurse to help with health-related problems, nutrition programs for parents and their children, and supervised activities for youth, the PPB believes that the quality-of-life is improved to the point that drug use does not become a desirable or acceptable alternative. In short, the purpose of these social services is prevention. When asked about the project's emphasis on the provision of social services and health (e.g., the community health nurse, the "Snack Attack" nutrition programs for adults and children, and the Great Start prenatal program), one commanding officer deeply involved in the program argued:

> ... we are trying to work through to the root causes of crime, and I guess we are convinced that if people are not in good health and have a good living environment that they can more easily say, ... "I don't feel good. But if I can get some [drugs] it will make me feel good." ... People are probably using drugs because they don't feel good about themselves. ... if we can get young people healthy and provide them with a good quality-of-life ... they won't need drugs. So in that sense we felt that the nurse was a real critical component.

Thus, strengthening the overall quality-of-life through the provision of human services will make drug use less attractive.

There are currently eight service providers working with the project coordinator at Iris Court (since November, 1990). The Oregon Employment Division provides a job placement assistance officer at the Iris Court contact office for 20 hours per week (the other half of her week is spent at Columbia Villa). The placement assistance officer has instituted a "Job Club" for residents that monitors state job openings, helps with resume

preparation and job applications, networks with local employers to create jobs, and meets as a support group.

Project Network is an intensive outpatient drug treatment program for pregnant substance abusers that works closely with the Iris Court community health nurse who helps identify potential clients.

Columbia Boys and Girls Clubs of North Portland provides structured activities for Iris Court children and teenagers. The Club runs a shuttle bus to transport children from Iris Court twice a week.

The Oregon State University provides volunteers to conduct parenting education classes on-site at Iris Court. The goal of the program is to provide parents with skills necessary to make child-rearing decisions. Five parenting classes have been held at Iris Court and have been attended by five to seven parents. The program is actively seeking a parent on the tenant council to help promote the program among residents.

The Oregon State University adult food and nutrition program and "Snack Attack" food and nutrition classes for children also hold classes at Iris Court. The adult program teaches 13 basic lessons in food preparation, nutrition and shopping. Sixteen people enrolled in the program and seven have graduated. "Snack Attack" teaches the same lessons as the adult class through hands-on food preparation classes. During six different Snack Attack sessions, 96 children attended and 11 adult volunteers were trained. In addition to providing children with knowledge about good nutrition, the program hopes to foster increased self-

esteem through positive group interaction and the development of practical skills.

The Multnomah County Health Division supplies (under contract with the PPB) a community health nurse who serves the residents of Iris Court exclusively (see "Community Health Nurse").

Albina Ministerial Alliance/Head Start runs the Amanti project for early drug prevention and intervention. The preschool Head Start program has served 17 children at their Iris Court Center. The Alliance also provides free child care services through the Head Start program (since December, 1990).

The Youth Gangs Program was recruited by the project coordinator to do gang outreach at Iris Court. Two outreach workers (one female, one male) spend part of their time working with tenants on gang-related problems at Iris Court. A particular focus of the outreach workers is "empowering" young, single women who have children by gang members to break free of the influence of gang members who intimidate, threaten and abuse them while occupying Iris Court apartments illegally.

In July, 1990 the Iris Court project staff conducted a job-health fair. Various service providers were represented at booths arranged along the sidewalks of Iris Court and made information available to residents there. In addition to the eight service providers directly connected to the Iris Court project, 21 agencies committed staff to information booths for the event (e.g., the Red Cross, U.S. Navy Recruiting, the Sickle Cell Foundation).

Community Partnerships. In addition to the human services partnerships created under the INOP grant, the Iris Court coordinator has created a partnership with the residents of Iris Court. Through the project coordinator's outreach efforts, the Iris Court resident's council and tenant's association were formed in 1991. The council is composed of elected representatives who serve the interests of the residents of Iris Court and act as liaisons to the police department and the Iris Court demonstration project. The council publishes a monthly newsletter that contains a variety of information including articles prepared by the Iris Court project coordinator and police officers from the Neighborhood Response Team. At the time of the Vera Institute's site visit in July, 1991, the council was meeting to prepare for the second annual Iris Court Job/Health fair.

F. Community Contact Office

The Portland Police Bureau Community Contact office is located in the Iris Court development in an apartment donated by the Housing Authority. The primary purpose of the contact office, which opened in October, 1990, is "to establish closer ties between the police and the community." The contact office is not a "mini-precinct" that takes reports or houses full-time police officers. Rather, its basic function is to provide social service referrals to the residents of the Iris Court development. The contact office is staffed by two women who were placed through the Private Industry Council's Senior Citizen Employment Program. The Portland Police Bureau thus does not pay wages to these civilian employees.

Though primarily a social service referral center, the contact office is used by PPB officers (particularly the NRT officers) as a "drop-in center" for afternoon and evening shift officers who need to write reports or call the precinct. It also gives them a place to meet with tenants on an informal basis and provides a site for public workshops. The contact center also houses the community health nurse's office.

G. Landlord Training

The Landlord Training program is designed to teach owners and managers how to keep drug activity off their residential property and is considered by many to be one of the department's most successful community-oriented policing projects.[9] Since the program was instituted in November, 1989, it has trained more than 3,000 landlords and property managers and has impacted over 50,000 rental units. The development, marketing and implementation of the program is done by Campbell Resources, a private consulting firm, through a contract with the city.

The program recruits prospective landlords by accessing the county assessment and taxation database and selecting anyone who owns a residential property. Two-thirds of all trainees are "small" landlords having fewer than 10 units, according to 1990 data. Trainees are attracted to the course through three major sources of information -- letters from the chief of police

---

[9]Since the INOP grants were announced, at least three INOP funded sites (Tempe, Norfolk, and Hayward) have instituted, or are in the process of instituting, Landlord/Hotel Management training programs based on the Portland model.

explaining the program (77%); "other" sources like property management associations (16%); and media exposure (7%).

The training usually takes place over two consecutive week nights or one Saturday session (five hours for the full course) and contains instruction in applicant screening procedures, signs of dishonest applicants, warning signs of drug activity, what to do if you discover a clandestine drug lab, how to work with the Police Bureau, and instruction on Section 8 housing. The program is available to all landlords or managers for a five-dollar fee to cover the costs of printing for course materials. The training manual is a "plain English" overview of basic course content and presents all applicable laws and a listing of support organizations.

The program is evaluated yearly through the use of post-training questionnaires distributed to each participant at the end of each training session. A recent evaluation of the 1990 program conducted by Campbell Resources, showed a high rate of satisfaction with the course with over 95% of all participants rating the training as "good" or "excellent". Furthermore, 97% of all participants reported that they planned to change their property management techniques as a result of their training.

Portland is currently in the process of expanding the training to include hotel and motel managers.

III. Other Program Components

A. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design

In June, 1990, the Iris Court project utilized Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) as a component in its

overall strategy to effect drug demand reduction. North Sumner Street, for example, had been used by drug dealers and gang members as a drive-through drug market, and drug deals were often carried out in parked cars along the street. In an attempt to reduce space for non-residents who might use N. Sumner Street for such purposes, parking was limited to one side of the street. In addition, N. Sumner Street was made a dead end by installing a barrier, thus making it a cul-de-sac. The barrier has helped reduce the drive through traffic by non-residents. Also, the basement laundry room, long a trouble spot because of drug dealing and thefts, was redesigned and opened in a ground-floor apartment in an effort to make those activities far more difficult. Finally, a newly paved basketball court provides youths from Iris Court a safe place to play (an effort to "encourage desirable behavior").

B. Evaluation

The evaluation of the Iris Court project will be done internally by the North Precinct command. The evaluation consists of a pre- and post-survey questionnaire which will be subjected to an as yet unspecified analysis. The first survey was conducted in July, 1990 by volunteers organized by the Piedmont Neighborhood Association and resulted in seventy-seven being interviewed. The survey questions focussed on levels of crime and fear of crime and asked residents about whether they knew where to find good health care in the area, whether they needed child care, and how they felt about police service in the area. At that time the survey revealed high levels of fear of crime (even though the

Police Bureau had instituted a strong police presence in Iris Court two months earlier) and gang activity. A post-survey was recently completed, in July, 1991. The Police Bureau is receiving help on the data analysis from staff members at Portland State University.

In addition to the survey of residents at Iris Court, 61 officers from the North Precinct also participated in a pre/post survey in July 1990, and July, 1991. Officers were asked to assess the quality-of-life in the Iris Court complex, what they believed to be the most serious crime problem in the complex, how they felt about the people who live in Iris Court, and how they would feel about having a mini-precinct in Iris Court. The analysis of the post-surveys will be available before Vera's second site visit in January, 1992.

C. Associated Technology

The North Precinct will use the Community Police Support Division computer system to determine changes in reported crimes for the Iris Court area before, during, and after the implementation of the Iris Court demonstration project. The statistics gathered will include the number of Part I and II crimes in the area over the course of the year and more specific data, such as the number of gang-related offenses in the area. Data sources will include reported crimes, calls-for-service, and citizen drug house complaints received by the Drugs and Vice Division.

The PPB will also utilize a desktop "Geographic Information System" (GIS) that will allow computer mapping of the data sources mentioned above. With GIS, information is downloaded

from the Police Bureau's mainframe (for reported crimes, or from tapes for the 911 system). The downloaded information is then subjected to a conversion program (Tralaine) that converts information to geocoordinates for the GIS (Mapinfo). The benefit of the GIS system is that it allows the analyst to define specific geographic boundaries (e.g., like the streets that form the boundaries of the Iris Court complex) and request all reported crimes or calls for service that fall within those boundaries for a particular time period. Because it allows a map to be printed indicating the locations of events, the GIS system will provide a visual representation of arrests, calls for service, reported crimes, etc., thus allowing the Bureau to produce hot-spot maps and plan future strategies as well as determine the effects of the Iris Court project.

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY

I. The Prince George's County INOP Project and the Target Area

A. Introduction

Prince George's County (PG), Maryland covers an area of nearly 500 square miles and has a total population of over 700,000 residents. The western end of the county, which is directly adjacent to some of the more troubled neighborhoods in Washington, D.C., shares many of the social problems of that city -- relatively high rates of poverty, drug abuse, violent crime and female-headed households. The eastern end, however, is decidedly rural and presents a marked contrast to the western end in terms of density and demographic composition.

There are six police districts in PG County, divided into ten separate patrol sectors. The site of the PG County INOP project (the Community Oriented Policing Squad or COPS) is in District III in the G sector, which has seven beats.

In 1990, the PG County police force began a planned expansion of the force from approximately 1,000 sworn officers to approximately 1,400 sworn officers. The fiscal crisis of 1991, however, capped the expansion of the force at 1,230 sworn officers. A primary objective of Department commanders in the expansion of the force was to devote staff, for the first time, to continuous neighborhood-oriented, problem-solving policing.

At the time of the implementation site visit in the last week of July, most of the components of COPS were in place. COPS officers had been trained in community-oriented and problem-solving policing. A project Planning Committee for COPS as a

whole had been selected and convened. The format for monthly Beat Condition Reports was developed and introduced. Satellite offices had been established in housing projects in each beat. COPS officers had developed beat profiles; conducted home visits; established connections with civic associations on their beats; become involved with Neighborhood and Business Watch groups on their beats; established mini-planning committees, representing community leaders and businesses in their respective areas; and participated in motorcycle training. The single component that had yet to be implemented was the acquisition of motorcycles, purchased with BJA funds, and the implementation of regular motorcycle patrol on COPS beats.

The primary implementation issue for the project stemmed from a delay in releasing funds received from BJA within the Department itself because of the 1991 fiscal crisis in PG county. Because of this delay, the project's contract with the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) to conduct training could not be executed as scheduled. Project supervisors developed and conducted staff training with the assistance of an FBI training unit. Satellite offices were temporarily furnished with borrowed and second-hand furniture until funds were released by the Department.

