

**STATUS REPORT TO THE INDEPENDENT MONITOR SUBMITTED BY THE  
PARTIES TO THE COLLABORATIVE AGREEMENT**

The Parties to the Collaborative Agreement, the Plaintiff Class, represented by the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Ohio; the City of Cincinnati (CPD) and the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP) (collectively referred to as “the Parties” or “the Collaborative Partners”) submit this status report to the Independent Monitor, pursuant to Collaborative Agreement, paragraph 105.

**March 5, 2005**

## Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Community Problem-Oriented Policing Strategy	4
CPOP Activities	4
Other CPD Initiatives	14
Paragraph 29 Status Update	18
Mutual Accountability Evaluation	35
Department of Justice Memorandum of Agreement	36
Fair, Equitable and Courteous Treatment	37
Citizen Complaint Authority	39
Miscellaneous	41
Appendix	42

## **INTRODUCTION**

This Report is intended to advise the Independent Monitor as to the progress that the Parties have made since the Monitor's Eighth Status Report was issued January 14, 2005. The Independent Monitor oversees implementation of both the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the City and the United States Department of Justice, and the Collaborative Agreement (CA) between the City, the ACLU, and the FOP. The MOA is appended to the CA and is enforceable solely through the mechanism of paragraph 113 of the Collaborative Agreement

The purpose of the Collaborative Agreement is to resolve conflict, to improve community-police relations, to reduce crime and disorder, to fully resolve the pending claims of all individuals and organizations named in the underlying litigation, to implement the consensus goals identified by the community through the collaborative process, and to foster an atmosphere throughout the community of mutual respect and trust among community members, including the police. The Parties recognize that there has been friction between some members of both the community and the CPD. The ultimate goal of the Agreement is to reduce that friction and foster a safer community where mutual trust and respect are enhanced among citizens and police.

Implementation will not only reform police practice, but will enhance trust, communication, and cooperation between police and the community. The City of Cincinnati continues to be enthusiastic and committed to this endeavor.

This report provides updates based on the following established committees to fully address each area stipulated in the Agreement:

- Community Problem-Oriented Policing Committee
- Mutual Accountability
- Department of Justice Memorandum of Agreement
- Fair, Equitable, and Courteous Treatment
- Citizen Complaint Authority Committee

## **I. COMMUNITY PROBLEM-ORIENTED POLICING STRATEGY**

Please see Appendix Item 1 to view a list of the current Community-Police Programs and Initiatives.

### **A. CPOP ACTIVITIES**

The following problem-solving activities are a compilation of every district's CPOP initiatives, many involving a CPOP team while others involve the community without creating a team. The initiatives involve the use of law enforcement and non-traditional activities, all which involve community participation in developing the response whether community participation came in the form of scanning and identifying a problem or analysis. Approximately 60% of the 17 problems identified in this report involve CPOP teams. As a result of the meetings facilitated by Magistrate Merz, the Parties continue to work on establishing deliverable/compliance standards for the implementation and monitoring of CPOP.

The CPD is progressing on refining the reporting process of CPOP activities. The CPD envisions a more detailed quarterly report from every district as a follow-up to the roll-out of the revised Community Problem-Solving Worksheet that went into effect January 25, 2005. The CPD is working to include aspects identified by the Monitor, specifically better documentation at the analysis phase.

The Parties continue to discuss an appropriate definition of CPOP that can be agreed upon by all members involved. A draft definition has been submitted and is currently under review by the Parties.

## **CPD PATROL BUREAU**

### **DISTRICT ONE**

Neighborhood officers continue to be involved in several community interaction activities this quarter. The activities include the Adult Senior Foster Parenting Organization, the H.O.G. (Homeless Outreach Organization), the Restock Housing-On drug dealing concerns, and the Over-the-Rhine Recreation Center.

District One resolved eight problem-solving activities during the fourth quarter. Among them are the following:

1. Case #CPOP040022: the situation at 1400 Walnut involving milk crates and chairs blocking the sidewalk was resolved after

residents of the area were asked to get involved by taking ownership of the corner.

2. Surveys were distributed to residents and police to gather comprehensive information about agencies that provide services to the community members in coordination with One City Cure Link.

## **Downtown Central Business District**

### Current Activities

- The problem of aggressive panhandling, trespassing and overall blight was identified in and around expressway underpasses. District One officers and outreach workers from the CPPC responded by offering services to those found under the bridges. Services included housing, mental health services, and job skills training. An on-site clean-up was conducted by inmates from the Queen City Correctional Facility and the City of Cincinnati Public Services Department. No Trespassing signs were also posted to deter any future encampments.

Assessment is on-going as officers continue to work with the Homeless Coalition and Downtown Council, Incorporated (D.C.I) to find the most compassionate strategy to accomplish this community problem.

## **Over the Rhine (OTR)**

### Current Activities

- Business and Outreach organizations observed escalating violence associated with increased drug trafficking at 1200 Republic Street. Officers researched calls for service to the area involving drugs and runs for shots fired.

The Neighborhood Officer responded by forming a CPOP team to coordinate a cooperation between the business and community organizations in the area. Three street fairs were held at 1200 Republic Street to disrupt drug trafficking, a sign was posted announcing “No Drugs Sold Here”, and better lighting was installed.

## **Pendleton**

### Current Activities

- As noted in previous reports, stakeholders from the Pendleton neighborhood recognized an increase in street level drug sales at 600 Reading Road. A CPOP team was formed and City Traffic

Engineering was included to respond to the problem. A temporary interruption of vehicular traffic was implemented utilizing a barricade to disrupt traffic entering the Pendleton community from Reading Road to East 13<sup>th</sup> Street.

The University of Cincinnati Criminal Justice Program assisted in assessing the problem and the utilization of the barricade. An evaluation was released in January 2005 to document the impact on crime in Pendleton.

See Appendix Item 2 to view the report.

## **West End**

### Current Activities

- Increases in drug abuse, sales, prostitution, illegal dumping, and loitering have been observed by business owners and police alike at 547 Findlay Street. Overgrown weeds and litter have contributed to the increase of criminal activity. The police responded by contacting the owner of the lot, the media, the West End Business Community Council, the Dayton Street Association, Urban Forestry, and the Juvenile Work Detail of Hamilton County. A member of the CPPC contacted Urban Forestry to trim the trees on the lot. As of the release of this report, there has been no action taken in response to the trees.

## **DISTRICT TWO**

### **Madisonville**

#### Current Activities

- Neighborhood officers continue to work with the community to combat the problem of youths loitering at 5810 Madison Road. While the problem still plagues the community, the CPOP team in Madisonville met to initiate more response from business owners as well as the owner of the plaza lot. They intend, with their cooperation, “No Loitering” signs will be posted along storefronts and in the parking lot. A draft letter has also been proposed to address trespassing issues as well as follow-up criminal prosecution for violators.

## **California**

### Current Activities

- A problem reported during the third quarter at 5993 Linneman Street is currently being assessed. Residents of the neighborhood complained of excessive noise, public intoxication, and disorder at the Riverstar Ballpark. Due to the seasonal nature of the complaint, accurate assessment will not be available until the new season in spring 2005.

### **DISTRICT THREE**

Community members in District Three have volunteered for the Court Watch Program, a program designed to allow citizens to track those accused of committing crimes as well as communicate the impact that criminal behavior has had on their community, Block Watch, and Citizens on Patrol. Members from both East and West Price Hill groups are working together in an effort to secure grants from the Safe and Clean Act.

