

City of Dublin, Ohio
Abstract
Herman Goldstein Award

The Village of Dublin was founded in 1810. During the 1970's, Dublin was transformed from a rural village to a suburban business center due largely to the completion of the I-270 outerbelt, development of the Muirfield Village Golf Club and residential community. With rapid business and residential growth Dublin officially became a City in September of 1987.

Today, Dublin encompasses approximately 23 square miles along the banks of the Scioto river in the northwest area of metropolitan Columbus. Dublin has a residential population of approximately 29,000. The daytime population rises to over 60,000, including residents and corporate citizens.

The Dublin Division of Police is an internationally accredited police agency comprised of sixty sworn and twenty-one non-sworn personnel. The Division embraces a Community Policing philosophy and has implemented a Problem Oriented Policing Unit (POP). The Unit addresses recurring, quality of life issues affecting Dublin and surrounding communities. The POP unit is comprised of a Sergeant and two Officers.

The POP unit initiated "Operation Bottoms Up" after identifying a problem with underage drinking. Intelligence was gathered from the DARE unit, residents, school officials, and internal reports. The POP Unit analyzed calls for service and reports to identify locations, persons and behavioral trends. The unit formulated a plan of action to aggressively pursue and enforce liquor laws pertaining to juveniles and adults when appropriate. During this response the unit identified another problem. Post arrest interviews revealed the ease of purchasing alcohol at our local gas

stations. A sister program was started. "Operation Too Young" was introduced to address the collateral problem. The unit found, by sending in confidential informants under 21 but over 18 years of age, that 66% of our liquor permit retailers sold alcohol with no identification being shown. Citations were issued against the clerk and permit holders. The Unit developed a partnership with the Ohio Dept. Of Public Safety, Division of Liquor Enforcement and presented educational seminars for local clerks and cashiers covering applicable Ohio Revised Code sections applying to the sale of alcohol and provided additional "hands on" practical exercises dealing with false identification. Both projects continue to be evaluated every six months. The last Operation "Too Young II", conducted in October of 1998, has shown a 50% reduction in sales to underage informants. Calls for service for problem residences where underage consumption of alcohol was occurring has decreased 78%. Juvenile alcohol related arrest by patrol officers have increased 76% over last years data.



S.A.R.A. PROJECT



Project Number; 98-10

Officer(s): Sgt. Potts, Officers DeJarnette and Liedtke

Date: 4-4-98

Nature of the Problem:

Underage consumption of alcohol

Where the Problem Occurs:

Various locations throughout the community, visible through neighbor/resident complaints of parties, D.U.I, arrests, underage alcohol possession and consumption charges.

SCANNING

How Was the Problem Identified?

Intelligence gained from Division's D.A.R.E. unit, residents, schools, and internal reports.

Who Identified the Problem?

The Problem Oriented Policing Unit choose to focus on the problem.

Far More Problems Are Identified than Can Be Explored Adequately. How and Why

Was this Problem Selected from among Other Problems?

Recurring nature of problem. Frequency of occurrence found when problem was researched. Designated goal of the department for 1998 (Goal #6 Identify and implement traditional and non-traditional strategies to redirect the behavior of our at risk juvenile offender population.)

ANALYSIS

Methods of Analysis Used

Once problem was identified, calls for service and report data was used to analyze the problem.

What Information Helped You Better Understand the Nature and Extent of the Problem?

In October 1997 responded to a complaint of a particular residence where parent allowed local teenagers to party (consume alcohol) regularly. During investigation local residents and arrested juveniles were interviewed. Information obtained during this investigation lead us to additional underage drinking party locations. The results of this initial investigation made it apparent that alcohol was easily obtained by juveniles in our community.

For How Long Has it Been a Problem?

Our records indicated the initially investigated residence had been a problem since the beginning of 1997. The department responded to numerous loud party complaints

involving juveniles consuming alcohol. There was also a juvenile arrested for D.U.I. leaving the residence in early 1997.

What Harms Resulted from the Problem?