B. Community Policing in PG County

On January 1, 1990, a new police chief, committed to the principles of community-oriented policing, was appointed to head the PG County Police Department. Then, the BJA Request for Proposals announcing the INOP program provided an opportunity for

Department personnel to define ways to operationalize that interest. It represented a way to introduce a new approach to policing in a Department that had admittedly been very "traditional" until that time.[1]

Yet the Department did have some prior experience with problem-solving approaches. In 1985, an experimental problem-solving squad, the ACTION (Attacking Crime through Involvement of Neighborhoods) team, was formed to provide a permanent capacity for tactical responses to identified neighborhood problems at the request of District commanders. Although Department personnel reported that they had been impressed with the unit's problem-solving approach, they were concerned with the frequent mobility of the unit (referred to as "hopscotching"), particularly in response to high-volume drug locations. The ACTION team did not provide long-term attention to specific problem locations.

In designing COPS, therefore, Department planners reported that they were particularly concerned with developing a "permanent, constant" presence in problem-ridden locations. Department planners sought accountability within the patrol squad for neighborhood conditions and a "continuing...relationship between operational line officers and average local residents." According to one Department planner, COPS officers would be "advocates for

---

[1]In addition to acknowledging a previous style of policing that had been dominated by the need to respond to calls for service, project planners and commanders, interviewed during the implementation site visit, acknowledged that in the course of the past decade there had been a history of strain between the police and community, of under-representation of African-Americans on the force and of community allegations of police brutality.

the community" in a project designed to "take regular street cops and tell them to apply management techniques that would normally be used at the administrative level."

As originally conceived, the COPS officers -- a supervising sergeant and seven patrol officers, each assigned to one of seven beats within the G sector -- would function as a "sixth squad" within the sector, which is currently staffed by five rotating patrol squads, responsible for responding to calls for service. Although the "sixth squad" concept is no longer central to the COPS program, COPS officers are expected to interact regularly with officers working on their beats from other squads; to exchange information about problems on the beat with other patrol officers, beat detectives and members of special units; to attend occasional roll calls of other squads; to help patrol officers, if available, with selected calls for service in the beat; and to function as a general manager of problem-solving activities on their beats.

In early February 1991, members of COPS established satellite offices in problem-ridden apartment complexes within their respective beats.[2] Each squad member holds office hours in the satellite office for ten hours a week.[3] The schedule of office

---

[2]Several of the apartment complexes housing satellite offices were recognized as the locus of drug-trafficking, loitering, trespassing, domestic violence and, on occasion, random shooting.

[3] Squad members set their own schedules, which vary according to the schedule of community meetings and events on their beats. The group holds a regular weekly squad meeting and works ocassionally as a unit to address specific problems on a single beat (e.g., a traffic checkpoint at one of the apartment complexes housing a satellite office).

hours is posted; answering machines in each office take messages in the absence of the officer (squad officers also carry pagers). Offices are stocked with a wide array of brochures for both children and adults on drug prevention, crime prevention and available local services. The officer's presence within the complex itself is expected to reduce the residents' fears, increase police visibility within the complex and provide an accessible role model for neighborhood children.[4]

In addition to their regular office hours, squad members are expected to conduct foot, motor and scooter patrols; to conduct home visits and home surveys in selected areas within the beat; to organize and oversee Neighborhood and Business Watch groups; to attend community meetings, marches, rallies, festivals and parades; to conduct crime prevention counselling in residences and commercial locations; to establish and meet regularly with "mini-planning committees" drawn from their respective beats; and to provide service referrals for neighborhood residents. In the course of conducting these various activities, squad members also gather information about neighborhood problems and conditions.

Squad members, all of whom have been trained in problem-solving techniques, are also expected to identify and address neighborhood problems, known within the squad as SARAs (Scanning, Analysis, Response and Assessment) in commemoration of

---

[4]During the implementation site visit, a community representative on the project's Planning Committee claimed that young children flocked "like puppies" around some of the squad officers.

Goldstein's (1990) four-stage problem-solving process. They are also expected to document the nature of each SARA on their beats and the actions taken to address it.

In the early days of the unit, each squad member created a beat profile, providing descriptive information about the beat. After beat profiles were developed, squad members have been expected to fill out Beat Conditions Reports on a monthly basis. These reports outline identified problems (crime reports and calls for service patterns,[5] drug activity, environmental conditions and social conditions); describe activities related to community organization and community involvements; and provide information about neighborhood canvassing, crime prevention activities, meetings attended, service referrals, law enforcement activities, departmental interaction and roll calls attended. Documentation of the SARA's addressed by each squad member is appended to the report, along with letters from community leaders.

C. The Target Area

District III in PG county is known within the Department as a "line" district -- that is, it is one of three districts (containing six sectors) that share a border with Washington, D.C.. The District shares a number of the problems that characterize troubled areas in Washington, D.C. -- drug trafficking, drug-related violence, prostitution, relative poverty. According to a

---

[5]Each officer's Beat Condition Report documents the analysis of the volume of various calls for service and crime reports in the beats over time.

command level staff member, in spite of the suburban character of much of the county, in District III, "This is big city policing."

District III is more densely populated than the rest of the county. It comprises only six percent of the total area of the county (29.5 square miles), although it accounts for roughly 18 percent of the county population (131,384). The COPS target area, the G sector (one of two sectors within District III) constitutes less than half of the land area in the district (42%, 12.5 square miles) and houses less than half of the District's population (41%, 55,000).

There are a number of townships within the sector, although only four (Fairmount Heights, Glenarden, Seat Pleasant and Capital Heights) are fully incorporated municipalities with separate police departments. These departments employ from two to ten officers each. Service calls are dispatched to these departments through the county's computerized area dispatch system (CAD).

In the past ten years, the demographic composition of the county has changed dramatically, from 46 percent black in 1980 to 65 percent black in 1990. The proportion of black residents in the target area, however, is substantially higher.[6]

According to Departmental data, the G sector (which is one of ten in the county) accounts for a disproportionate amount of

---

[6]Although data are available for only four of the seven beats in the sector, those beats range from 86 to 97 percent black and do not differ visibly from beats for which these data are not available.

drug arrests (41%), drug-related calls (33%), and homicides (22%). Open-air and apartment-based drug dealing are common.

Although there are three large industrial parks and several shopping malls within the sector, the area is primarily residential. Neighborhoods characterized by tracts of privately owned single-family houses are adjacent to multi-family housing complexes, heavily populated with families who are dependent on Section 8 housing subsidies and public assistance. COPS officers characterize the residents of these housing complexes as highly transient.[7] Throughout the sector, there are a number of abandoned, boarded-up houses which, according to COPS officers, often served as the site of drug distribution.

Drug trafficking and abuse, loitering, trespassing in housing complexes, street violence and street crimes are commonly cited community problems, according to COPS officers. In addition, several area bars and convenience stores are widely recognized as problem spots by both the police and the community. Other identified neighborhood problems include abandoned houses, underlit parks, the lack of recreational facilities for area youth, the lack of appropriate male role models for youth, trash

---

[7]In some of the housing complexes which serve as sites for satellite COPS offices, levels of fear among residents are notable. At a meeting during the implementation site visit of residents of one complex who were planning a community event, one resident spoke of bullets "coming through my child's bedroom window." Another said, "I don't say nothing. I just close my blinds and tune it out." Another referred casually to "the last homicide here." Still another resident mentioned a period during which the Post Office refused to deliver mail to the complex because of the perceived danger.

dumping sites, abandoned cars, inadequate fencing, domestic violence, black-on-black crime and prostitution.

Although there are a few recognized heroin spots in District III, the drug problem has been largely shaped by the expansion of the crack cocaine market in recent years. Open-air drug markets are evident in apartment complexes and residential areas throughout the county. District officers are especially concerned about the periodic emergence of Jamaican drug posses from New York City as significant figures in local drug trafficking.

II. Drug Demand Reduction Activities

A. Drug Prevention and Treatment

COPS officers are involved in a wide variety of drug prevention activities. Several officers actively recruited local youth (14-25 years old) to join the Explorers program, a police-run uniformed troop, loosely modeled on the Boy Scouts, designed to promote a positive interaction between youth and police officers, provide positive role models for youth and help them develop alternatives to drug involvement. According to one COPS officer, quoted in a local newspaper, because of active recruiting by COPS staff, "All of the kids in my [Explorer] Post come from areas that are having a lot of [drug] problems." Explorers meet as a group on a regular basis at the police station. They participate in public service projects at least every two weeks, tutor other young people, pass out anti-drug literature, etc.

COPS officers also take part in a male mentoring program, generally catering to pre-adolescent and adolescent boys. This

program is also designed to provide positive male role models and develop alternative activities for neighborhood youngsters.

The satellite offices also provide a center for the dissemination of literature and fliers on drug abuse, prevention and treatment. COPS officers attend DARE programs in local schools.

COPS officers participate actively in organizing community anti-drug marches, rallies and festivals and work actively with Neighborhood Watch groups to encourage such activities in their beats. Some officers have organized citizen groups that maintain an evening presence at the entrances and exits of housing complexes to "keep an eye" on the traffic moving through the complex and, in essence, reclaim the area for residents.

COPS officers are trained to advise apartment complex residents about Maryland's FIST (Families Insisting upon Safe Tenancies) programs. Apartment complexes participating in FIST require tenants to sign riders to their leases permitting eviction if a preponderance of evidence points to the incidence of drug trafficking or unlicensed guns in the apartment. According to a representative of FIST, the program is designed "to heighten the awareness of landlords and tenants," to increase the ability to get rapid evictions of troublesome tenants and to promote "zero tolerance" within drug-ridden apartment complexes.

COPS officers are encouraged to refer drug abusers within their beats to treatment facilities and to provide information about AA and NA meetings. Monthly Beat Conditions Reports document the number of such referrals by individual officers.

B. Law Enforcement Activities

The COPS program employs a variety of enforcement techniques in its drug demand reduction efforts. The Department as a whole recently reinstituted an undercover sting operation known as "Triple Play" (the arrest of dealers, drug and asset seizure and the arrest of customers). The operation (undercover officers pose as dealers selling procaine, at known drug locations; back-up officers arrest drug purchasers) had been suspended following a court challenge, based on the argument that it was not illegal to purchase procaine. The operation was re-introduced after state-wide legislation made it illegal to purchase any substance believed to be an illicit drug. In July, "Triple Play" stings led to 200 arrests and substantial property seizures both inside and outside the target area. Although Operation Triple Play is not officially linked to the COPS initiative, it provides an intensive enforcement context for other neighborhood-oriented enforcement activities.

By building community contacts and developing information sources throughout their beats, each COPS officer develops detailed, specific information about narcotics locations. Some of this information is passed directly to the Narcotics Enforcement Division (NED); Beat Condition Reports document drug arrests made by other units based on COPS information. In other instances, COPS officers work directly with the NED or the ACTION team in efforts to close down drug locations.[8] They also

---

[8]For example, one crack house on a residential block had been generating approximately 30 service calls a month. Resident-dealers would sell only to people they knew, a practice that

respond regularly to drug calls on their beats and establish a visible presence at known drug locations, identified as SARAs, on their beats.

Another tactic used by COPS involves traffic checkpoints, conducted in concert with the ACTION team, at the entrances and exits of apartment complexes that are known for drug activity. All cars entering or exiting the area are stopped and licenses and registrations are checked. The activity establishes a short-term, intense police presence designed to deter drug dealers in the complex who drive in from other areas.

COPS officers are also actively involved in exploring avenues of civil enforcement. COPS officers regularly investigate abandoned houses that are being used as drug locations and make efforts to have those houses sealed up by either the owners or the county (at the expense of the owner) or, in some instances, demolished. They actively enforce loitering and trespassing provisions within housing complexes and have been exploring methods of enhancing eviction powers to combat drug dealing within those complexes.