## **Lower Price Hill**

### Current Activities

- Neighborhood officers are addressing a problem at 660 Neave Street. Residents in the neighborhood identified loitering as a problem at this location. This problem was reported last quarter while in the analysis phase of SARA. Community residents found used drug paraphernalia, an increase in vehicular and pedestrian traffic, and noticed more litter in the area as a result of this problem. Officers also identified drug sales and prostitution at this location. Reports of damaged property were received and calls for disorderly conduct involving adults and juveniles. Officers are now in the response phase and have conducted directed patrols in the neighborhood and formed a neighborhood walk which drew 42 residents.
- Problems in the area also included abandoned and vacant buildings. The Buildings and Inspections Department was contacted to board up target homes. Response was prompt and the problem resolved.
- In the same area, the CPD responded to several robberies primarily involving the Hispanic community. Officers responded, in conjunction with the Santa Maria Community Center and US Bank, to better educate the Hispanic residents in managing money. A representative

from US Bank explained the benefits of opening bank accounts versus carrying large sums of cash. As a result, the problem has dissipated.

A CPOP team was formed in the area to assist in combating community complaints by acquiring more adequate lighting for the area as well as additional stop signs in the neighborhood.

- A problem reported at 2360 Wilder Avenue during the third quarter has progressed into the assessment phase of SARA. Residents in the area identified loitering as a problem and felt intimidated by subjects who were blocking the sidewalk. After careful analysis, the neighborhood officer and members of the community discovered the problem occurred during the evening rush hour and late at night. The majority of those who felt intimidated were members of the Hispanic community. The neighborhood officer attended several community meetings in an attempt to gain resident involvement. Information was gained that the problem appeared to stem from tenants residing at the location. Fortunately, those tenants moved and the problem has been resolved.

## **South Fairmount**

### Current Activities

- Stakeholders in this neighborhood called in several complaints of loitering and blocked sidewalks at 1871 Westwood Avenue. The neighborhood officer worked with the Sanitation Department to clean up and remove the garbage. Shrubs were cut back and lighting in the area was serviced to deter individuals from hanging out in the area. As a result, the problem has been resolved.

## **DISTRICT FOUR**

## **Avondale**

### Current Activities

- Neighborhood officers were made aware of a problem at Burnet Avenue and Rockdale Avenue by complaints from citizens of drug sales and loitering. Further analysis of calls for service, crime analysis data, field observation, and stakeholder information was done. Officers responded by coordinating efforts with the district's Violent Crimes Task Force to initiate covert operations in the area.



The management company of 353 Rockdale Avenue was contacted and asked to provide a Permission of Agent letter as well as an updated tenant roster to assist in combating the problem. The neighborhood officer and a representative from Local Initiative Support Coordination are currently organizing a Blockwatch for the area.

## **Bond Hill**

### Current Activities

- Safety issues have arisen in the rear parking lot of 4916 Reading Road because of drug activity at that location. Residents, concerned with the negative image that accompanies loitering, complained to neighborhood officers. Officers analyzed the problem by tracking the number of calls for service to the location. Complaints included not only drug activity but alcohol sales to minors as well.

A CPOP team was formed to implement a response. “No Trespassing” signs were posted, shrubbery was cut away, and Cinergy was contacted to install additional lighting. Complainants were satisfied with the response and the issue has been resolved.

The team is currently assessing the problem to keep track should the situation come up again.

## **Hartwell**

### Current Activities

- Calls for service and citizens’ complaints of garage burglaries increased in the neighborhood of Hartwell. The neighborhood officer initiated a neighborhood notification to advise residents to secure their garages. Efforts have also been coordinated to implement undercover surveillance in the area.

This project is currently in the assessment phase of SARA.

## **Mount Auburn**

### Current Activities

- Several burglaries have been reported in the neighborhood of Mt. Auburn as well as several reports of thefts from autos. The neighborhood officers are currently responding to the problems through a number of methods. Safety talks on home safety have been

held, organized walks through the neighborhood have been conducted, directed patrols and covert surveillance are in place, and crime prevention surveys have been distributed.

## **DISTRICT FIVE**

### **Northside**

#### **Current Activities**

- A CPOP case originally reported last quarter concerning vacant/abandoned buildings at Fergus Street and Apjones Street is in the response phase of SARA. In addition to efforts made as of last quarter, the CPOP team has organized a street cleaning and a ‘meet and greet’ in an effort to get more involvement and buy-in from those living on Fergus Street. The team also drafted a letter to send to the owners of the properties on Fergus that are either vacant, abandoned, or being used as rental property inviting these owners to actively participate in the problem-solving process.

### **College Hill**

#### **Current Activities**

- The neighborhood officer received numerous complaints during community council and business association meetings from residents concerned with possible animal abuse/neglect at 5751 Hamilton Avenue. The situation drew attention because of the strong odor of dog feces and incessant barking from pit bulls.

The College Hill CPOP team, working with the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCA), attempted to make contact with the owner without success. The next step has been to draft a letter to be mailed to the owner of the property relaying their concerns.

- The CPOP team is currently assessing their response to complaints of pit bull dogs being housed at 7647 Knollwood Lane. Concerns arose after an odor of dog feces was detected and complaints of constant barking were received.

The CPOP team included the Health Department, Buildings and Inspections, the SPCA, and the Law Department to assist in combating the problem.

The owner of the property has been convicted of violations relating to the possession of the dogs. The dogs have been removed from the premises and the owner has agreed to not own or possess any dogs at this location for a period of two years. This agreement will be monitored for compliance by the neighborhood officer and affected residents of Knollwood Lane.

### **Citizens on Patrol Program**

The Cincinnati “Citizens on Patrol” Program (COPP) was proposed by several Cincinnati City Council members in 1997. The responsibility for developing the program is assigned to the COP Coordinator. The responsibility for administering and coordinating the neighborhood-based program is assigned to the District Commanders.

As of February 2005, there are 8550 trained members of which 500 are active members in 25 units patrolling throughout the 52 neighborhoods of the City of Cincinnati.

#### COPP Statistics:

The program has held four successful COPP Academies in 2004, 171 new members have joined the program with new units in the Downtown Business District, Lunken Airport, Over-the-Rhine and Mt. Auburn.

In October, 180 Citizens on Patrol members attended the yearly in-service training and awards program held at Xavier University’s Schiff Family Center. Key to the training was a Homeland Security training course put on by the Tactical Planning Unit and a presentation put on by Tri-State RCPI on Volunteers in Policing (VIPS).

Four COPPs Units were recognized for having completed five years in the program. Eighteen citizens were presented with plaques honoring their dedication over the preceding twelve months.

The Cincinnati Police Department also fields volunteers in the following capacities:

1. Volunteer Surveillance Team
2. Desk Officer Assistant
3. Support Drivers

As we roll into 2005 we anticipate completing training of members from Evanston and Lower Price Hill. We have several residents trained in these neighborhoods and anticipate their involvement in 2005.

**Alarm Reduction Unit**

In 2003, 30,000 false alarms cost taxpayers more than \$500,000 and diverted much needed resources from other public safety response activity. After analyzing the reoccurring situation, as previously reported, the False Alarm Reduction Unit was formed to address the issue. Alarms continued to decrease this quarter. November produced 730 calls, a 31.47% decrease; December produced 265 calls, a 12.74% decrease; and January produced 468 calls, a decrease of 22%. Overall, the total reduction for 2004 was 22.15% or 6,427 from last year.