Underage alcohol consumption leads to other even more serious problems such as school truancy, D.U.I.'s, vandalism, assaults, rapes, etc. It also leads to community, moral, and quality of life decay.

What Procedures or Legislation Existed to Help Address this Problem?

Departmental policies and procedures, as well as juvenile alcohol and curfew related laws offered limited assistance. Also received cooperation from prosecutors during court phase of process.

In What Ways Were Citizens Involved in the Analysis of Your Problem?

Citizens were interviewed and witness statements were obtained concerning their personal observations.

RESPONSE

Methods of Response Used

Received training from the Ohio Department of Liquor Control which helped us better understand liquor laws and investigating tactics used.

Conducted surveillance operations on residences and businesses for alcohol violations.

Took enforcement action against juveniles observed with or consuming alcohol. Also

took enforcement action against parents allowing groups of juveniles to consume alcohol on their property. In situations where there was not enough evidence to charge parents, brought the problem to their attention through meetings at the police department.

Used underage informants to attempt to purchase alcohol from local businesses. Took enforcement actions against cashiers who sold alcohol to underage persons. (Operation "Too Young")

Forwarded alcohol violation information to the Ohio Dept. of Liquor Control who can take action against the violating businesses.

Offered cashier training to local business who sold alcohol to prevent further violations.

Recognized businesses that did not sell alcohol to our underage informants through certificates of appreciation.

Shared information with police patrol personnel on community trouble spots for underage alcohol consumption.

Provided local press releases as applicable to alert the community of issues concerning underage alcohol consumption.

Met with complainants/residents and updated them on progress and received additional information from them.

Further along in our response after some initial success, formed a partnership with

Columbus Police Department Vice unit. Working with C.P.D. Vice we also conducted informant buys in the Columbus jurisdiction which borders our community. We realized that if we prevented juvenile alcohol sales in our community, kids would look for nearby communities where they could purchase alcohol.

What Were You Intending to Accomplish with Your Response Plan?

Make community aware of problem.

Reduce problem by making it harder for juveniles to obtain alcohol in our community.

Educate staff employed at local businesses that sell alcohol.

Make it less inviting for parents to allow juveniles to consume alcohol on their property through police education, intervention, and enforcement.

Raise the quality of life for area residents by reducing loud parties, vandalism, thefts, and other related crimes.

What Was or Should Have Been Done Before You Implemented Your Response Plan?

What Was Your Response?

Consulted the Ohio Department of Liquor control, local prosecutors, and police administration and Juvenile Officer. In the future plan to work more with the local high school, D.A.R.E., and School Resource officers as an education part of this project.

What Difficulties Were Encountered During Response Implementation?

Limited legal avenues on private property as it relates to search and seizure issues. If

juveniles were inside a residence and refused police access with no parent present, it was often difficult to legally enter residence under current laws, policies, and procedures. On initial contact with the parent whose home was being utilized for underage drinking, we received little cooperation.

Citizens/complainants were not as committed when they had to get directly involved. Some citizens provided witness statements on their observations, however many did not want to get directly involved such as testifying in court. Many citizens gave the impression this was a "police problem" to solve.

What Resources Were Available to Solve the Problem?

Ohio Department of Liquor Control.

Division's Juvenile Officer

Surveillance equipment such as: Video cameras, body wires, binoculars, night scopes, and unmarked vehicles.

Funds for informant alcohol buys.

Ability to alter P.O.P. officers' schedules.

Division's D.A.R.E. unit was not fully utilized, however will be incorporated in future efforts. Also the Division is in the process of implementing School Resource Officers at the high schools. Will also use them as a resource in future efforts.

Neighboring Police Agencies.

How Were Citizens Involved in the Response to Your Problem?

They were involved through periodic updates on status.

ASSESSMENT

Methods of Assessment Used.

Number of additional calls to identified trouble spots since project completion.

Juvenile alcohol related arrest made and charges filed.

Underage alcohol sales and related charges filed.

Response to our cashier training class.

Results of second underage informant alcohol buys.