---

precluded a buy-and-bust strategy based on undercover narcotics officers making purchases. COPS officers, working with the Narcotics Division, recruited a local prostitute-informant to make a controlled buy at the site. Photographs taken by neighbors of drug transactions provided additional evidence. These buys led to three separate search warrants and an arrest for narcotics sales. Ultimately, the house, which was owned by the dealer's mother, was put up for sale.

III. Other Program Components

A. Recruitment and Training

In early January 1991, PG Department commanders sent a memo throughout the Department describing community policing and asking for volunteers. Fourteen volunteers responded to this notice, and seven were selected to serve in the COPS unit. Other volunteers were trained in community policing techniques; officers from this group will be drawn upon if a permanent replacement for a COPS officer is needed. The initial response to the request for volunteers was recognized within the District as relatively meager. Some COPS officers acknowledged that they were strongly urged to volunteer.[9]

The fourteen officers who volunteered were trained in community policing between January 7 and January 25, 1991. Because of the delay in funding the PERF training component, initial training was provided by the Department, which adapted the ACTION Team training component for the COPS unit, with the assistance of an FBI unit familiar with the theory and practice of community policing.

The initial COPS training provided introductions to various county agencies expected to be instrumental to the project (Pub-

---

[9]District commanders, who envision expanding the program throughout the H sector in the coming year, are encouraged by the fact that the Department has already registered 14 volunteers interested in the expansion of COPS, well before the request for volunteers will be posted. They attribute this interest to the good working relationships established by COPS officers with other officers in the District. A few District officers from regular District squads, randomly selected at roll call for interviews during the implementation site visit, confirmed that the image of COPS among non-COPS personnel is positive.

lic Works, the Department of Environmental Resources or DER,[10] the Liquor Board, the County Attorney and the Health Department). COPS officers also received FBI training in community policing, training in civil citations, drug investigations training, and training in officer safety (driving, survival skills and the use of firearms).

Training continued on a regular basis even after COPS became operational. In February, all officers on the squad began reading sections of Goldstein's Problem-Oriented Policing and discussing those readings in weekly squad meetings. At the end of February all COPS officer went to Newport News, Va. to examine the community policing initiative there. In addition, there has been on-going training at weekly squad meetings, which bring together the whole squad, including the Sergeant and supervising Captain, with various guest lecturers.[11] The squad as a whole also received additional training in April on Beat Condition Reports. Shortly before the implementation site visit in July, all squad officers attended motorcycle training for a week in preparation for scooter patrol.

In April, COPS officers also received two days of training by PERF, along with additional PGPD supervisors and members of

---

[10]DER, in addition to other responsibilities, is the agency in charge of abandoned properties, a common site of drug trafficking in PG County.

[11]Weekly squad meetings have included presentations by representatives of FIST, the Big Brothers Association, Alcoholics Anonymous, the Department of Social Services, the State Attorney's Office, an officer trained in CPTED, and a PGPD Psychological Services Unit.

other units (approximately 40 officers attended). The PERF training was conducted off-site and covered the history of 20th century policing, the nature of traditional police responses, the problem-oriented approach to policing, illustrations of SARAs from other jurisdictions and workshops on addressing and resolving community problems. The PERF training is supplemented by ongoing technical assistance throughout the course of the project.

B. Community and Agency Partnerships

The COPS Planning Committee. In early January 1991, COPS supervisors sent letters to selected County and private service organizations and members of the Department's Citizen's Advisory Council describing community policing and asking for representatives for the COPS Planning Committee, an advisory group set up to review COPS strategies and to provide inter-agency and community support. By early February, the members of that committee had been selected. The project Planning Committee includes four community representatives (a City Council member; the president of a Recreation Council, the president of a local non-profit youth services corporation and an employee of a large property management company with multiple sites in the target area). It also includes five agency liaisons, representing DER, the Health Department, Child Protective Services, the Department of Public Works and the Apartment and Office Building Association. Before the implementation site visit, the committee had met three times, in March, April and May.

The agency liaisons were expected to be a central component in developing solutions to community problems. PGPD command

staff felt that relying on informal, "bottom-up" relationships which officers developed with agency people would be a mistake:

> We had a couple of police officers who could get things done through people they know. I didn't want that kind of relationship because I felt that we didn't want to have an informal relationship where you could call Joe and get something done, because what about the next guy that comes along, how about the guy that doesn't know Joe? We wanted a formal relationship where it would get done because it was community policing, and you have to do it when community policing calls.

Yet District command staff, along with COPS officers, continued to be frustrated about the nature of inter-agency responses even after the Planning Committee had been established. As one commander put it

> ...our impression of the program was [that] when I make a phone call to my contact person in public works, they see to it that it's done. My obligation to get it done is to contact the person who does it, and he handles it from there. And I think it took us a long time to realize that we had to change not only our way of thinking but we had to change the way that government, and the services of government, think.

Because COPS officers continued to be frustrated by perceived delay in the response of other agencies, in July, the County Executive held a meeting with all the agency heads in PG County, featuring a "symbolic cutting of red tape." At that meeting, the County Executive insisted that requests from COPS officers be given priority treatment, as if the requests were from the office of the County Executive himself.

District commanders acknowledged the importance of this "top down" empowerment during the July site visit:

> ...if you asked me what I would concentrate on more from the beginning, it would be the relationships with the other government agencies. I would settle that first... I was putting that in the middle...of the things I had anticipated

problems with, but...it turned out to be a source of frustration for the officers.

At the time of the site visit, District commanders were considering expanding the Planning Committee to include representatives of other agencies that might contribute to the COPS initiative (e.g., the State Attorney's Office). Both command personnel and committee members reported that they wanted to meet more regularly and wanted the Planning Committee to have a greater involvement in COPS activities.

Mini-Planning Committees. Each COPS officer is also expected to develop a mini-planning committee to provide advice and support for problem-solving strategies on particular beats. The nature of these committees varies according to the individual beat. Mini-planning committees include area businessmen, political leaders, school representatives, tenant representatives, clergymen, etc. These committees meet on a monthly basis and provide an opportunity for area residents to bring issues to the attention of the officer, for group brainstorming about approaches to short-term problems and long-term issues. They also provide officers with a community workgroup of involved community residents.

Other Partnerships. COPS officers work closely with various other groups on their beats -- church groups, members of Neighborhood Watch and Business Watch, and tenant organizations in the apartment complexes where their satellite offices are located. The nature of these organizations varies greatly from beat to beat. One officer organized a Business Watch in an industrial

park housing several Fortune 500 companies, who were concerned about security in their common parking lot. Another officer works closely with the owners of Mom-and-Pop stores troubled by persistent loitering and drug sales near their premises.

COPS officers interact with municipal officials in the various townships on their beats. In some instances, such officials have been included on mini-planning committees, a tactic which can help defuse potential town-county rivalries.

In addition, COPS supervisors have been approached by directors of the Interfaith Action Committee (IAC), a consortium of 43 local churches interested in expanding community policing throughout the county. During the first year of the COPS project, IAC established one satellite COPS office, not funded by BJA funds, within the H sector in District III. The COPS officer working in H sector has participated in G sector training, supervision and weekly staff meetings. IAC staff have offered to provide additional office space when the COPS program is expanded to H sector and, during the implementation site visit, expressed strong support for the COPS initiative.

C. Outreach and Advertising

The COPS initiative has been the subject of several articles in local newspapers. These include an article about the formal opening of the satellite offices in housing complexes, an article about the resurgence of the Explorers Post in the County and an article describing one COPS officer's daily activity.

The COPS officers themselves have engaged in extensive outreach on their beats. Satellite offices are marked by signs that

officially designate the presence of a police substation. The satellite offices are outreach centers, containing fliers about community events and the COPS program, along with crime and drug prevention literature. COPS officers also attend a wide array of community meetings and events where they make presentations about the program.

Officers spend some of their time conducting home visits, designed to gather information about perceived problems in a specific location. In the course of conducting an informal home survey, officers go door-to-door on a particular block, introduce themselves to residents and provide information about COPS and other relevant services.

D. Volunteers

Although the COPS program does not rely heavily on volunteers, individual officers occasionally use volunteers (e.g., they call upon church groups in organizing a barbecue for National Night Out, or solicit free materials from a business for a neighborhood clean up). In addition, they draw upon the Explorer's group as needed to help organize community events. COPS commanders are currently considering having Explorers staff satellite offices for several hours a week when COPS officers are engaged in other activities.

E. The Role of the Department's Management Information System (MIS)

In preparing their Beat Condition Reports, COPS officers are expected to analyze trends in calls for service and crime reports for their beats. To facilitate this process, and avoid the

delays inherent in relying upon the Department's Crime Analysis Unit, COPS supervisors plan to have all officers trained in performing crime analysis functions themselves. In the coming year, COPS officers will have access to a computer terminal in the District office and will be able to retrieve beat-specific data.

The computers purchased under the INOP grant are not connected to Department information systems. They are kept at the satellite offices and are used in preparing Beat Condition Reports, descriptions of SARAs, crime prevention fliers and other public announcements.

F. Program Evaluation

The evaluation of the project will be conducted by PERF staff, who have also been involved in providing training and technical assistance for the project. Although the evaluation will examine routine pre/post data on calls for service and crime reports, the primary focus of the impact evaluation will be on the COPS response to problems within individual beats. Thus, the process evaluation, describing the implementation of the COPS initiative, will be closely linked to the impact evaluation, which will provide a qualitative assessment of the program's effect on identified problems in the various beats.

G. BJA Funds

The primary expenditure for the COPS program under the INOP grant (approximately $200,000) involved establishing and furnishing the satellite offices. Project funds paid for computer equipment, answering machines, pager rental fees, office furni-

ture and supplies, printing expenses and utilities. In addition, project funds covered the PERF contract (training, technical assistance and evaluation), motorcycles for scooter patrol and travel expenses. A small proportion of project funds subsidized staff salaries.

IV. Expected Impacts

A. Community Effects

According to one project planner, COPS officers serve as Beat Condition Managers whose primary goal is to "turn things around in [their] neighborhood." To do so, it is expected that COPS officers will respond effectively to identified problems on their beats; reduce the fear of crime, particularly within the apartment complexes where their satellite offices are located; and improve police-community relations.

During the implementation site visit, several respondents reported that some effects of COPS were already apparent. One officer reported that "there used to be 20-30 people hanging out who'd run [when the police arrived]... Now it's gone full circle." A resident of another beat reported that, following COPS efforts to reduce loitering and trespassing near local convenience stores, there appeared to be "no place to drink any more."

One of the COPS officers believed that satellite offices were already proving instrumental in reducing fear and improving communications:

> Now, they have no problem with coming in. People from Peppermill Village will walk, they're not afraid to walk through Central Gardens anymore because they know that

> during my office hours I'm on the premises. And they'll walk over, talk and chat. Talk about problems, etc.

Supervisors of the unit report having been "amazed" at the extent of support for the program within the community. One project commander had anticipated having to win over the community in stages -- first by attending local civic association and other meetings and building relationships with area residents; second, by demonstrating concern about crime through problem-solving and enforcement. He reported that the process was easier than expected:

> I think that we were all kind of surprised with how they just kind of welcomed us. It seemed that...this was the kind of police department or the kind of relationship with the police that they had wanted.... We expected it to take a long time to establish credibility in the community, and it seemed to happen almost overnight.

In addition, improved relations between the police and community appear to be generating increased information about narcotics conditions in target areas. As one COPS officer reported, "People walk in with various concerns, problems. Informants and snitches walk in and give me information.... Being in an apartment complex, I get a lot of traffic from the residents..."

B. Departmental Effects

Expanding COPS. Command personnel in PG County had expressed substantial interest in beginning community-oriented policing before the BJA program was announced. According to one project planner, however, "the grant allowed us to do what [the Chief] wanted to do." The PGPD is currently committed to expanding the COPS model into other Districts, although there is some concern about how readily this model could be adapted to the more rural, less dense western Districts in the county.