**CPD INVESTIGATIVE BUREAU**

**Community Response Teams (CRTs)**

The CPD conducted a Community Response Team effort this quarter. The CRTs continue to specifically address criminal activity, victimization, and community concerns of crime in affected neighborhoods. Targeted areas of enforcement included the following communities as well as the number of arrests made in that area:

<u>Community</u>	<u>Number of Arrests</u>
• Avondale	13
• Bond Hill	0
• Camp Washington	1
• Clifton	3
• College Hill	5
• Corryville	4
• CUF	5
• Cumminsville	7
• Downtown	1
• East End	0
• Evanston	2
• Fairmount	0
• Kennedy Heights	3
• Madisonville	11
• Mt. Airy	2
• Mt. Washington	1
• Northside	8

- Over-the-Rhine 57
- Pendleton 0
- Pleasant Ridge 2
- Price Hill 13
- Roselawn 4
- Walnut Hills 16
- West End 14
- Westwood 9
- Winton Place 0
- Winton Terrace 4

<u>Arrest Information</u>	<u>Jan. 25</u>	<u>Jan. 26</u>	<u>Total</u>
Adult Felony	24	39	63
Adult Misdemeanor	60	46	106
Juvenile Felony	5	2	7
Juvenile Misdemeanor	4	5	9
<b>Total</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>185</b>
Prostitution Arrests (included in Misdemeanor Total)	9	8	17

**Seizures**

Crack Cocaine (gms)	31.88	32.52	64.40
Powder Cocaine (gms)	5.5	729.03	734.53
Marijuana (gms)	1108.8	714.47	1823.27
Heroin (gms)	7.84	15.85	23.69
Pharmaceutical Pills	0	4	4
Firearms Recovered	3	3	6
Vehicles Recovered	4	1	5
Search Warrants	1	1	2
Currency	\$970	\$4,235	\$5,205

See Appendix Item 3 to view the CRT statistics for 2003 and 2004.

**Robbery Task Force (2004 – 2005)**

The 2004 Robbery Task Force initiative began on November 14, 2004 and concluded January 8, 2005. The process used during the operation included Scanning, Analysis, Response, and Assessment (SARA).

See Appendix Item 4 to view the Final Report.

## B. OTHER CPD INITIATIVES

In addition to the CPOP problems identified by community stakeholders and residents, the CPD in District Two have addressed other community related issues specific to each shift and unit. First shift officers conducted targeted enforcement in November and December 2004 for Daytime Curfew and Truancy. The following are the results from both months:

	<b>Daytime Curfew</b>	<b>Truancy</b>
<b>November 2004</b>	28	9
<b>December 2004</b>	11	5

District Two's beat officers, bike patrol, and neighborhood officers targeted pedestrian and littering violations at two specific corners in the Evanston area: St. Ledger Place at Woodburn Avenue and Clarion Avenue at Montgomery Road. The goal is to gather information on a monthly basis and identify potential hot spots in the community.

The following are the results from November and December 2004:

	<b>Pedestrian Violations</b>	<b>Littering Violations</b>
<b>November 2004</b>	1	0
<b>December 2004</b>	0	0

District Two continues to practice a strict enforcement policy for potential DUI offenders. The goal of the project is to reduce the number of auto accidents that arise as a result of the criminal nature of drunken driving.

The following are the results of their enforcement:

	November 2004	December 2004
Number of DUI Arrests	17	10
Year to Date	161	171

The investigative unit at District Two implemented a project to reduce the number of auto thefts by ensuring that all shifts receive training on preservation of crime scenes. Since the project and training began in January 2004, 112 officers have been trained and auto thefts have decreased 15% by December 2004.

## District Two Violent Crimes Task Force

The VCS began a project in January 2004 in an effort to confiscate and potentially eliminate guns from District Two. The goal was to reduce the number of violent criminal offenses occurring by confiscating at least ten guns a month as a District.

The following are their results:

	Number of Guns Confiscated
November 2004	5
December 2004	16
Year to Date	106

## **TRAINING SECTION**

### **Police Academy**

“The Citizen Police Academy (CPA) is an instructional program designed to provide the Cincinnati Citizen with an understanding of the science and art of policing. The comprehensive program is designed to provide information on the law enforcement industry and its government principles.

The CPA will expose citizens to a number of current law enforcement issues and the latest Cincinnati Police Department procedures.”<sup>1</sup>

#### November 2004

- Thirty six community residents graduated from the Citizens Police Academy.
- Members of the Youth Services Section and the Academy hosted a Youth and Violence Seminar for 110 adult and youth members of Harmony School.
- Thirty-nine members of Bethlehem Temple Church attended a Firearms and Training System (FATS) training/demonstration.
- Eighteen officers attended Customer Service Skills Training.
- Sixty-one officers attended Peer Support Training.

#### December 2004

- Fifty-one SWAT team members received Mental Health Response Team (MHRT) Training.
- Seventeen officers attended Ethics Training.
- Seventeen officers attended Customer Service Skills Training.
- Thirty-two citizens graduated from Citizen on Patrol Training.
- Thirty-nine officers attended Citizen Observer Training.
- A new police recruit class began.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.cincinnati-oh.gov/police/pages/-5410-/>

- Management Training for all supervisors concluded.
- Firearms qualifications at the target range concluded.

#### January 2005

- Thirty citizens began classes for Mental Health Professionals.
- Spanish for law enforcement and fire began.
- Six officers attended Citizen Observer Training.
- Eleven officers attended Problem-Solving Training with Community leaders.
- Twenty-five members of the Youth Civil Air Patrol attended a FATS demonstration.
- In-service Training for police officers and specialists began.

See Appendix Item 5 to view the agenda for 2004-2005 In-Service Training for Supervisors and Officers and the Management Training Agenda.

#### **Youth Services Section and the DARE Unit**

YSS and DARE continually receive requests for police appearances by their officers. The reporting period for the fourth quarter was no different and the following is a list of such requests:

#### November 2004

- Specialist Eric Smoot was asked to conduct a gang presentation for Security Assistants at the Education Center.
- An Adjunct Professor at Cincinnati State Technical and Community College requested an officer to speak on Youth and Gang Violence.
- Harmony School requested a representation by Specialist Smoot to address Gangs, Drugs, and Violence.

#### December 2004

- The CPD participated in a school program hosted by Xavier University students that included a presentation on Gang and Drug Prevention.
- Specialist Smoot and Officer Forte presented a Drug Use and Abuse Among Youth presentation to a group of nurses.

#### **Citizen Observer**

In January, the CPD introduced CitizenObserver.com, a communication tool that allows users to receive instant updates on crimes occurring in their neighborhood and throughout the city directly to their email, cell phone, pager and/or fax.



## **Off the Streets Policy Team**

The *Off the Streets Policy Team* was introduced in our last status update. The objective of this program is to explore best practices and plan creative intervention/diversion strategies for women arrested/charged/convicted with solicitation/prostitution in Hamilton County.

The Off the Streets Project has scheduled a visit in March by representatives of the Standing Against Global Exploitation (SAGE) Program from San Francisco. They will come to Cincinnati to offer workshops on topics related to addressing street level prostitution. Additionally, a group of Off the Streets Project participants will travel to San Francisco (tentatively scheduled for May) to observe first hand how the SAGE Program works.

“The Standing Against Global Exploitation Project—or the SAGE Project—is a nonprofit organization with one primary aim: bringing an end to the commercial sexual exploitation of children and adults (CSE/CSEC). We at SAGE contribute to that goal by raising awareness about CSE/CSEC issues, and by providing outreach and services to CSE/CSEC survivors.

SAGE is a unique collaboration between law enforcement, public health, social services, and private agencies. Our approach is collaborative as well as prevention and solution oriented; it's about restorative justice that benefits individual communities and the whole of our society.