Follow-up with residents/complainants in underage drinking trouble/party spots.

Were There Problems Implementing the Response Plan as Intended?

No

What Were the Results? What Response Goals Were Accomplished and What Impact

Did the Response Plan Have on the Problem?

The P.O.P unit made 4 juvenile arrests for underage consumption/possession of alcohol during the investigation phase. In addition 1 parent was charged with allowing underage consumption of alcohol on her property and contributing to the delinquency of a minor. (Pled to a lesser charge and paid a fine) Information obtained from these arrests lead us from a P.O.P. project to this full scale S. A.R.A. project.

The P.O.P. unit also filed 13 charges for "sell of alcohol to an underage person", or related charges against cashiers working at local businesses. UPDATE: Filed 5 additional charges in October of 1998 as a result of Operation "Too Young II".

During March of 1998 Operation "Too Young" revealed that when underage informants were sent in local businesses to purchase alcohol, 60% of the time an illegal sale occurred. In October of 1998 Operation "Too Young II" the ability for our underage informants to purchase alcohol reduced to 33%.

Patrol Sergeants have established shift goals requiring strict enforcement action involving juvenile related alcohol, drug, and curfew laws. Since then patrol units have filed numerous charges related to underage consumption/possession of alcohol charges. This includes separate recent (Sept./Oct. 98) incidents where as many as 14 and 10 individuals were arrested for underage alcohol violations by patrol officers.

How Did You Measure Your Results?

During initial investigation, established 3 area residences where underage drinking was occurring frequently. During 1997 our department received a total of 18 complaints involving these residences relating to underage drinking, loud parties, etc. As of June 30, 1997, we have received 2 calls reporting this type of behavior, a reduction of 78% so far this year.

A 27% reduction in our underage informants ability to purchase alcohol from our area

businesses.

Received feedback from second shift Sergeant indicating loud party complaints are down so far this year.

We now frequently get information from citizens, parents, and schools regarding upcoming underage drinking parties.

9 cashiers attended our first alcohol sale training class. This response increased to 15 cashiers at our second session.

Had two stories reported in local newspapers concerning this issue.

Received verbal praise from citizens who originally brought the problem to our attention. Citizen advised it made a drastic difference in the quality of life on her street.

How Long Was the Response Evaluated?

On going six month evaluations.

Will Your Response Require an Ongoing Effort to Maintain Your Results?

Yes due to yearly changes in juvenile population and also the same turnover in cashiers that work for area businesses that sell alcohol.

We will continue to form partnerships with bordering police agencies to start similar programs in their communities. We will continue to look for ways to expand the program and make it an area wide effort to reduce underage drinking.

How Are You Going to Continue Monitoring the Problem and the Effectiveness of

Your Response in the Future?

On going contact with residents, District officers, Juvenile officer, D.A.R.E. officers, and School Resource officers. Also will continue to monitor departmental activity reports. Follow-up underage informant alcohol buys, to help maintain vigilance on the part of local merchants.

How Were Citizens Involved in Your Evaluation Process?

On going contact with complainants/residents.

Agency and Officer Information

At What Level of the Police Organization Was this Problem-solving Initiative Adopted?

This project was initiated by the Division's Problem Oriented Policing unit (P.O.P.) who's members consist of Sgt. Greg Potts, and Officers John DeJarnette and Jeff Liedtke.

Have the Officers Received Any Special Training in Problem Solving?

During new officers field training period, each officer receives training in the C.O.P. philosophy that outlines problem solving techniques.

P.O.P. unit members attend regular conferences, seminars, and training related to C.O.P. and problem solving.

What Guidelines Were Used by the Officers to Help Manage this Problem-solving

Initiative?

Unit was guided by departmental General Orders, local prosecutors, and the Ohio Department of Liquor Control.

Submitting Officers): Sgt. Greg Potts, Off. John DeJarnette, and Off. Jeff Liedtke

Date Of Submission: 7-2-98 Reviewed and Updated: 10-17-98, 3-25-99.