Department personnel also acknowledge that some District commanders are resistant to neighborhood-oriented policing. Yet they believe there is a growing interest in the COPS approach among community groups and civic organizations throughout the county. Project planners, therefore, firmly believe that the PGPD as a whole will ultimately institutionalize COPS as a permanent component of the Department throughout a large portion of the county, if not the entire county.

Improved Intra-Departmental Communication. If COPS officers are to function effectively as "beat condition managers," it is important that they readily with the regular squad officers who work on their beats. COPS officers often need the cooperation of squad officers in addressing neighborhood problems (e.g., establishing a visible patrol presence in known loitering spots). Squad officers interviewed during the implementation reported that there had been some resentment of the squad early in the program, but that the personalities of the individual COPS officers had helped to "override that resentment."

Similarly, COPS officers often require the cooperation of other units (NED, Crime Analysis) in identifying and addressing neighborhood problems. These relationships can be problematic for COPS officers. For example, because of delays in getting information from the Crime Analysis Unit, COPS supervisors plan to have all COPS officers trained in crime analysis techniques; in addition, the second year proposal seeks support for a statistical officer to provide enhanced crime analysis (e.g., geo-mapping techniques) for the unit.

One COPS officer reported that it was sometimes difficult to engage the Narcotics Division in investigations on his beat. According to this officer, NED gets so many tips that, "I gotta make mine more attractive." He tries to do so by providing very detailed, documented information to NED about specific locations; he believes that the COPS program has enhanced his ability to receive and pass on such information to NED.

Improved Partnerships. According to one member of the project Planning Committee, COPS officers provide a valuable link between community groups and county officials. For example, by feeding information to COPS officers about narcotics activity within apartment complexes, apartment managers can try to expedite evictions, based on the arrests of known drug traffickers within the apartment complex. Similarly, by passing on information about drug activity in abandoned houses to DER, COPS officers attempt to address narcotics problems by having these locations either boarded up or torn down.

At the time of the implementation site visit, several actions had been taken to improve the processing of inter-agency requests. The symbolic cutting of red tape by the County Executive sent a message to various agencies within the county about the importance of addressing problems identified by members of the COPS unit. At the time of the site visit, various members of the Planning Committee remained convinced that the project's efforts were hampered by "too damned much red tape." It was still too early to determine whether the County Executive's message had made a difference.

HOUSTON

I. The Houston INOP Project and the Target Areas

A. Introduction

Houston, Texas is a city of roughly 1,700,000 people occupying more than 600 square miles. The work-day population of Houston is said to be to over 2 million. The Houston Police Department (HPD) employs 3,950 sworn officers and 1,550 civilians.

By the time of the Vera site visit to Houston in August 1991, the Houston Police Department's INOP-funded "Operation Siege" project had: implemented a Zero Tolerance enforcement detail in both target areas; formed a Cantina Squad focusing on quality-of-life problems associated with local bars in one of the two target areas; enlisted the aid of the department's Tactical Response Unit, which conducts regular street-level buy-and-bust narcotics and prostitution enforcement; formed a special warrant squad to apprehend wanted persons in one of the target areas; conducted a number of neighborhood clean-ups targeting vacant lots in both areas; helped to form a new community association in one target area; developed liaisons in a number of key city and county agencies; identified a group of private sector volunteers willing to help repair the homes of senior citizens and install target hardening hardware; and conducted approximately 200 home security surveys in both areas.

Two planned project components had not been implemented at the time of the site visit. Due to a delay in the release of BJA grant funds from the City of Houston, the target hardening compo-

nent of Operation Siege had not begun. Home surveys designed to identify houses eligible for target hardening continued, however, as did the estimation of target-hardening costs for those houses deemed eligible.[1] Finally, a five-man Truancy Squad designed to target a problem with youth in one of the target areas had not yet gone into operation. It will begin work with the opening of the school year in the fall of 1991.

B. Neighborhood-Oriented Policing (NOP) in Houston

Neighborhood-oriented, problem-solving policing has a relatively long history in Houston, beginning as early as 1982 with the appointment of Lee P. Brown as Chief of Police. Chief Brown's efforts at transforming the Houston Police Department from a traditional law enforcement agency into a neighborhood-oriented police department are well-documented in the community policing literature which often cites Houston to emphasize the need for a broad change in departmental style and philosophy to successfully implement community policing.[2]

Brown began to shift Houston's policing philosophy in 1983 with a series of programs designed to improve communication between police and communities and to allow officers to work with

---

[1]A Department memo titled "Operation Siege Project Time Extension Request" and dated July 18, 1991 indicates that the installation of target hardening hardware in target area homes is projected to begin November 1, 1991.

[2]See, for example, Sparrow, Malcolm K. et al. 1990. Beyond 911: A New Era for Polcing. New York: Basic Books.; Brown, Lee P. 1989. "Community Policing: A Practical Guide for Police Officials." Perspectives in Policing, No. 12. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice and the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.; and Pate et al. 1986. Reducing Fear of Crime in Houston and Newark: A Summary Report. Washington, D.C.: Police Foundation.

neighborhood residents in solving local problems. These experiments (which included a police newsletter mailed directly to area homes, a special police unit whose main purpose was to encourage civic groups to organize, and a police substation designed to encourage walk-in traffic and collaborative police/community problem solving) were the focus of an early National Institute of Justice (NIJ) study of fear reduction through innovative policing in Houston and in Newark, New Jersey.

Between 1982 and 1987, the HPD pursued its vision for community policing through the development of additional experimental programs, all of which incorporated the notions of beat integrity, a problem-solving approach to quality-of-life issues, increased and improved interaction between police and citizens, and community involvement in policing decisions and activities.[3] In 1987, through a series of executive sessions within the Department, the HPD developed a department-wide agenda for community policing which it called Neighborhood Oriented Policing (NOP)..

The development of NOP inaugurated the beginning of what Chief Brown then called "Phase II."[4] This shift from Phase I, which sought to implement community policing gradually, through

---

[3]Brown, Lee P. 1983. The Plan of Action. Houston: Houston Police Department, (April). See also, Oettmeier, Timothy N. and Lee P. Brown. 1988. "Developing a Neighborhood-Oriented Policing Style." Pp. 121-134 in Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality, edited by Jack R. Greene and Stephen D. Mastrofski. New York: Praeger.

[4]Brown, Lee P. 1989. "Community Policing: A Practical Guide for Police Officials." Perspectives in Policing. No. 12. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice and the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

discrete programs in specified locales, to Phase II of community policing in Houston, involved a sweeping resolve by the Department to adopt community policing as its dominant operating style (Brown, 1988). This resolve was clearly stated in the HPD's 1987 mission statement, which mentions first the desire to "enhance the quality-of-life in the City of Houston by working cooperatively with the public ..." (Greene and Mastrofski, 1988:121).

It is within this context of extensive experimentation with community policing and of the post-1987 commitment to NOP as a departmental style that the INOP grant project in Houston, called Operation Siege, has developed.[5]

C. The Target Areas: Frenchtown and the Near-Northside BOND Area

Frenchtown is located in the city's Fifth Ward -- nicknamed the "Bloody Fifth" by police officers because it leads Houston in Part I crimes. The area (consisting of about 600 homes) came to be known as Frenchtown because of the large number of Creole immigrants from Louisiana that settled there just after the turn of the century.[6] Today, however, most of the residents of

---

[5]A major difference between the Houston INOP project and those of most other cities, is that while other cities are enthusiastically embracing community policing for the first time, Houston's NOP has recently come under severe criticism. A recent audit report from Cresap Consulting commissioned by the HPD, is highly critical of HPD management and asserts that officers in the department are not being used efficiently. In addition, the study also reported that the department has an unimpressive crime clearance rate, poor response times, and delivers an unimpressive quality of service.

[6]The name "Frenchtown" has only recently come into use. Since the decendants of the Creole immigrants who gave Frenchtown its name at the turn of the century have largely left the area, few people, until recently, have called the area Frenchtown. The

Frenchtown are African-Americans. The majority of the people who inhabit Frenchtown are lower-income, although some of the well-maintained homes are occupied by working and middle-class families who own their homes (nearly 70% of the residents rent their homes).

The major problems in Frenchtown identified by members of the Frenchtown Community Association (the only active community group in the area) during the Operation Siege problem-identification phase were: prostitution (there are three motels in the Frenchtown area, all of which rent by the hour and, according to residents and police, cater to prostitutes); crack cocaine dealing; abandoned buildings which are used by crack users; and trash in vacant lots. The drug and prostitution problems here are exacerbated, according to respondents, by Frenchtown's easy accessibility from several major highways. The highways make it relatively easy for "drive through" drug buyers and johns to engage in illegal activities and make a quick exit from the neighborhood.

According to both police and members of the Frenchtown Community Association, the Frenchtown community and the police have traditionally had an "adversarial" relationship. Operation Siege, however, has reportedly brought the community and the police closer together through the involvement of the residents in the problem-identification and problem-solving processes.

---

newly reestablished community association chose the name "Frenchtown" to recall memories of "how the neighborhood used to be -- a true community," according to one association member.

The Near-Northside BOND area is named after the neighborhood watch group that covers the second target site.[7] The 155 square blocks that make up the target area are adjacent to the Frenchtown site. Its largely Hispanic population is lower income and, like Frenchtown, a large number of families rent their homes rather than own them. One of the BOND area's most distinctive features is its large number of cantinas. Because Houston has no zoning ordinances, visitors to the area will find as many as three or four cantinas located in the middle of an otherwise completely residential block. There are 33 cantinas located within the BOND target site. According to surveys done by HPD, BOND area residents identified cantinas and criminal activity associated with cantinas as one of the major problems plaguing their community. Unlike Frenchtown, which reportedly has a serious street-corner drug problem (mostly crack), the BOND area's problems are confined primarily to the cantinas, prostitution and vagrants.

Site Selection. The Near-Northside BOND and Frenchtown communities were selected as the Operation Siege target sites because they had high levels of drug activity and drug-related crime and because residents had expressed a willingness to form partnerships with the police in an effort to address the conditions that have contributed to the drug problem. The high-

---

[7]"BOND" is a generic acronym standing for "Blocks Organizing Neighborhood Defenses" (a neighborhood watch). The BOND target site for Operation Siege is one of over 50 BOND groups located throughout the city.

ranking supervisor responsible for the selection of the sites did not base the selection on any formal research or needs assessment. Rather, he felt that the two neighborhoods were reestablishing themselves through revitalization efforts and becoming more formally organized. His belief was that the Operation Siege project could contribute to that revitalization.[8]

II. "Operation Siege": The Houston INOP Project

A. Goals, Objectives and Strategy: Drug Demand Reduction

Operation Siege is unique among the eight BJA-funded INOP sites because its approach to drug demand reduction is purely enforcement-oriented. It thus stands in contrast to projects like Portland's which rely primarily on the provision of social services. The goals of Operation Siege are to enhance the quality of life by preventing crime at the neighborhood level; introducing crime prevention strategies (e.g., target hardening), and reducing fears associated with reporting crime. The HPD hopes to enhance its current drug enforcement strategies by involving the public and private sector in the demand reduction effort. The project will thus allow for the systematic inclusion of community residents, other criminal justice agencies, city departments, and the public and private sector in the demand reduction strategy.

---

[8]This high-ranking officer left the HPD shortly after the proposal was approved. This description of site selection is based on a phone conversation between this former supervisor and a member of the HPD with extensive responsibility for the implementation of Operation Siege.

The project was implemented in six stages: (1) a series of meetings were held with community groups to identify problems and plan a crime prevention strategy; (2) heavy enforcement activity by the department's TACT squad (undercover operations, buy-and-bust); (3) saturation patrol and Zero Tolerance; (4) neighborhood clean-ups; (5) crime prevention surveys; (6) target hardening and senior citizen home repair.