SAGE is also unique in that it is one of the few organizations that was created by and for CSE/CSEC survivors. Within our various programs, we work with several hundred women and girls per week, and advocate for many more in our awareness-raising efforts. SAGE programs are also replicated by other organizations, with expert guidance from SAGE staff members.

The personal knowledge and experience possessed by many on the SAGE team enables us to effectively provide support and engender trust without re-traumatizing even the most fragile of clients. This survivor-centered perspective also makes SAGE a valuable resource for legislators, those in law enforcement, and others interested in bringing an end to commercial sexual exploitation.”<sup>2</sup>

See Appendix Item 6 to view the minutes from the October Meeting.

---

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.sageprojectinc.org/html/about\\_vision.htm](http://www.sageprojectinc.org/html/about_vision.htm)

## C. PARAGRAPH 29 PROGRESS UPDATE

*Item 29(a). The City, in consultation with the other Parties, shall develop and implement a plan to coordinate City departments with the CPOP focus of the CPD.*

### **Monitor's Previous Assessment**

“In a number of prior Reports we expected the Parties to report on the quality, timeliness, and results of interagency collaboration vis-à-vis the projects undertaken by the pilot CPOP teams (e.g., Are inter-agency liaisons responding in a timely way? How long does it take to board-up a problem property? Has the Health Department been responsive in a timely way to problem properties with health code violations? In what ways have CPD officers relied on the Community Development and Planning Agency? Should the City try to enlist certain County service deliverers such as Social Services?). The Parties have not reported on the effectiveness of the liaison system in addressing CPOP problems.”

“The Monitor's concern is that the City has not yet reported how well the initial system worked in support of CPOP. It is now not clear what will remain of that system, and how the incorporation of other City agencies into the same system will impact CPOP requests.”

### **Status Update**

Extensive work is currently underway with the Collaborative Agreement stakeholders on the definition and implementation of CPOP. The CA Parties' final definition of CPOP will inform an updated structure for City department participation in CPOP. In the meantime, we are addressing improved communication which supports CPOP among the CPD, the CPPC and City staff. The executed CPOP Action Plan, June 19, 2003, has been provided to the department staff on the CPOP Integration Team as background to increase their understanding of CPOP and its original implementation strategy. The City of Cincinnati Department Guide was provided to CPD neighborhood sergeants and officers to increase their understanding of existing City resources that are in place to address CPOP issues. There are plans to post this Department Guide on the City's web site to provide both City staff and citizens with current information. Currently, CPD, Fire, Buildings and Inspections and Health departments work together in comprehensive code enforcement of specific locations working with neighborhood residents to mediate blight, crime and disorder problems.

The Partnering Center's Executive Director serves on the Code Enforcement Task force which is developing new resources to address quality of life issues in Cincinnati neighborhoods. These new resources include a Citizen's Guide to Community Action: Addressing Nuisance Complaints and Neighborhood Blight.

There is also a proposed Neighborhood Quality of Life Unified Code designed to grant common enforcement authority on selected quality of life issues to key enforcement agencies. Discussions continue on ways to improve the effectiveness of electronic data management and sharing. Recommendations on ways to more effectively and comprehensively integrate CPOP into City service delivery will utilize existing organizational resources.

See Appendix Item 7 to view the City of Cincinnati Department Guide, PowerPoint presentation from *Keep Cincinnati Beautiful* on the Blight Index, and the Citizen's Guide to Community Action.

*Item 29(b), the Parties shall develop and implement a system for regularly researching and making available to the public a comprehensive library of best practices in community problem-oriented policing.*

#### **Monitor's Previous Assessment**

"To simplify the site for users the Parties may want to consider organizing the "best practices" publications into two broad categories within the "best practices" tab: (1) Reducing Crime and Other Public Safety Problems; and (2) Community Building and Partnering. This will need to be updated if new, relevant publications become available."

#### **Status Update**

Thirty-four problem-solving guides are posted on the CPOP website. Thirty additional publications describing "best practices" in Community Oriented Policing, Problem-Oriented Policing, problem solving, community surveying, crime prevention and community building have also been posted. These publications have also been provided to the Hamilton County Public Library for posting to their website in April. These postings will coincide with a public campaign to provide resource information to citizens interested in neighborhood problem-solving efforts that address crime and disorder. Further, a list of six books about Problem Oriented Policing and related topics have been provided to library staff for acquisition and subsequent use by library users.

*Item 29(c). The City, in consultation with the Parties, shall develop a process to document and disseminate problem-solving learning experiences throughout the Police Department and the public.*

### **Monitor's Previous Assessment**

“Under Section 29(c), experiences with problem-solving should be documented and disseminated. The descriptions of the efforts are important for purposes of modeling; they provide concrete examples of what is expected of employees under the CA. Effective descriptions of problem solving also help residents of Cincinnati by creating a knowledge base of what different neighborhoods in their city have done and whether it has worked (or has not worked) to reduce crime or other public safety problems.”

“This CA section also requires that the CPD emphasize problem solving in training. It does not appear that problem solving is emphasized in the Academy, in in-service training, in field officer training or in field officer supervisors’ training.”

“Ongoing training required under this CA section can also be crafted around the “best practices” identified on the CPD’s CPOP website.”

“The Monitor Team has found that additional training emphasizing problem solving is needed, even for the CPOP officers. Some of the CPOP supervisors appear proficient in community policing, but less so in problem-oriented policing, putting them at a disadvantage in participating in or coaching problem solving.”

“The Partnering Center proposed that neighborhood officers participate with CPPC outreach workers in joint training to sharpen their understanding of problem-solving and fine-tune their presentation skills. Moreover, training for the rest of the department in problem-solving should be ongoing, and should be integrated with different curricula, whether it is training for narcotics officers, field trainers, vice, traffic, property or personal crime investigators, etc.”

### **Status Update**

The Community Police Partnering Center has offered to provide a two day training seminar in mid-March to Cincinnati Police Officers in tandem with CPPC staff. The training will be presented by Gary W. Cordner, Ph.D., Department of Criminal Justice and Police Studies, Eastern Kentucky University, and Gregory Saville, Criminologist and Urban Planner Senior Partner, Alternation LLC.

This training will focus on the application of Problem Oriented Policing, situational crime prevention, and crime prevention through environmental design principles.

See Appendix Item 8 to view a copy of the training agenda.

During the months of November, December and January, CPD conducted its annual management training for all personnel at the ranks of sergeant, lieutenant and captain. As a component of that training, Lieutenant Larry Powell presented an overview of Community Problem-Oriented Policing. The presentation emphasized the goals of the Collaborative Agreement, the elements of community policing versus problem-oriented policing, and the SARA model.

See Appendix Item 9 to view a hardcopy of the PowerPoint presentation.

*Item 29 (d), The Parties shall research best practices and unsuccessful methods of problem-solving used by other professionals (e.g. conflict resolution, organizational development, epidemiology, military, civil engineering and business).*

**Monitor’s Previous Assessment**

“The intent of this section is to have the Parties look outside the CPD’s existing approaches to reducing crime and safety problems to those efforts employing a problem-oriented policing approach, and to disseminate these widely within the organization (not just to make them available). Doing so will help build the CPD’s capacity to engage in community problem-oriented policing. As the Monitor Team has noted before, 29(b), 29(c) and 29(d) are closely tied, and these and other CA sections are meant as ways to ensure that the CPD adopts CPOP as its principal strategy to reduce crime and disorder in Cincinnati.”

**Status Update**

See response to Item 29(b).

