INDIANAPOLIS POLICE DEPARTMENT
COMMUNITY BASED POLICING
MASTER PLAN

INDIANAPOLIS POLICE DEPARTMENT
COMMUNITY BASED POLICING
MASTER PLAN

This Community Based Policing Master Plan has been prepared for Mayor Stephen Goldsmith, Director of Public Safety Michael Beaver, and Chief of Police James Toler. Portions of this plan were presented to representatives of the four police districts, the Training Academy, and the Community Services Branch of the Chief's Office, on Thursday, February 18, 1993.

OVERVIEW:

In January, 1992, Mayor Stephen Goldsmith and Chief of Police James Toler announced plans to move the Indianapolis Police Department from a traditional Law Enforcement Based style of policing to a Community Based style of policing, based on the following tenets:

> Emphasis on the Police Districts
> Increased Community Relations with the Community
> District Police-Community Task Forces
> Problem Solving (versus Basic Police Response)
> Reduction in Calls for Service

The concept of Community Based Policing (also known as Community Oriented Policing or Problem Oriented Policing) has been implemented successfully in many other cities across the United States. The commitment to Community Based Policing in Indianapolis was based on a need to effectively deal with the following issues:

> Perceived Lack of Manpower
> Lack of Community Support
> Lack of Support from Police Management
> Increasing Calls for Service
> Low Morale of Officers

The Indianapolis Police Department Community Based Policing Master Plan attempts to bridge the gap between the theory of Community Policing in Indianapolis and the actual implementation of such an endeavor. To accomplish this, the Plan has been divided into two sections.

The first section "A Community Based Policing Concept" reviews the basic tenets of Community Based Policing as listed at the beginning of the Overview. These early stages of Community Policing were addressed by outside consultants Robert Wasserman and George Kelling in the first part of 1992.

The second section "A Blueprint For Community Policing in Indianapolis" takes a look at more fundamental issues such as low morale, lack of manpower, etc., and establishes a foundation for addressing these issues with the implementation of Community Based Policing city-wide.

The second section shows how an effective Community Based Policing program would assist the police department by building problem-solving coalitions consisting of police officers, community members, and police management. These coalitions (or Task Forces) would enable the department to find solutions to some of the department's key issues listed in the Overview.

The second section also contains a Community Based Policing design for the police districts. This blueprint would allow the department to proceed with the implementation of Community Based Policing on all four police districts. Some of the recommendations in this section have already been implemented with varying degrees of success on the South District of the Indianapolis Police Department.

COMMUNITY BASED POLICING CONCEPT:

Extensive research on the implementation of Community Policing in other U.S. cities has established that there are essential elements that need to be part of the basic Community Based Policing Plan for Community Policing to be effective.

Emphasis on Police Districts:

One of the first changes implemented in 1992 was to rename the sequential quadrants as neighborhood districts. While this was originally thought by some to be an insignificant change, it was the cornerstone for the identification of parts of the city as homogeneous entities. Police Officers and residents who previously identified their section of the city with a number, were now able to identify their neighborhoods as a distinct area of the city.

District Commanders were promoted in rank from Major to Deputy Chief to return command authority to the field level rather than headquarter's divisions. Some investigative authority was also removed from headquarters to support the districts.

While the move to upgrade the status and emphasis of the districts within the department has been well received-over time-the net gain is negated if progress in the area of Community Based Policing is not maintained. For emphasis to remain at the district and neighborhood level, district Deputy Chiefs must continue to be progressive and innovative with community programs. District Chiefs must push for additional responsibilities at the district level even beyond the recommendations in Sections One and Two of this report.

Increased Community Relations:

Crime Watch Coordinators were reassigned from the Mayor's Office early, 1992, to assist the police districts with Community Relations and Crime Prevention. However, maintenance of current programs is not enough. District Community Relations and Crime Watch personnel must expand their roles become the Community Based Policing liaisons between neighborhood organizations, beat officers, schools, businesses, and the district Deputy Chiefs.

Under this new design, district Community Relations and Crime Watch personnel would be responsible for organizing monthly task force meetings and setting agendas. They would coordinate beat officer attendance at beat community meetings; coordinate beat officer programs at schools on the officer's beats; maintain contact lists with city agencies for problem resolution; and assist officers and neighborhood organizations with problem solving and problem resolution. They would explore the possibility of publishing a monthly district newsletter to keep district officers, neighborhood organization, and task force members current on Community Policing programs and news.

In addition, as more resource centers (mini-stations or storefront locations) opened up in the district. Community Relations and Crime Watch personnel would be involved in the staffing and maintaining of the sites.