Operation Siege may also be unique among the eight INOP projects because it is being implemented in a police department undergoing large-scale reorganization. In addition, many of the original planners of the Operation Siege have left the department or have been reassigned. This has had a largely negative impact on project implementation for both the BOND and Frenchtown sites, but especially Frenchtown where the officer now in charge of the project has had less than two months of experience with the project. He is currently relying on the BOND area officers for guidance in implementation and evaluation. In addition, internal delays in getting INOP funds released to do enforcement activities and target hardening have placed the implementation of the project behind many of the other INOP-funded sites. Operation Siege officially began in April, 1991.

B. Enforcement: Zero Tolerance, Cantina Squad, TACT Team and the Warrant Squad

Zero Tolerance. Zero Tolerance is one of the three enforcement strategies implemented in Houston's demand reduction effort. Zero Tolerance (initiated on May 11, 1991) is a high-visibility patrol effort using four to five officers in one- and two-person

patrol cars working only within the boundaries of the target areas. Officers work this detail on an overtime basis and do not respond to calls for service.[9] BJA funds are used to pay the overtime for the vast majority of officers who work the detail. Officers volunteer to work on this program through a sign-up procedure. The times and dates for Zero Tolerance are posted and officers fill in their names in the time/day slots that they wish to work (on a first-come, first-served basis).[10] Except for those officers who work Zero Tolerance every day as their regular assignment, officers sign-up to work on their days off and are paid on an overtime basis.[11] Supervisors (sergeants) are responsible for relating the Zero Tolerance strategies to officers who have not worked the program before and for informing them of the particular types of offenses taking place in the target sites. The program is not unique to this project; it has been used by the HPD before (most notably in the 1988 Link Valley Experiment) but has not been used in the two Project Siege target areas.

Under Zero Tolerance, uniformed officers in marked units patrol the two target areas during the day and early evening shifts searching primarily for open-air drug activity and pros-

---

[9]Some officers, however, are permanently assigned to work Zero Tolerance on a daily basis.

[10]The schedule is posted every three weeks and officers are limited to two dates per list.

[11]In Frenchtown, for example, there are only two units (four patrol officers) who work Zero Tolerance as their regular detail (five days per week, eight hours per day). One unit works the day shift, the other works the evening shift.

titution.[12] However, because open-air activity is not very common (especially during the day/early evening shifts when Zero Tolerance operates primarily), patrol officers attempt to make arrests for <u>any</u> infraction of the law. Officers will, for example, make arrests for public intoxication and urinating in public. As one sergeant who has supervised Zero Tolerance said:

> Zero Tolerance is going out and enforcing <u>all</u> laws, including all traffic laws and minor misdemeanors -- the more minor things that are generally overlooked. And that can be effective because it lets people know that not only are the police officers out there, but they're actively engaged in policing.

Because they arrest or cite people for a great many "minor" infractions of the law, officers who work this detail may make many more arrests than the average patrol officer. Two officers in Frenchtown, for example average 250 arrests per month. Officers who work Zero Tolerance every day of the week as their regular assignment will also take all narcotics complaints that come into the district station desk (which are placed on "alert slips"), and do checks on as many locations as they can during their shift. Since crack houses are often located in abandoned

---

[12]According to one officer involved in implementing Zero Tolerance, the program runs primarily during the daytime hours because " ... research that I did, [found] more burglaries, robberies, prostitution, and drug activities occurred during the day than at night." In addition, the officer explained that Zero Tolerance was originally designed to run "all day" from 8:00 a.m. -- 8:00 p.m. "for the purpose of being fair and equitable to all three shifts having the desire to work Project Siege." The hours were curtailed, however, because the day-shift had "dragged the streets" (i.e. made a lot of arrests) and left few people for the night shift to arrest. Hours for the detail are sometimes staggered (e.g., 7:00 a.m. - 3:00 p.m. or 10:00 a.m. - 6:00 p.m.). In addition, working during the daylight hours would make the police more visible to residents of the target area.

buildings, officers explained, they are often able to close the house down by having illegally installed utilities shut off. According to officers working the program, no formal partnerships with city agencies or private utilities have been established through Operation Siege:

> It's not a network. We just talk to whoever we can get on the phone. If they don't give us any satisfaction, then we ask for their supervisor, and we go up until we can find somebody to help us with our problem.[13]

Prostitutes are targeted by Zero Tolerance, officers explained because "they are always looking to buy drugs; that's why they're out there selling themselves for the most part." Officers will use local ordinances like, "hitchhiking and walking in the street" to cite prostitutes plying their trade. Two officers in Frenchtown, for example, created a notebook of ordinances (local, state, federal) that they can use for the Zero Tolerance program.[14]

Cantina Squad. During meetings with community leaders in the BOND area, HPD learned that the community's greatest concerns were truancy and the problems (drugs, fights, prostitution, noise, loitering) caused by the local cantinas in the area. Because Houston has no zoning ordinances, it is very common in

---

[13]Liaisons exist in several agencies (e.g., County Commissioners Court, Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission, Solid Waste) but no formal partnerships between the police department and these agencies have been established for Operation Siege. This became apparent when none of the interviewees in these agencies were aware of Operation Siege as a HPD project.

[14]These officers created this reference on their own; it was not provided by the department.

the Near-Northeast BOND area to find several cantinas located in the middle of residential areas in homes converted into liquor establishments. According to residents of the BOND organization, many cantinas are centers of drug, gambling and prostitution activities. Residents also complain of general quality-of-life problems caused by the cantinas, such as loud noise and parking problems generated by the lack of parking on cantina property.

The Cantina Squad is a purely enforcement-oriented response to those concerns that serves to check all cantina/liquor establishments and their surrounding areas for intoxicated people creating disturbances.[15] The detail does not function in the Frenchtown area where cantinas or bars are few compared to the 33 that operate within the 155 square block BOND target site. This detail, like Zero Tolerance, is staffed by patrol officers and a supervising sergeant working on overtime who are paid by BJA funds. The staffing of the Cantina Squad is accomplished by the same sign-up procedure used for Zero Tolerance. The Squad works a bi-weekly schedule, Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights from 9:30 p.m. to 2:00 a.m. (peak times for the cantinas, many of which are open only on these nights). The Squad is staffed by four uniformed officers in marked patrol units and one sergeant (usually riding in an unmarked unit).

Typically, the officers working the Cantina Squad will meet at a designated place where a sergeant will brief them on what

---

[15]Like Zero Tolerance, the Cantina Squad was not created originally for the Operation Siege project. The detail had been used several years ago until budgetary problems forced it to disband; it was reinstituted for Operation Siege.

cantinas they will check for the evening. Any cantinas that have been the source for numerous calls for service or complaints, for example, would be targeted. Officers will enter a Cantina and check for signs of disorderly behavior and public intoxication. If any patron is intoxicated or causing a disturbance, he/she will be arrested.

The Cantina Squad also checks Cantina licenses to be sure that they are in order and any other violations of the state alcoholic beverage code (e.g., serving a patron who is clearly intoxicated). Under Texas law, citizens may petition the County Commissioner's Court (which is responsible for processing liquor licenses and conducting hearings when license renewals are protested) to deny the renewal of a license to any liquor establishment that has been a source of chronic criminal activity or violation of Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission (TABC) laws. The officers working the Cantina squad have been trained using TABC manuals to enable officers to recognize common criminal offenses pertaining to the Texas Alcoholic Beverage Code.

HPD will use arrest reports or records of citations given Cantina managers/owners ("Public Disturbance Report for the TABC") to inform TABC of any violations. This information may then be used by the County Commissioner's Court if TABC or community residents wish to protest a liquor license renewal for a cantina that they consider a nuisance to the community. Cantina Squad arrests or citations are thus routed to a TABC liaison who will use the information to help Commissioner's Court deny

license renewals to chronic trouble spots. Since January, 1991, three cantinas have been closed through this process.

BJA funds have also been used by the HPD to pay for the overtime hours spent by officers testifying at license application or renewal hearings. Because the Commissioner's Court is not a criminal court, officers previously were not paid for the time they spent testifying in licensing hearings.

TACT Squad. The Tactical Squad (TACT) functions in both the Frenchtown and BOND areas. This unit was put into operation for Operation Siege on April 1, 1991. Its covert operations target drug sellers (through buy-and-bust tactics) and prostitutes specifically. Prostitutes are targeted because they are active drug buyers, according to police, and because they have been identified as a major crime problem by Frenchtown/BOND residents in police community meetings.

The undercover operations run from three to five days per week and enlist 18 officers (eight officers per unit and two sergeants) who work 7:00 a.m. - 3:00 p.m. or noon - 8:00 p.m. Because it would be counterproductive to have extra marked units in an area where TACT is attempting to conduct an undercover operation, HPD is does not schedule Zero Tolerance when the TACT Squad is functioning. BJA funds also pay officers who work this program on an overtime basis.

Warrant Squad. Another enforcement component in the Frenchtown area of Operation Siege is the Warrant Squad which, like Zero Tolerance and the Cantina Squad, functions on an overtime basis. Officers who work this detail (paid by BJA funds) develop

information on suspects on whom warrants have been executed and attempt to make arrests of these suspects. The detail (usually two officers) works from 2:00 a.m. - 6:00 a.m.

C. Target Hardening/Senior Citizen Home Repair

In an effort to reduce the fear of crime among the elderly and prevent burglaries (i.e., drug-related crime), Operation Siege plans to replace doors and locks and install window burglar bars in a "target hardening" effort. Home surveys conducted by HPD officers, volunteers from the BOND organization and volunteers from the Southwest Voters Registration Drive, were used to identify those who qualify for target hardening.[16]

To qualify for the target hardening, a homeowner must be 65 years old or handicapped and must have an income of less than $2000 per month. The home security survey conducted by the police department will determine the security needs of a particular home. The home may need, for example, two new solid-core doors and two deadbolt locks and burglar bars for the windows. Labor for the installation of the hardware is free of charge and is supplied by volunteers from the community who are trained by the HPD and volunteers of the Private Sector Initiative (PSI), a private non-profit agency.

Unfortunately, the BJA funds slated for target hardening (approximately $64,000) had been "improperly tagged for it to be channeled to the appropriate divisions." It is still unclear

---

[16]HPD representatives were unable to provide an exact count of the surveys done at the time of the implementation site visit, but they believe it to be approximately 200.

whether the city or the police department is at fault for the delay in the delivery of funds. At the time of the Vera site visit in August, 1991, money for target hardening still had not been released for use by the police department. According to representatives of the Frenchtown and BOND sites, they had completed over 200 security surveys and had absolutely no funds to deliver the work promised.

This delay in the release of funds clearly disrupted the target hardening schedule, and perhaps more importantly, created a crisis of legitimacy for the project. According to several officers responsible for the implementation of the target hardening effort:

> The community was all fired-up when we had the April and May kick-off for the project and there was no money for the project. We're not here to point any fingers but someone in this department dropped the ball on this thing.

In addition to the target hardening, Operation Siege has incorporated a senior citizen home repair program into its overall effort. The program is administered and implemented by the Private Sector Initiative (PSI) based in Houston. Twice a year the PSI home repair program recruits volunteers to paint and repair between 80-120 homes owned by low-income elderly or handicapped people. Homes for repair and target hardening are selected from the home security surveys done by the HPD and its volunteers. The purpose of the program is to instill pride in ownership and reduce the risk of crime by, for example, replacing inadequate doors, locks or windows, and doing some low-level CPTED in the form of trimming shrubberies. In addition, the

program is expected to reduce fear of crime, especially burglary, among senior citizens.[17] Thus, the HPD delivers the hardware (doors, locks, security bars) to PSI crews who install them for homeowners free of charge.