*Item 29(e). The Parties, consistent with the Community Partnering Program, shall conduct CPOP training for community groups, jointly promote CPOP and implement CPOP training.*

**Monitor’s Previous Assessment**

“The third quarter involved less training than the prior two quarters; however, neighborhood training will resume in the spring.”

## **Status Update**

During this reporting period, the Community Police Partnering Center (CPPC) devised a Neighborhood Training Schedule that will be jointly facilitated by the CPD and the CPPC beginning in the spring of 2005. The schedule prioritizes neighborhoods where no CPOP team is currently active, and includes neighborhoods where new stakeholders have expressed an interest in receiving SARA or other problem-solving trainings. This schedule was approved by the CA CPOP Working Committee on January 20, 2005.

As part of the upcoming training schedule, the Center has begun to develop new problem-specific curriculums based on the SARA model. The first such training, titled "Citizens Response to Open-Air Drug Markets", was developed for and presented at the 3<sup>rd</sup> Annual Neighborhood Summit, held February 5, 2005 at the Cintas Center at Xavier University. This training was presented to 53 citizens and jointly facilitated by the CPD's District Two Captain Michael Cureton and CPPC Outreach Worker Amy Krings.

The Citizens' Response to Open-Air Drug Markets, which lists "Drug Prevention and Treatment" as one example of a response to drug markets, will be particularly useful to new CPOP participants in Kennedy Heights, Madisonville and Lower Price Hill. These three communities are participating in the "25 Cities Initiative", a plan to engage local officials and concerned citizens in each city to identify substance abuse problems, and ways to solve and prevent them.

The Neighborhood Summit also featured a "CPOP Best Practices" forum, which highlighted the problem-solving successes of CPOP teams in Bond Hill (District 4) and Northside (District 5). This panel was moderated by CPPC and included five citizens currently involved in CPOP efforts in their community.

Additional problem-specific trainings are being developed by the CPPC and the CPD staff for use in 2005.

At the request of the Pendleton Community, District 1 Sgt. Maris Herold and CPPC Senior Outreach Worker Madeline Moxley jointly conducted SARA training in that neighborhood on January 19, 2005. Since that time, the Pendleton group has convened to discuss the efficacy of keeping the street barrier at 13<sup>th</sup> Street and Reading Road and to begin the SARA process to address the issue of problem-displacement as a result of the street closure. Partnering Center staff will continue to work with these residents.

The Pendleton training was the only CPD and CPPC jointly facilitated training during this reporting period. Other activity during this reporting period involved CPD & CPPC staff working together to supporting active and developing CPOP teams in their problem-solving efforts. Currently, there are 31 neighborhoods with CPOP efforts underway. At last count, 19 of these teams were considered

“active” CPOP teams. CPPC and CPD are working together to bring “active” CPOP team lists up-to-date, and ensure that all necessary documentation has been done.

See Appendix Items 10 AND 12 to view the 2005 Neighborhood Training Schedule, the current CPOP Committee members, and a current list of CPOP teams.

*Item 29(f). The Parties shall coordinate efforts through the Community Partnership Program to establish an ongoing community dialogue and interaction including youth, property owners, businesses, tenants, community and faith-based organizations, motorists, low-income residents and other City residents on the purposes and practices of CPOP.*

#### **Monitor’s Previous Assessment**

“The Monitor recommends additional CPOP forums, including discussion of the CA and the MOA, use of force, vehicle stop study, as well as CPOP. The Monitor would like to see a coordinated plan outlining community forums to discuss the issues that brought the Parties initially to the table. These include fair and equitable policing, police use of force and alternatives to use of force, police response to the mentally ill, and police response to those under the influence of drugs and alcohol.”

“The Parties, through the Partnering Center, are to develop ongoing community dialogue and interaction for CPD with youth, property owners, businesses, tenants, community and faith-based organizations, motorists, low income residents and other City residents on the purposes and practices of CPOP. More of these types of events and others tailored to the different groups should be jointly promoted.”

#### **Status Update**

The Plaintiffs have accepted the responsibility to take the lead on implementing actions necessary for compliance. As of this report period, the Plaintiffs have nothing to report.

*Item 29(g). The Parties shall establish an annual award recognizing CPOP efforts of citizens, police, and other public officials.*

### **Monitor's Previous Assessment**

“The rolling out of joint CPOP training took precedence over the awards process, so the Parties and communities would have the skills to address problems. With 19 active CPOP neighborhood teams, an awards ceremony will be a timely addition by recognizing the committed efforts of those engaged in problem-solving.”

### **Status Update**

At the last meeting of the CPOP Awards Committee, held February 3, 2005, it was determined that an event planner was needed to plan the details of the actual Awards Ceremony. The committee decided that funding for the planner would come from one source; however, part of the duties of the planner would be to solicit funds for the event itself, with direction from the committee about possible funding sources. Several potential event planners were discussed.

It was agreed that a non-profit organization, such as the Greater Cincinnati Foundation, should be approached about handling all fund raising and expenses related to the Awards Ceremony.

The projected date for the awards ceremony is September 2005. The committee outlined the criteria necessary for CPOP projects to be worthy of an award, and agreed that the ceremony itself should be worthy of the effort the communities have put in to their various CPOP efforts.

Flyers about the CPOP Awards were included in the packet to over 500 citizens who attended the February 5th Neighborhood Summit (see Appendix Item 13).

Partnering Center's newly-hired Community Analyst has begun to analyze police data and environmental surveys, along with citizen surveys from past CPOP projects and compare data from before and after CPOP interventions. Based on this analysis, teams whose responses had a significant impact in reducing, eliminating or better managing crime and disorder problems, will be encouraged to submit a proposal for a CPOP Award.



*Item 29(h). The City, in consultation with the Parties, shall develop and implement a system for consistently informing the public about police policies and procedures. In addition, the City will conduct a communications audit and develop and implement a plan for improved internal and external communications.*

**Monitor's Previous Assessment**

“The City conducted a communications audit, but has not yet developed and implemented a plan for improved internal and external communications.”

**Status Update**

In November 2004, the CPD met with representatives from the National Conference for Community and Justice (NCCJ), as well as, associates from Hollister, Trubow and Associates (HTA), the communications/marketing consultant that prepared the Communications Audit.

Following the City Council's approval to accept the “loaned executive” to serve as a community relations coordinator, a communications council was established consisting of representatives from the NCCJ, HTA, Police Relations Section, Public Information Office and Community Oriented Policing. The Council has met to finalize this position's role between the CPD and the community. A contract and scope of services was developed and agreed to between the CPD and the NCCJ in December 2004. The contract is currently under review by the NCCJ and should be finalized by the end of the first quarter. A job description will be posted following contract finalization.

See Appendix Item 14 to view the job description.

*Item 29(i). The CPD will create and staff a Community Relations Unit.*

**Monitor's Previous Assessment**

“The addition of an officer (PO Mary K. Werner) to CRU is a positive development and we look forward to working with her.”

**Status Update**

The Police Relations Unit continues to work effectively with the CPD and city personnel, plaintiffs' representatives, the CPPC director and staff, and the monitoring team to manage/coordinate resources to implement the terms of the CA, as well as the MOA. In addition, S. Gregory Baker, Executive Manager of

Police Relations, is a member of the CPPC Board of Directors and participates on several board committees.

During the past quarter, P.O. Mary K. Werner, of the Police Relations Unit revised the CPOP Problem-Solving Worksheet (see paragraph 29 k) and has assisted in managing the implementation of the recommendations contained within the Communications Audit (see paragraph 29 h).

See Appendix Item 15 for the Steering Committee agenda and minutes.

*Item 29(j). The Parties shall describe the current status of problem-solving throughout the CPD via an annual report. Each party shall provide details on what it has done in relating to its role in CPOP.*

**Monitor's Previous Assessment**

“The Parties have been in compliance with this section of the CA for two consecutive annual deadlines.”

**Status Update**

The Parties have nothing to report since the completion of the 2003-2004 report.

*Item 29(k). The CPD Commanders shall prepare quarterly reports that detail problem-solving activities within the Districts. Reports shall identify specific problems and steps taken by the City and community toward their resolution. Reports shall identify obstacles faced and recommendations for the future. Reports should be available to the public through the Community Relations Unit.*

**Monitor's Previous Assessment**

“Unit Commander quarterly reports are to detail problem-solving efforts. Some of the efforts were highly consistent with problem-solving; others were less so. Also, there were some units whose commanders did not submit quarterly reports. We look forward to viewing the revised unit commander quarterly reports.”

**Status Update**

A revised form of the Community Problem Solving Worksheet was submitted and approved by the CPD command staff, the CPPC, and the Neighborhood units in each district. The form became effective January 25, 2005 and is being utilized by all members involved in implementing CPOP. A more detailed description of the

SARA process as it applies to community problems should be reflected in June's status report. Stemming from the meeting facilitated by Magistrate Merz, the Parties are working to develop a CPOP case reporting process that includes some level of involvement/notification of the CPPC. The District Commander's Quarterly Reports will continue to reflect the detailed problem-solving efforts in each neighborhood.

To view the revised form, see Appendix Item 16.

*Item 29(l). The Parties shall review existing Police Academy courses and recommend new ones in order to effectively and accurately inform police recruits, officers, and supervisors about the urban environment in which they work.*

#### **Monitor's Previous Assessment**

"The Plaintiffs have been denied access to review police training. As the FOP still has the opportunity to review Academy courses, we encourage the FOP to suggest any modifications or new courses that would help the CPD officers better prepare for policing in an urban environment."

#### **Status Update**

The Fraternal Order of Police suggests the following training implementation as well as suggestions with respect to data collection and analysis:

1. With respect to training for the entire department, as well as recruits, more emphasis should be placed on informing members of the CPD of the liabilities they face when they are named as defendants in their individual capacities, as well as their right to legal representation from outside the City Solicitor's office. This training should be conducted by attorneys who are not city employees in order to assure that matters of conflict of interest are fully disclosed.
2. If there should be any changes made to the current procedure involving the use of tasers, there should be full training on those changes before the new procedure goes into effect. Again, there should be training in the risks involved in the use of the taser in a manner contrary to the new procedure, which should include legal liability. The legal aspect of the training should be conducted by attorneys who are not city employees.
3. With respect to data collection and analysis, surveys of police officers and the community should include questions relating to both satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the Citizen Complaint Authority investigations. It is not appropriate to conduct surveys relating solely to investigations by the CPD. Officers and citizens alike should be permitted to express their opinions relative to ALL INVESTIGATIVE AGENCIES.

4. More training should be directed toward search and seizure, as well as when it is appropriate to charge a person with Disorderly Conduct and Obstruction of Official Business. The number of lawsuits against the police with respect to improper investigations and arrests involving those three areas reflect a need for more specialized training.

On January 4, 2005, the CPD received a request from one of the Plaintiffs' representatives requesting a copy of the new academy training schedule. The CPD fulfilled the request on January 6, 2005 via email. The Plaintiffs have nothing further to report.

*Item 29(m). The Parties, in conjunction with the Monitor, shall develop and implement a problem-tracking system.*

#### **Monitor's Previous Assessment**

"Improvements to the problem tracking system will be a positive advance. Once the Parties collaborate on this improvement, we recommend that they share their draft for an improved tracking system with the Monitor. The Monitor will determine compliance when the new system is up and running."

(The following comments were made in previous reports from the Monitor as suggestions for the problem-tracking system. We address them here in recognition of those suggestions.)

#### **From the Monitor's Report: January 2004**

"In the Scanning menu, several additional reporting fields would be useful:

- The type of property where the problem is occurring (e.g., a convenience store, gas station, a privately owned apartment building)
- The type of place the problem is occurring (e.g., the sidewalk in front of the property, inside the property, behind the property, in the property's parking lot)
- The name of the owner(s) of the property
- The property manager (if any) of the property
- Contact information for the owner and the property manager

Throughout the tracking report are boxes titled "comments." For the most part, these are left blank or the information in them is very generic. Changing the title of these boxes to "Give Specifics" or "Provide Examples" may guide users to input more solid evidence, increasing the likelihood of quality problem solving.

We also note here that the website should reflect the collaborative nature of the CA. The website's home page has several statements about CPOP and its goals

that should be more inclusive, to match the goals of the CA. For example, the website homepage, as of January 1, 2004, states:

- “The goal is to form working partnerships between residents and the City of Cincinnati under the direction of the Cincinnati Police Department.”
- “City employees and the community work together, under the direction of the Cincinnati Police utilizing a consistent process of Scanning, Analysis, Response and Assessment (SARA) to resolve problems.”

In each case, the Parties may want to reference the Partnering Center and the Parties to the CA.”

#### From the Monitor’s Report: April 2004

“A further suggestion is that once inside the tracking system and viewing a case, the reader should be able to go directly from one part of a CPOP case section to another. For instance, when the reader reaches the end of the scanning section in a CPOP case, the reader should be able to click on a tab to immediately take the reader to Analysis 1; when in Analysis 1 the reader should be able to click a tab to go to Analysis 2; when in Analysis 2 there should be a clickable tab to Response, and so on. As currently formatted, the reader must click back to the original case each time and then click to the next part of SARA (Scanning, Analysis, Response, Assessment).”

#### Status Update

Members of the Police Relations Unit and the Community Oriented Policing unit are continuing to work on the problem-tracking system within the CPOP website. Problems that have been encountered include an inconsistent number of CPOP problems being entered by officers and the CPPC being unable to enter information into the website. In the past, the Monitor has made several suggestions as to improvements. The CPD has taken them into consideration and is currently working on implementing several of them.

The CPD realizes the lack of detail being reported within each problem posted on the website and has initiated action to address this problem. We also believe that movement from phase to phase within each problem adds to ease of use for visitors to the site and are continuing to work towards implementing that suggestion.

The CPD utilized the suggestions made by the Monitor to change the “comments” box to “give specifics” and tabs were created at the bottom of each phase for the user to move easier through the site.

In regards to the Monitor’s suggestion of naming property owners and property managers as contacts for CPOP problems listed on the website, the CPD feels that

this poses privacy and protection issues for those involved. The CPD feels that problems can be addressed and resolved without making this information public.

See Appendix Item 17 for an overall analysis of current CPOP cases in the system.

*Item 29(n). The City shall periodically review staffing in light of CPOP.*

### **Monitor's Previous Assessment**

“The staffing formula appears not to take into account the switch the CPD must make to a CPOP agency. The CPD can explore a range of options for folding problem-solving into the uncommitted time of patrol officers. In addition, given the importance of analysis to CPOP, the Department's staffing plan should consider whether its current crime analysis staffing level is sufficiently robust to support the type of work expected under the CA.”

### **Status Update**

The CPD provided the Monitor its staffing formula in September 2004. As a result of disagreements over the ability of the staffing plan to facilitate agency-wide implementation of CPOP, the CPD requested on several occasions for the Monitor to provide examples of police agencies' staffing plans that the Monitor believes reflect a commitment to COP and/or CPOP. Most recently, the Monitor referred the CPD to the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department as a resource because that Department's staffing plan integrated CPOP into deployment decisions.