D. Community Partnerships

Operation Siege has created partnerships with two citizen groups that have been the focus of the HPD's community outreach efforts. In the Near-Northside BOND area, HPD has enhanced an already strong relationship with the BOND organization (which is, according to officers in the area, the only formal civic organization in the target site). The neighborhood watch group assists the police department by providing volunteers to do home surveys when necessary, helping to organize and provide volunteers for neighborhood clean-ups and senior citizen home repair projects and providing information on drug and prostitution hot-spots in the project site through the CB Patrol. In addition, the BOND group has formed a Cantina Committee which monitors community problems related to the many cantinas in the area. The BOND group has offered testimony at liquor license renewal hearings that have resulted in helping to close-down three cantinas that have been troublesome to the community.

In the Frenchtown community, the police department was directly involved in the recent revitalization of the Frenchtown

---

[17]An executive from PSI admitted, however, to worrying about whether homes which look so much better than those surrounding it might make a more attactive target for burglars. He has proposed that the HPD study whether homes targeted by PSI for repair and target hardening fall victim to crime more often than surrounding homes.

Association. Like the BOND group, the Frenchtown Association is the only active civic group (meetings are currently held every two weeks) in the Frenchtown community. The Association has aided the police department in neighborhood clean-up activities and supplied volunteers in the senior citizen home repair projects. In addition, the members of the association have helped police by providing information on drug and prostitution activity in the target site. Both the BOND group and the Frenchtown Association were active participants in the problem identification process of Operation Siege and continue to have an impact on police decision-makers through their participation in monthly progress meetings.

III. Other Program Components

A. C.B. Patrols

Another program being used in the BOND area for Operation Siege is the CB Patrol. The patrol is composed entirely of citizens (between 15-20 volunteers) who volunteer their time to patrol the BOND area. The volunteers are all part of the BOND organization. The police department provides all volunteers with CB radios (and a base station radio whose operator can contact the police department directly) and signs for the side of their private vehicles indicating that they are the civilian patrol. The police department also provides two training seminars (six hours) which every volunteer must complete before being allowed to patrol the street. The CB Patrol was instrumental in supplying the HPD with drug and prostitution locations before Operation Siege began.

B. Neighborhood Clean-Ups

Operation Siege also conducts neighborhood clean-ups in an effort to instill pride in community and as a vehicle for building community partnerships and trust. Working with BOND and the Frenchtown Association, the HPD has organized four neighborhood clean-ups since the project began in April, 1991. BJA funds are used to pay overtime to some officers who work security details for the clean-up efforts.

C. Evaluations

The evaluation of the Operation Siege project in both the BOND area and Frenchtown will be conducted internally by the HPD (two evaluations will be done -- one by officers responsible for the BOND area and another by those officers responsible for the Frenchtown area). According to the project proposal the evaluation would determine "if there has been a disruption in ... street-level drug trafficking, ... and other criminal activity." Data would be collected for time periods before and after the Operation Siege intervention to determine whether the project had any impact on reported crime and calls for service. Given the late date at which HPD began this project, coupled with the loss of senior personnel who were responsible for the project in its development stages, the officers now in charge of the project are in the process of determining an appropriate evaluation strategy.

Officers involved in the BOND area, however, were able to provide some early details about the evaluation. First, the possible effect of the project on calls for service will not be considered in the evaluation. Second, when target hardening has

begun (when money is released for hardware, and it has been installed) the evaluation team would like to see whether target-hardened homes are burglarized less frequently than the average home. In addition, the evaluation team is skeptical that enforcement efforts will result in many drug-related arrests (for reasons that are unclear). As one sergeant said:

> We are going to end up with a bunch of arrests but they are not going to be narcotics. We are going to have a handful ... arrests will be nothing near what they said [in the proposal]. But on some of these other programs -- Cantina, Zero Tolerance -- they are just scooping them up. [As far as the program's effect on drug demand reduction] ... I think that what [Operation Siege] is going to do ... is that the way we are going to be successful is that we are going to move those people [i.e., drug traffickers, prostitutes] to a different location ... They know they are not going to go back to that neighborhood and sell the drugs ...

An officer from the BOND area is currently attempting to get computer programmers in the department to label all crimes reported within the BOND area with a special code. The purpose of this, he explained, would be to make it easy for the evaluation team to monitor Operation Siege and its progress. At the time of the Vera site visit, he explained that he had been told that this was not possible due to limited programmer resources.

At the time of the Vera site visit no evaluation plan had been developed for the Frenchtown project. Because responsibility for the project has only recently been placed in the hands of a new officer, the evaluation plan has yet to be developed.

LOUISVILLE

I. The Louisville INOP Project and the Target Area

A. Introduction

Louisville, Kentucky is a city of approximately 300,000 people. The Louisville Police Department (LPD) has an authorized strength of 671 sworn officers, supported by 295 civilian employees. There are six police districts within Louisville. The Louisville INOP project includes the entire Fourth District.

At the time of the Vera implementation site visit in mid-August, the Louisville INOP project -- Community Oriented Policing (COP) -- had completed training all 66 officers within the target district; established a Project Committee, comprised of six precinct officers and 12 community residents, which met regularly to define priority problems within the district; advertised and held three public forums to assist in the definition of priority problems; completed a baseline survey of target area residents and residents of a comparison area; established a Strategy Committee of senior officers to develop responses to priority problems; and held a preliminary meeting with a designated interagency Support Committee.

Several key program components had not yet been implemented at the time of the site visit. These include the identification and implementation of strategic responses to priority problems; the implementation of a computerized system to divert lower priority calls for service (CFS) from central dispatchers to district dispatchers; the implementation of a plan for delayed response (or "alternative run handling") to lower priority CFS;

the implementation of a split patrol force plan, permitting a portion of the patrol force to carry out strategies developed in response to identified priority problems; problem-solving activities drawing upon the resources of the designated interagency consortium; a planned monthly newsletter to residents; and an extensive advertising campaign aimed at drug demand reduction within the target area. Implementation of these remaining project components was scheduled for the beginning of September.

B. Neighborhood-Oriented Policing in Louisville

According to current LPD command personnel, at the time that Louisville submitted its INOP proposal to BJA, there was relatively little command-level support for neighborhood-oriented policing in the LPD. The proposal was developed and submitted by the commander of the Fourth District, a captain who had come to believe that old styles of policing simply were not working in his command -- the predominantly black, relatively low-income "West End" of Louisville. His belief in the value of neighborhood-oriented policing was not strongly supported by either the (then) Chief of Police or his staff. Shortly after the Louisville INOP proposal was funded, however, a new Chief of Police, a strong supporter of community-oriented policing, was appointed, following a widely publicized FBI investigation of his predecessor.[1]

---

[1] Following this investigation, the previous Chief was removed from office, although he retained his civil service rank of Captain within the LPD. Currently, there is litigation under way, challenging his removal from office.

The Captain's recognition of a need for a more neighborhood-oriented style of policing stemmed in part from the widespread image (both within the LPD and within the community) of Fourth District officers as an "occupying army" in the area. According to several members of the Department, for many years the Fourth District had served as a "dumping ground" or "punishment" for officers who "got into trouble" within the Department. In previous years, according to some members of the Department, district officers under other commanders had had a reputation of brutality, defined by one outside observer as a "kick ass and take names" approach to policing. This image had reportedly softened a bit in recent years, following a foot patrol experiment in one of the most troubled housing projects within the district. Yet the Captain remained concerned with the District's inability to address recurring problems within identified "hot spots" in the District, to counteract the negative perception of the Department within the community and to mobilize the support of other units within the Department (e.g., the Narcotics Division).

To avoid the divisiveness of an "elite" unit approach, the Louisville INOP proposal deliberately did not designate a special neighborhood-oriented unit within the District. Ultimately, all officers within the District will take part in the COP project, implementing strategic responses to priority problems identified in community forums.

COP was designed to have two phases -- a first phase for planning and problem identification and a second phase for strategy development and strategy implementation. During the

first phase, only the six officers selected to work with 12 community leaders[2] on the Project Committee were intensively involved in project work, although all District officers went through COP training during this period (from February through mid-August). Project committee officers defined their role as being, at least in part, the "ears and mouth of the community." During the start-up phase, officers on the Project Committee were relieved from their platoons[3] to help develop the project's advertising campaign, in collaboration with community representatives on the committee; design the project's computer-aided call diversion effort; conduct three open community forums (held in April); and define the priority problems of the community by reviewing the content of those forums.

During the second phase, scheduled to begin in mid-August, officers on the Project Committee return to their platoons and the nine officers on the Strategy Committee (senior officers selected for their experience in the District) leave their platoons for a two-week period of intensive strategy development. At the end of this period, all District officers will return to

---

[2] The community members of the Project Committee include leaders of Block Watch groups and Neighborhood Associations, a local minister, an employee of a real estate development firm and a teacher in a local school (see Appendix -- for a list of members). The various community members are drawn from each of the distinct neighborhoods within the District -- Algonquin, California, Chickasaw, Hallmark, Limerick, Park Hill, Parkland, and Park du Valle. The number of community residents on the Project Committee was increased from the six initially envisioned in the Louisville INOP proposal.

[3] The Fourth District has three platoons. Platoons are identified with specific shifts -- midnight to 8 a.m., 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. and 4 p.m. to midnight.

their platoons to work collectively on the police strategies selected to address priority problems (e.g., surveillance at drug locations, followed by intensive enforcement; foot patrol; etc.).

According to the project design, once strategies for addressing priority problems have been defined, the District will implement a split patrol. Some proportion of each platoon will be freed from responsibility for answering calls for service to carry out problem-solving activities. Assignment to problem-solving will be rotated among the officers in each platoon. Plans for call diversion and delayed response are central to the split-patrol concept; analysis of the District's CFS workload in 1990 revealed that 20 percent of calls did not require that a patrol car be dispatched immediately.

According to senior LPD personnel, a central implementation issue has involved the computer-aided call diversion component of the COP initiative. Because this component requires modification of the central Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) system, and because capital funds for that system have been frozen pending an independent review of city- and LPD-based computer systems, efforts to implement the COP call diversion plan have met substantial impediments (see the discussion of the MIS component below).

In spite of the delayed implementation of several program components, in July the Fourth District experimented with problem-solving strategies in Algonquin Park, an area identified at the community forums as the site of drug activity and loitering. In concert with the Department of Parks and Recreation and the Department of Public Works, the District re-designed the

area. With city funding, secured by a local Alderman, barriers were erected, a parking area was replaced with grass and "no stopping" signs were posted.[4] The Algonquin Park experience was cited frequently in interviews with city and Department officials as an example of what COP might accomplish in Louisville.

Currently, there is substantial support for community-oriented policing in both the LPD command structure and in the city administration.[5] Plans are being developed for several other Districts within the LPD to develop community-oriented policing models.

C. The Target Area

The Fourth District in Louisville, one of six police districts in the city, occupies seven of the 66 square miles in the city and has a population of over 42,000 residents. It has the highest volume of violent crime (homicide, rape, robbery and aggravated assault) of the police districts in Louisville. It also has a substantially higher proportion of minority residents than the rest of the city (91% of its residents are African-American compared to 29% for the city as a whole); a substantially higher unemployment rate (18%) than the city as a whole

---

[4] During the implementation site visits, tours revealed virtually no loitering or drug trafficking in the park area. A front-page newspaper article during that period focused on recent improvements in Algonquin Park, following the problem-solving initiative.

[5] The Mayor and the Director of Public Safety in Louisville are both stong advocates for community-oriented policing and were actively involved in the lengthy proceedings that led to the dismissal of the previous Chief of Police, who was resistant to community-oriented policing.

(10%); and significantly lower assessed mean housing values (approximately $18,000) than the city as a whole ($47,000).

The Fourth District also has among the highest concentrations of public housing in the city, including four housing developments that are either the locus of or adjacent to many of the quality-of-life problems within the District (domestic violence reports, loitering, drug abuse and trafficking). In addition to these housing projects, administered by the Housing Authority of Louisville, there is a largely abandoned, privately-owned development, known locally as "Peyton Place," where several vacant apartments have been broken into and vandalized or, in some instances, used as "shooting galleries."