The CPD contacted the Charlotte-Mecklenburg PD and discovered their patrol staffing and deployment plan mirrored the CPD's and nothing in their plan gives special consideration to CPOP. In fact, some of the assumptions and outcomes of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg patrol plan would not be accepted by the Cincinnati community. Specifically, the response time to emergency calls for service (CFS) for Charlotte-Mecklenburg is seven minutes. The CPD's response time to emergency calls, according to data reported in the CPD's Executive Information Summary through September 2004, is 3.3 minutes, down 2.9% from 2003. In Charlotte-Mecklenburg, the response time for non-emergency CFS is less than forty minutes. The Charlotte-Mecklenburg plan contemplates allowing patrol officers 25% of their tour of duty for discretionary activity, which may include problem-solving. Cincinnati's patrol plan allows patrol officers 30% of their tour of duty for problem-solving and other discretionary and proactive activity.

The CPD staffs assignments and deploys personnel to insure its capability to fulfill the myriad of functions and tasks that comprise its mission, including but

not limited to, problem-solving, emergency response to crimes in progress and citizen calls for help, critical incident management, criminal investigation, vice enforcement, preventative patrol, special event management, auto accident investigation, and traffic enforcement.

The City of Cincinnati and the CPD are committed to achieving the adopted goals of the CA through implementation of CPOP as a principle philosophy which drives all activities. Police officers and city employees consider all requests for service, all crime and disorder, and all community needs as opportunities to use the SARA methodology, to combine City resources, to partner with the community, and to engage in collaboration and problem-solving.

A significant component of the CPD's staffing plan is the assignment of neighborhood officers to each and every neighborhood in Cincinnati. The neighborhood officers are integral to the Action Plan agreed to by the Parties and work in concert with community members. City departments and their staffs, Police Department personnel, and Police Partnering Center staff to identify problems, apply SARA, and resolve problems.

The Monitor asserts, "The staffing formula *appears* not to take into account the *switch* the CPD must make to a CPOP agency [emphasis added]." Specifically, paragraph 24 of the CA, refers to the CPD's long history of problem-solving prior to the CA. The Monitor's report indicates that a radical departure from normal CPD operations is necessary as a result of the CPOP requirements of the CA. The CPD's integration of CPOP into its operations and its staffing and patrol deployments plan is an evolution that began as early as 1993, as described in CA paragraph 24.

The CPD utilizes data and analysis extensively in its operations. The CPD has a Crime Analysis Unit which provides data and analysis to all of the CPD districts, sections, and units, and to the community, to enhance problem-solving and law enforcement. Recently, the CPD formed a partnership with the University of Cincinnati to develop responses and solutions for implementation in "hot spot" areas in Cincinnati. University of Cincinnati researchers are using CPD data to formulate interventions. *Keep Cincinnati Beautiful* has worked with the CPD Crime Analysis Unit to identify areas of concentration for litter, disorder, graffiti, dumping, and crime and to tailor responses to these problems. Examples of data resources, which are made available to the public and are utilized extensively by CPD managers, officers, and citizens include:

- CINSITE: The Cincinnati Strategic Intervention Target Effort tracks the reporting areas with the highest concentration of crime, disorder, drugs, and violence. Police managers use this data to direct resources and maximize impact.
- Executive Information Summary (EIS): Comprehensive monthly and year-to-date data reflecting department operations and outcomes.

- Crime Analyst’s Monthly Report: A summary of reported crime, arrests, and traffic enforcement. This also includes staffing data.
- Neighborhood Calls for Service and Crime Data: Monthly updates on calls for service, reported crime and arrests, broken down by district, neighborhood, and beat.

This area, consistent with this entirety of paragraph 29, continues to be a focal point of discussion among the Parties in regards to agreeing upon how CPOP is implemented and integrated into the CPD at an operational level or the identification and definition of deliverable item(s).

*Item 29(o). The City shall review and, where necessary, revise police departmental policies and procedures, organizational plans, job descriptions, and performance evaluation standards, consistent with its commitment to CPOP.*

**Monitor’s Previous Assessment**

“The Monitor must determine whether the revised documents are consistent with the CPD’s required commitment to CPOP. We do not find this is the case.”

“While SARA is mentioned, only two of its elements are highlighted in the rating description: problem identification and solutions (response). The absence of analysis and assessment may describe a type of police problem-solving that ultimately is less than called for by the CA. Under the CA, problem-solving is to become the principal strategy to fight crime and disorder in Cincinnati, not just for the CPOP teams.”

“Overall, the Monitor believes that the revisions fail to place problem-solving as the CPD’s central approach.”

We recommend that the Parties meet to discuss these issues, with the CA as a guide.

**Status Update**

The CPD has conducted reviews and has revised procedures, plans, job descriptions and performance evaluations where appropriate, as required by the CA. The CPD researched performance evaluations and job descriptions in other cities and found its CPOP revisions to be more substantial than those found in any other agency contacted, several of which were recommended by the Monitor Team.

Most significantly, training and implementation are the most important components of a successful performance evaluation system. The best written



words are of little value if not conveyed and emphasized by the right personnel. An Assistant Police Chief and seven Department Commanders, including all five District Commanders, provided training to all department managers and supervisors on the new performance evaluation system and the revisions to the department's job descriptions. It is through the training and implementation process that the priority of problem-solving is established. The CPD is actively engaged in the performance evaluation process as its managers and supervisors rate personnel on their 2004 performance. The CPD will be reviewing the ratings and will assess the effectiveness of the written materials and the training in order to evaluate the success of implementation.

The Monitor seems to suggest that the entire CPD performance evaluation process must be drastically revised in order for the CPD to achieve a determination of substantial compliance. The CPD personnel have been involved in problem-solving, as described in the CA, since at least 1993. Paragraph 29(o) requires further evolution of CPD's commitment to CPOP, not necessarily a radical reconfiguration.

Obviously, the City and the CPD believe that it is in full and substantial compliance with this provision. However, further discussions are necessary to ascertain the application of problem-solving as "CPD's central approach."

*Item 29(p). The City shall design a system that will permit the retrieval and linkage of certain information including repeat offenders, repeat victims, and/or locations.*

#### **Monitor's Previous Assessment**

"The City is not yet in compliance with this CA provision."

#### **Status Update**

The following is an update for the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) and Records Management System (RMS) project:

- June 22, 2004 – RFP released
- August 20, 2004 – Proposal due date (five vendors submitted proposals)
- August 23 – January 2005 – Vendor evaluation
- February – March 2005 – Vendor reference checks / Final Selection / Contract Negotiations begin

Five vendors submitted responses to the published RFP and three were selected to provide onsite demonstrations of their product. Each vendor provided three full days of demonstrations, each during a different week in January 2005. The first day for each consisted of CAD demonstrations, the second day was dedicated to

the RMS component demonstrations, and the third day covered issues of system integration, project management, security, and geographical file accuracy and completion issues as well as any other burning items uncovered during the previous days' demonstrations.

The revised cost proposals, system interface proposals, and reference checks are currently ongoing. Each vendor is also being asked to respond to follow-up questions specific to their product or proposal.

Chief Streicher has dedicated a new position within the organization, at the rank of lieutenant, to act as the CAD/RMS Project Manager. This position will be filled by Lieutenant Lee Carmichael. Lieutenant Carmichael was instrumental in development and planning of the Employee Tracking Solution and has a clear understanding of overall information goals as well as proven Information Technology project implementation experience. He will report directly to Lieutenant Colonel Cindy Combs, the Project's Executive Sponsor. Providing full-time staff to attend to the project will minimize delays, cost overruns, and ensure overall project success.

See Appendix Item 18 to view RAND's Quarterly Progress Report, December 2004.

*Item 29(q). The City shall secure appropriate information technology so that police and City personnel can access timely, useful information to detect, analyze and respond to problems and evaluate their effectiveness.*

#### **Monitor's Previous Assessment**

The CA established February 5, 2003 as the deadline for development of a procurement plan, April 5, 2003 to secure funding, August 5, 2003 to procure systems, and August 2004 to implement any new purchases. The City has not met the deadlines in the CA for compliance with this requirement.

#### **Status Updates**

The Parties believe that the new RMS system will also meet the requirements of this section of the CA.

## **II. MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY EVALUATION**

### **Evaluation Protocol**

*Items 30-46, Evaluation Protocol*

### **Monitor's Previous Assessment**

While the components of the Evaluation Protocol have not begun, the RAND efforts are a very positive development. The Monitor will work closely with the Parties and RAND in this next quarter to begin the process of evaluating whether the goals of the CA are being achieved.

### **Status Update**

The first quarterly report from RAND as well as drafts of survey instruments have been provided to the Monitor and all parties. Revisions have been made by RAND in response to input on the first draft and a second draft of the survey and observation instruments is currently under review by all parties.

The CPD continues to fill requests for data as received or according to the schedule. See Appendix Item 19 to view the tracking log for requests for data from RAND.

### **III. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT**

*Collaborative Items 47-49*

#### **Pointing Firearms Complaints**

##### **Monitor's Previous Assessment**

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

##### **Status Update**

The Parties have nothing to report in this area.

#### **IV. FAIR, EQUITABLE AND COURTEOUS TREATMENT**

*Collaborative Items 50-54. The CA requires the Parties to collaborate in ensuring fair, equitable and courteous treatment for all, and the implementation of bias-free policing. Data collection and analysis are pivotal to tracking compliance, and training is essential to inculcate bias-free policing throughout the ranks of the CPD. The Monitor, in consultation with the Parties, is required to include detailed information regarding bias-free policing in all public reports. The collection and analysis of data to allow reporting on bias-free policing is to be part of an Evaluation Protocol developed with the advice of expert consultants.*

##### **A. Data Collection and Analysis**

###### **Monitor's Previous Assessment**

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

RAND is at the beginning stage of checking quality and consistency of the data fields. The Parties are not yet fully in compliance with this requirement.

###### **b. Data Collection**

RAND will request statistical compilations produced by the City in January 2005. The Parties are not yet fully in compliance with this requirement.

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

RAND will request statistical compilations produced by the City in January 2005. The Parties are not yet fully in compliance with this requirement.

###### **Status Update**

The Parties have nothing new in this area to report.

##### **B. Training and Dissemination of Information**

###### **Monitor's Previous Assessment**

As we noted in our last report, the Monitor has not seen evidence that the Parties are cooperating in ongoing bias-free policing training. Therefore, we cannot find compliance at this time.

**Status Update**

The Parties have nothing new in this area to report.

**V. CITIZEN COMPLAINT AUTHORITY**

*Collaborative Items 55-89*

**Monitor’s Previous Assessment**

“The CCA currently does not have access to a shared database, and the City is not in compliance with this provision. However, the City stated in the last quarter that it anticipates obtaining a vendor to develop software so that CCA will have access to the ETS system.”

“The area of greatest concern is whether the City will take appropriate action on CCA findings where the City Manager agrees with those findings. Also, there have been concerns raised by the Plaintiffs that the CCA has not been sufficiently supported by the Parties. The Plaintiffs have submitted a proposal that the Parties be convened to resolve issues related to the CCA. The proposal envisions a facilitated, intensive dialogue between Party representatives around the CCA, and the perceptions of it held by the Parties. The goal would be to efficiently address the problems identified during the dialogue, to assist in ensuring that the CCA fulfills its purpose. The FOP has agreed to participate so long as the process is highly structured. The CCA Board Chair and Executive Director have indicated a willingness to participate. The Monitor has sent the proposal to the City with a request to be informed whether the City will participate in such a meeting.”

**Status Update**

Paragraph 74 requires that the Chief of Police and the Executive Director develop written procedures that will assure the timely exchange of information and the efficient coordination of CCA and CPD investigations. While there may be an implied understanding of this process, CCA recommends that a written procedure be developed to ensure that each party is aware of the process. During this period, the CCA has identified the following investigations which were not received from the CPD in a timely manner:

**CPD-CCA REFERRALS**

<b><u>CCA #</u></b>	<b><u>Incident Date</u></b>	<b><u>Closed CPD</u></b>	<b><u>Received at CCA</u></b>
04509	12-01-03	11-03-04	11-15-04
04520	06-26-04	11-09-04	11-22-04
04521	10-03-04	10-22-04	11-22-04
04523	10-15-04	11-02-04	11-22-04
04524	06-05-04	11-17-04	11-22-04
04525	10-05-04	10-19-04	11-22-04
04539	08-26-02	12-01-04	12-02-04
04540	11-17-03	12-01-04	12-02-04
04541	04-04-03	11-19-04	12-02-04

04551	09-04-04	12-02-04	12-09-04
05008	08-21-04	12-30-04	01-10-04
05009	07-17-03	01-05-04	01-10-05
05010	07-21-04	12-29-04	01-10-05

Paragraph 80 requires the CCA and CPD to develop a shared database to track all citizen complaints, the manner in which they are handled and their disposition. Currently, the CCA does not have access to a shared database. However, the City has stated that the CCA will have access to the ETS system. In the past quarter, the CCA solicited bids to develop a database that is capable of interfacing with the CPD's ETS to obtain limited officer information and read-only access to IIS case files. The request to suspend the acquisition of the CCA interface due to issues related to the performance of the vendor. However, this delay has adversely impacted on the ability of the CCA to move forward and to meet this objective. The CCA will move forward with discussions with the vendor and attempt to develop an interface supported by the CPD's ETS.

The CCA and the CPD revisited the timely exchange of information related to the review of completed CCA cases forwarded for the City Manager's action. A systemic review of these cases has been developed and provides the City Manager with a comprehensive evaluation of cases presented for review.



## **VI. MISCELLANEOUS**

See Appendix Item 20 for the following:

- 2004 Homicide Statistics
- Enquirer Article(s)
- Thank you note

## APPENDIX

1. Community-Police Programs and Initiatives
2. Evaluation of Traffic Barricade Impact on Crime in Pendleton: Cincinnati, Ohio
3. Community Response Team Statistics
4. 2004 Robbery Task Force Final Report
5. 2005 Winter Inservice Training Schedule
6. *Off the Streets Policy Team* Meeting Minutes (October)
7. City of Cincinnati Department Guide and Blight Index
8. CPPC Training Seminar Agenda
9. Community Problem-Oriented Policing Presentation
10. 2005 Neighborhood Training Schedule
11. CPOP Committee Members
12. Current CPOP Teams
13. Cincinnati CPOP Best Practices Award Flyer
14. Community Relations Coordinator Job Posting
15. CA Steering Committee Minutes (October, December, and February)
16. Community Problem Solving Worksheet (Form 560)
17. Graphs of CPOP Cases
18. RAND Quarterly Progress Report (December 2004)
19. Tracking Log for Requests for Data from RAND
20. 2004 Homicide Summary; Enquirer article, *Violent Crime Rate Stubborn*; Thank you Note