Much of the area consists of privately-owned single family homes and rented houses, many of which have been abandoned and boarded up, even on relatively well-maintained blocks. Some neighborhoods within the District, however, house the relatively affluent members of Louisville's black middle class -- doctors, lawyers, city officials.

There is little commercial development in the area,[6] although there is a concentrated industrial area in the eastern end of the district. There are also a substantial number of liquor stores and bars, many of which have been defined as "hot spots," the locus of repeated crime reports and calls for ser-

---

[6] At a Project Committee meeting attended during the implementation site visit, community representatives on the Committee complained about the scarcity of services (e.g., banks, dry cleaners, restaurants, supermarkets) in the area.

vice. Several of these spots are also identified drug trafficking locations.

Louisville does not have a major crack cocaine problem, although there is a substantial volume of powder cocaine and marijuana trafficking (marijuana is the primary cash crop in the state). The Fourth District, in previous years, had been the center of heroin trafficking within the city, although the heroin problem has reportedly abated in recent years.

At the three community forums held in April, residents identified 43 problems, many associated with particular locations in the district. The Project committee divided these problems into 13 categories: random shootings; street corner drug dealing; loitering around liquor stores; other congregations of loitering men; congregations of youth; burglary; auto theft; police-community interactions; loud music; vandalism; traffic problems; illegal dumping; and stray dogs.

II. Drug Demand Reduction Activities

A. Drug Prevention and Treatment

Even before the development of the Louisville INOP project, a number of active, organized block associations had been formed within the Fourth District. In fact, several block association leaders became active members of COP's Project Committee. Project planners expect that the training on drug abuse prevention received by community resident Committee members will be carried back to their respective block watch groups.

Other aspects of the project, related to drug prevention approaches, have not yet been implemented. The COP project plans

to train eight additional community residents at the LPD Academy on the goals of community-oriented policing, ways to respond to neighborhood-based drug abuse and general crime prevention techniques, along with training on issues related to domestic violence and to black-on-black crime. Project planners expect the community residents who are trained at the LPD Academy to disseminate the knowledge gained in training sessions to other residents who are involved in neighborhood associations.

In addition, an advertising program, planned for Autumn 1991, will be targeted at building community awareness of drug issues through the media, billboards and newsletters. Other strategic responses to identified local drug problems, employing either drug prevention or drug education techniques, have not yet been developed.

COP has been included as an integral member of the AWAREE (Area-Wide Alcohol/Drug Rehabilitation, Education and Enforcement) Coalition, a joint city-county initiative, begun in the Fall of 1990. The objectives of the Coalition are to recruit volunteers to serve on AWAREE committees, to develop a drug prevention curriculum, to hold a local conference on drug issues and to conduct a survey, assessing perceptions of local drug and alcohol problems. Through this coalition of enforcement groups and service providers, COP is formally linked to the consortium of treatment and prevention programs (e.g., DARE, the Probation and Parole Drug Testing and Treatment Program, the Community Alliance for Prevention) in the area.

B. Law Enforcement Activities

Enforcement strategies in response to identified drug problems in the Fourth District had not been designed at the time of the implementation site visit. Members of the Strategy Committee, however, reported that they expected to use a variety of techniques (e.g., surveillance, saturation patrol, foot patrol) in response to drug problems.

The COP project also expects support from the newly reorganized Metro Narcotics Unit (MNU). In October 1990, shortly before the INOP project received funding, the Mayor of Louisville and the County Executive of Jefferson County (where Louisville is located) created a joint city-county narcotics unit of 48 officers. The unit is currently directed by a Major in the Jefferson County Department. His appointment marked the beginning of a new cooperation between District police units and the Narcotics Division. The director of the MNU has pledged his support to the initiative. In an interview during the implementation site visit, he reported that his street enforcement unit had made over 100 arrests in the past month at one of the most active "hot spots" in the COP target area. Command staff in the Fourth District reported that both the MNU's responsiveness to District problem spots and its willingness to address something other than major cases (e.g., street-level drug sales) represented a departure from previous practice within the LPD.

III. Other Program Components

A. Recruitment and Training

The police officers who were to serve on the Project Committee and on the Strategy Committee were selected by the Captain before the beginning of February, when the Project committee began to meet on a weekly basis. District officers were asked to volunteer for both committees. The six officers on the Project Committee were drawn equally from the three platoons (two from each). The nine officers on the Strategy Committee, seasoned veterans of the force, were selected for the extensiveness and variety of their police experience within the District. The supervising Lieutenant on the project transferred to the Fourth District specifically to participate in developing the project's approach to neighborhood-oriented policing.

All officers in the District underwent two days of training in preparation for the implementation of COP. Training was conducted jointly by faculty from the Southern Police Institute (SPI) and by District Command personnel. Training covered the history, evolution and objectives of community-oriented policing; a description of the Louisville COP project; problem-solving methods and examples of how the problem-solving approach was implemented in other jurisdictions; police-community relations; and practice in problem analysis and response development. Community members of the Project Committee participated in this training to the extent that their schedules allowed.

Officers on both the Project Committee and the Strategy Committee received an additional day of training. This training

session focused on problem identification; problem management; special investigations and operations; and the development and implementation of tactics. Selected members of the Project Committee, along with several high-ranking members of the LPD, also attended a three-day workshop on community policing held by the National Crime Prevention Institute at the University of Louisville.

In addition, as discussed in Section IIA, the Project plans to provide training to eight community representatives through the Citizens Training Unit at the LPD academy. This training will cover the COP program itself, drug use and abuse, domestic violence, black-on-black crime and crime prevention. Instructors for these training sessions have been selected and course outlines have been prepared.

Four civilian employees in the Fourth District have also received 40 hours of training on the computer-aided dispatch (CAD) system in preparation for the call diversion component of the COP initiative.

B. Community and Agency Partnerships

A primary motivation for developing COP in the Fourth District was to have active community participation in identifying priority problems. According to the Captain, there were both practical and political reasons for increasing community involvement:

> ...as district commander, I was getting complaints, problems fired at me right and left. I had more than I could deal with. It was left up to me to decide what was (most) important, and every time I made that decision, I was continually asked to justify it....I'd rather have the community

> decide....And I wanted to be able to identify some strong community support for [enforcement] activities, rather than the police just responding to a complaint here and there...

The central methods of soliciting community involvement in problem identification are through the community representatives on the Project Committee and through the three public forums held at the end of April. The priority problems identified through these two sources will be matched against data on the responses to a baseline survey of a random sample of community residents (see Section IIIF) to provide further verification (or qualification) of community concerns.

Although the project also participates in a set of formal partnerships with twelve city agencies through its Support Committee, these partnerships have not yet been drawn upon extensively, because strategies for dealing with priority problems have not yet been defined. The Support Committee includes representatives of the Sinking Fund (the Mayor's taxing authority); JTPA (initiative undertaken under the Job Training Partnership Act); the Health Department; Public Works (traffic and highways); the Housing Authority; Inspections, Permits and Licenses; the Department of Law; Public Safety (Police, Fire and Emergency Services); Economic Development; Parks and Recreation; Solid Waste (sanitation); the local Housing and Urban Development office; Human Services; and the Community Action Agency. At a recent meeting of the Mayor's cabinet, which includes the chiefs of the various agencies on the Support Committee, the Mayor firmly endorsed the COP project and insisted upon the active

cooperation of all supporting agencies in the neighborhood-oriented policing effort.

City officials interviewed during the implementation site visit reported that they expect few problems in operationalizing interagency partnerships because the Mayor and his staff will ensure that agencies "understand the importance of responding." These officials identified three agencies as most likely to be drawn upon frequently by COP -- Inspections, Permits and Licenses; Solid Waste Management; and Parks and Recreation. They also envision the active involvement of the Department of Public Works and the Department of Human Services.

Commanders in the Fourth District had already been working collaboratively with representatives of the Housing Authority of Louisville on problems in the public housing projects in the area well before COP was developed. The OASIS project, developed several years before the COP project, placed Fourth District officers on foot patrol in District housing projects. It is expected that the collaboration between the District and the Housing Authority will be enhanced by the COP project.

C. Outreach and Advertising

Outreach and advertising play a central role in the COP project. During the first few months of the project, the Project Director and the secretary funded through the INOP project attended 23 community meetings to announce the project and explain its goals. In preparation for the public forums held in April, the project hired a local advertising consultant, Designing Ideas, to publicize the event. Throughout April, the project

arranged to have extensive television, radio and newspaper coverage of the public forums. Fliers announcing the forums were distributed throughout the target area and letters were sent to pastors of all local churches. Public service announcements were broadcast on local radio stations.

In addition, the Project Committee and the advertising consultant have been working on developing an advertising/public awareness campaign to run in various forms of media (radio, billboards, print, television) from September through December. The public awareness campaign will focus on drug prevention, domestic violence and black-on-black crime. Several local radio stations have offered to match the amount of purchased advertising time with free time for public service announcements.

Posters announcing the COP project, developed by the advertising consultant, were being reviewed by the Project Committee during the implementation site visit. The project also plans to disseminate 3,000 newsletters about relevant police and community issues in target neighborhoods on a regular basis. The format for these newsletters, however, has not yet been developed.

D. The Role of the Department's Management Information System (MIS)

The COP project initially anticipated purchasing computer hardware to permit the development of a separate call dispatch system for lower priority Fourth District calls, diverted from the central CAD system.[7] Yet consultations with personnel in

---

[7] The Louisville CAD system processes calls for all three branches of emergency service -- police, fire and ambulance dispatch.

charge of the LPD CAD system convinced COP project directors of the utility of maintaining records (e.g., the disposition of the run) and procedures for the diverted calls within the central system.[8] These consultations also convinced them that the CAD unit had the capacity to program an automatic diversion of these calls to a satellite computer at the District.

As currently envisioned, lower priority calls will be automatically transferred to the Fourth District satellite computer. District staff will place a follow-up call to the caller and either take crime report information over the phone or schedule an appointment. Data will then be entered and/or updated on the dispatch screen. "Clearing the run" (i.e., entering run disposition data) will provide a complete record of call response, linked to the central data system.

Implementation problems resulted from the decision to rely on modifying the central CAD system for call diversion. In 1989, the city's data processing department had begun to argue that the independent LPD data processing department should be taken over by the city. In early 1991, the Humana Corporation, which is centered in Louisville, was commissioned to conduct an independent study of the two systems. During the course of that study, the capital budget for LPD MIS expenditures was frozen.

---

[8] The CAD unit argued that a centralized call diversion system could serve as a prototype for neighborhood-oriented policing projects in other districts, if they were to employ the split-patrol concept.

Although the Humana study, released in June, fully supported the independent LPD computer system, the period for approving capital budget expenditures in Louisville had passed. During the implementation site visit, LPD CAD staff explained that there is not enough disk space available to write and test modifications to the CAD system required by the call diversion plan. They reported that developing the call diversion system for COP is their "number one priority," but argued that their ability to do so was limited by the city's delay in reviewing their request for an additional $1.3 million in expenditures to expand the system.

The COP project is awaiting the disposition of this issue before the call diversion system can be developed. Whether or not this system is in place, they plan to begin implementing strategic responses to priority problems on September 1st.

Originally the project had anticipated hiring a computer consultant to develop call diversion protocols. Although that consultant was hired in June, the definition of his tasks depends, at least in part, on the resolution of the CAD budget allocation issue. The computer consultant has begun work on developing software for a problem management data entry system.

E. Program Evaluation

The evaluation of the Louisville INOP project will be carried out by two faculty members at the Southern Police Institute (SPI), located at the University of Louisville. The evaluation consists of both an impact analysis and a process analysis.

Telephone surveys of random samples of each neighborhood within the target area (N=400) and of a comparison neighborhood

outside of the District (N=200) constitute a central component of the impact analysis.[9] These surveys were developed by the SPI research team, based on standardized Fear of Crime survey instruments, similar to those developed by the Police foundation (and used in many community surveys of fear of crime throughout the country); additional questions were developed to address the priority problems identified by target area residents in the public forums. The survey instruments are designed to examine quality of life issues, fear of crime, police-community relations, victimization and awareness of the COP project.

The surveys are being conducted under the INOP grant by the Survey and Evaluation Unit of the Urban Research Institute at the University of Louisville. At the time of the implementation site visit, baseline household surveys had been completed, although the data were not yet ready for analysis. Baseline survey data will be used to verify the list of priority problems identified at the community forums and to provide baseline data on the experimental area and the comparison area. Follow-up surveys, assessing the impact of the project in the target area, will be conducted after the implementation of strategies addressing priority problems; the precise dates of the follow-up surveys have not been specified.

---

[9] SPI research staff indicated that it had been relatively difficult to identify a site that was comparable to the target area outside of the Fourth District. The area of "Smoketown," in the Fifth District of Louisville, was selected as a comparison site because of its demographic composition and the number of Housing Authority buildings in the area. SPI research staff rejected possible comparison sites in the Second District because of the planned expansion of neighborhood-oriented policing into that District.

In addition to the survey, the impact analysis will review changes in calls for service and crime complaints in both the target area as a whole and the comparison area. Findings from the various components of the impact analysis will be supplemented by the process analysis, which is examining the implementation of the project, problems in the target area, strategy development, community involvement in project activities and the call diversion/split patrol initiative.

F. BJA Funds

In Louisville, BJA funds ($187,290) support the evaluation component and the community survey, the advertising consultant and the computer consultant. BJA funds have also been allocated to cover the costs of computer hardware and software, training, printing (including newsletters), postage and travel.

BJA funds provide the salaries of two support staff hired to work on the COP project -- a secretary and a data entry clerk. The project secretary, a resident of the District, is responsible for correspondence, the minutes of the various committee meetings, scheduling meetings and the transcription of recorded public forums. She is also scheduled to attend the citizen training sessions and will address community groups on the COP project and crime prevention techniques.

As a result of the considerable delay in the computerized call diversion component of the program, the tasks of the data entry clerk have been less clearly defined. The data entry clerk

has been trained in data entry, assisted in project meetings and public forums and received instruction about the CAD system. Project staff acknowledge that she has, to some extent, been under-utilized because of the implementation delay in the development of computer-based call diversion.

IV. Expected Impacts

A. Community Effects

The Louisville INOP proposal clearly identified the goals and objectives of the project with respect to the community. The primary stated goal is to reduce crime and disorder in the target area. An ancillary goal is to improve police-community relations.

Reducing Disorder. The Fourth District's experience in redesigning Algonquin Park to reduce drug trafficking and loitering led to optimism among several respondents interviewed during the implementation site visit about the project's ability to reduce disorder. According to a local alderman, the Algonquin Park initiative "served notice" to drug dealers and loiterers that they "can't hang out here." Another city official claimed that the initiative "turned that problem around over night." Community members of the project committee also expressed hopes that inter-agency efforts targeted at abandoned properties or disruptive street-corner locations might make negligent property owners take better care of their property and, thereby, improve some problem locations.[10]

---

[10] In the proposal, another stated program goal was to increase clearance rates for Part I offenses by five percent. During the implementation site visit, however, project staff were less optimistic about the likelihood that the project would have any short-term, quantifiable impacts on either crime rates or criminal investigations.

Police-Community Relations. Respondents from both the community and the Department were very vocal about the history of hostility between the police and the community. One Department official reported that in the past the LPD had "totally ignored" what the community wanted. An officer remarked that local children "are trained to hate us." A community member of the Project Committee defined the program as an effort to "re-educate the police on how to handle us." A high-ranking member of the Department defined it as an effort to "turn 'them' into 'us'."

A few district officers raised questions about the project's ability to maintain community involvement in the project, particularly given the extensive delays in implementation. One officer was particularly skeptical about the community's willingness to become involved with the police or to care about improving conditions; he believed that community residents were "afraid to help us."

Yet, on the whole, District personnel expect that, by actively soliciting community involvement in setting police priorities, the project will be able to improve relations between the police and the community. Project staff report that both police and community members on the Project Committee were surprised to discover a consensus between the two groups on the identification of priority problems in the District. It is hoped that improved communication and interaction between these groups will lead to increased community satisfaction with police services.

B. Departmental Effects

Another stated goal of COP is the efficient resolution of problems and investigation of crimes. Yet the lengthy delay in the project's efforts to introduce a split-patrol and delayed response model may have decreased expectations in this regard. A few district officers questioned the project's ability to provide sufficient coverage for the calls-for-service workload when this model is ultimately implemented. They also were skeptical about the community's willingness to accept anything other than a rapid response to calls for service.

Another, less clearly defined, potential benefit of the project for the Department itself is improved communication between individual Districts and centralized units (e.g., crime analysis, the CAD division, the Narcotics Unit). It is hoped that the increased interactions between the District and these units necessitated by the COP project will improve their working relationship.

There is currently a command-level commitment in the LPD to the expansion of innovative neighborhood-oriented policing. The BJA-funded project in the Fourth District is expected to serve as a valuable model for this anticipated expansion.

AFTERWORD

The implementation site visits conducted in the summer of 1991 were designed to permit Vera research staff to develop full descriptions of the eight INOP projects. As a group, these visits demonstrated the extreme diversity of the INOP projects in terms of the neighborhoods in which they are located, the model of community policing employed, the departmental context in which the INOP project was introduced and the approach to drug demand reduction adopted by that project.[1]

In addition to permitting full descriptions of program operations in the eight sites, the implementation site visits provided research staff with contacts with individuals who can help assemble focus groups for subsequent visits. The data assembled on these visits will also be instrumental in helping research staff design the structure and substance of focus groups and semi-structured individual interviews to be conducted during future visits.

Implementation issues. The projects differed substantially in the stage of implementation that they had reached and in the nature of the delays and/or barriers to implementation experi-

---

[1]The descriptions presented in this report are based largely on the programs' self-presentations during the implementation site visit. In large part, the individual projects took responsibility for the scheduling of interviews and events during those visits. The projects differed in terms of the comprehensiveness of their documentation and their representation of program components. Some sites kept research staff very busy and assembled large packages of program documents, press clippings and departmental reports. Other sites appeared to have far less to show.

enced. Some projects (Norfolk, New York,) had faced substantial delays and were not yet operational at the time of the implementation site visit.

> -- BJA funds for the Norfolk INOP project had not been released, pending review and approval of a revised project design, distinguishing the INOP initiative from Norfolk's citywide PACE program.
>
> -- The New York project was delayed by Departmental and City requirements related to the purchase of the vans, which will constitute the primary location for project services.

Other projects (Louisville, Hayward, Houston) had been partially implemented in spite of the fact that central program components were "on hold".

> -- In Louisville, delays in city funding for the expansion of the Department's CAD system, needed to implement the call diversion component of the INOP project, led to the postponement of a "split patrol" model. This model was expected to release District resources required for implementing strategic responses to identified problems. Yet the Louisville project had already completed a period of involving community residents in the effort to identify priority problems and was ready to design strategic responses to those problems.
>
> -- The Hayward program was delayed by complications in purchasing the van designed to house many of the project's services.
>
> -- In Houston, although various enforcement-oriented squads were actively addressing drug conditions in target areas, project funds for the "target hardening" component of the program had not been released; it was not clear whether the City or the Department was responsible for this delay. In addition, a project "truancy squad" would not be implemented until the beginning of the new school year.

Even those projects that were very close to full operations at the time of the site visit (Prince George's County, Tempe and Portland), had experienced various unanticipated difficulties in project implementation.

> -- In Prince George's County, Departmental delays in releasing project funds affected the hiring of PERF for

training and technical assistance and the purchase of motorcycles for scooter patrol. In spite of these delays, the Department began training COPS officers early in 1991 and established satellite offices in each beat shortly thereafter.

-- In Tempe, the opening of a project office in a park at the center of the target area was delayed by the need to review and comply with City code specifications. Nevertheless, the "Beat 16" squad was trained in January, conducted community surveys in February and began operations in the target area in March.

-- In Portland, project operations were somewhat delayed by the need to recruit and hire a project coordinator and the community health nurse. The project was fully operational by April.

Significant program features. Several of the individual INOP projects have salient features that distinguish them from the other projects. For example, in Norfolk the unique "top down" structure of the interagency partnerships established through the PACE program is designed to guarantee a timely, documented response from all city agencies to requests for services, regardless of their origin. The New York project is unique in its reliance upon community volunteers, providing service referrals to neighborhood residents. The Louisville project specifically allocates project funds to an extensive advertising campaign about the program itself and about drug prevention issues.

Some of the unique features of other projects are direct outgrowths of the local approach to drug demand reduction. The Houston project, for example, strongly emphasizes drug enforcement over and above other program components. In contrast, the Portland project is intensively focused on drug prevention, treatment and education, supplemented and enhanced by a variety of community services in a narrow target area. The Portland

program also features a landlord training component, designed to reduce the prevalence of drug activity on rental property.

The salient features of projects in other sites are more specifically related to that project's model of community-oriented policing. In Prince George's County, for example, the project's extensive community outreach and organization efforts, and its "beat manager" approach, are enhanced by satellite offices located in housing projects on each officers beat. Tempe, in contrast, employs a team approach to beat management, with an entire squad concentrating its efforts on one of the city's fifteen beats.

Leveraging institutional change. In the various sites, the INOP projects represented different stages in the overall development of neighborhood-oriented policing within the jurisdiction. In several of the sites (Tempe, Prince George's County, Portland, Louisville), the INOP project served as a catalyst in realizing a new Departmental objective (often introduced by a new Chief of Police) of implementing neighborhood-oriented policing. Each of these projects represents a pilot effort, designed to examine the efficacy of this approach in a narrowly defined target area. In most of these sites, efforts to expand the pilot approach beyond the target area are currently being explored.

In other sites (Norfolk, Hayward), the INOP project was not clearly delineated from the city's overall approach to new, neighborhood-oriented police initiatives. In Norfolk, this was largely because INOP funds had not been awarded by BJA at the time of the implementation site visit. Yet the delay in the

awarding of those funds was related to BJA's desire for a clearer separation between the INOP project and Norfolk's new PACE initiative. In Hayward, the lack of demarcation between the INOP project and the citywide community policing initiative is partially related to the delay in purchasing the van which will house INOP activities. In both cities, the INOP project represents a sub-component in a broader, new citywide initiative.

Finally, in other sites (New York, Houston) the INOP project represents a relatively small sub-component of well-established, large-scale, nationally recognized community policing models. In Houston, the project represents the expansion of established neighborhood-oriented drug enforcement strategies into new areas. In New York, although the project does attempt to enlist community volunteers in a new service-provision capacity, community police officers themselves are very skeptical about the project's ability to enlist volunteers or draw residents into the van. In neither site does the INOP project represent an expansion of the philosophy or a compelling new strategy in the overall approach to neighborhood-oriented policing.

Future Reports. This report is the first of three planned for the course of the INOP evaluation; because it has been produced after only three months of research project operations, it is necessarily descriptive rather than analytic. By the time the next report is produced (in August of 1992), all the INOP projects will have been operational for at least several months. In addition, the timing of the report will allow sufficient time to analyze the data more fully. This analysis will include the

interview and observational data collected during the implementation site visits, data collected by phone and mail between site visits, and data collected in the follow-up visits (to be conducted during January and February, 1992). Systematic analysis of these data will allow the August 1992 report to be more evaluative with regard to program implementation and impacts in the various sites. Similarly, the final report (December 1992) will be based on analysis of data collected in all three sets of site visits (the third set to be conducted during June and July, 1992) and on any other materials submitted by the sites.