District Police-Community Task Force:

District Task Forces were formed last Spring to assist the district Deputy Chief's with district assessments, and proved to be a valuable resource in other areas as well. District Task Forces were utilized on the South District to assist the Deputy Chief with district awards, minor complaint resolution, communication flow, and the district newsletter. It was discovered after a short time that the Task Force members made excellent resource people, and were an automatic pool of volunteers for district-wide projects. Task Force members became an exellent sounding board for new ideas. The Task Force meetings provided an excellent opportunity for South District Deputy Chief Don Christ to introduce shift supervisors and beat officers to residents and business people on their beats.

It is recommended that District Task Forces meet on a regular basis at least ten times a year (monthly except July and December). The District Task Forces should be coordinated by district Community Relations/Crime Watch members. The district newsletter should be a communications device for the Task Force and the district, and should also be coordinated by Community Relations personnel.

Problem Solving (versus Basic Police Response):

Community Based Policing addresses district problems by involving the three main players in the police-community relationship (uniformed officers, police managers and the community at-large) in a cooperative effort to maintain a problem solving agenda. This is accomplished by identifying and analyzing problems/concerns in a particular neighborhood, and enlisting neighborhood and district support for identifying and implementing solutions. The last phase is to review the success or failure of the problem resolution.

Problem Solving is currently being done on the South District using the SARA method. This method first SCANS the problem/concern to identify and recognize it. The next step is to ANALYZE the problem/concern in a concise, systematic manner. The third step is to RESPOND with a solution. Once the response is implemented, an ASSESSMENT should be done.

Done correctly, problem solving becomes not only a building block for problem resolution in the neighborhood, but a system for training officers and residents to work in a cooperative manner to effectively address concerns before they develop into problems. **Problem Solving** is probably the most important aspect of implementing a successful Community Based Policing Program. Problem Solving and its proactive approach is also time/cost effective.

Reduction in Calls for Service:

If the department could reduce the number of runs an officer must respond to during the officer's shift, more time would become available for the problem solving process to take place. Run reduction is currently being done by the Public Assistance Office in the Communication Center.

The idea is to screen calls for service that do not require a police officer's response, and for police officers on light duty (or other) to handle those requests for service via the telephone. By using Public Assistance Officers to direct calls for service in a more efficient manner, beat officers are able to spend more time in their neighborhoods doing problem solving.

There are of course, other ways to reduce run volume. One method currently underway on the South District is using monthly/year end run logs to target locations of repeated calls for service. Locations of high run volume are identified, and beat officers are assigned to meet with residents (or owners) of the locations to coordinate problem solving.

The goal is to reduce runs from high volume locations by at least 25% over 1992. Even a 25% run reduction of a high volume location would result in monumental time savings for the officers. This additional time would again allow officers to spend more time in their neighborhoods problem solving.

A BLUEPRINT FOR COMMUNITY POLICING IN INDIANAPOLIS:

This section looks at issues that currently affect the operation of the Indianapolis Police Department, and attempts to provide some solutions. While the problems are serious in nature, they are common to most police departments and can be overcome. It therefore makes sense to look at how other departments have been successful in resolving issues related to dwindling resources and increased demands for service.

A quality, committed Community Based Policing program would assist the department in solving problems of increased demand and decreasing resources by addressing the following three areas:

> Problem Solving at the Beat Level
> Problem Resolution and Community Relations/Service
> Commitment to Manpower and Training

Adopting the basic Community Based Policing tenets of the first section of this plan, setting goals, and following the recommendations of this section, will enable the department to resolve some of these major issues. In addition, a strong foundation for a successful Community Based Policing Program would be initiated.

Problem Solving at the Beat Level:

Problem Solving (as it was explained in the first section) is the key to a successful community based program. However, problem solving is more than just identifying problems and finding solutions.

Before problem solving occurs, officers must be prepared in problem solving techniques, and the community must be informed of the value of problem solving. For problem solving to be successful, both the police and the community must understand and support the problem solving method.

Problem Solving can be achieved on the districts if the Deputy Chief's make an commitment to work through the following three steps:

> Initiate a Volunteer District Pilot Program
> Implementation of a Problem Solving Shift
> Extend Implementation to all Shifts

The first step in attempting problem solving is to identify officers who are interested in evolving beyond the traditional methods of police response to problems. The district Deputy Chief's should meet with their district officers and explain the department's (and their personnel) commitment to Community Based Policing and the Problem Solving method. They should explain the department's vision of both concepts. Proposed job descriptions should be passed out to all officers.

Next the Deputy Chief's should identify overtime funds from their budgets that would allow them to commit to a volunteer, off-duty problem solving pilot program for at least 12 weeks. Interested officers should be allowed to volunteer and should be trained as a unit.

A district supervisor (Community Based Policing coordinator) should be trained and assigned on each district to coordinate officer training and overtime expenditures. The coordinator would review all problem solving agendas submitted on SARA sheets from program officers, and would work with the officers to identify problem solving methods.

Officers would be encouraged by the coordinator to address problems that occur on their own beats. However, officers who desire to problem solve in other areas would not be discouraged. The coordinator would also encourage other officers to participate in the program, if they expressed an interest.

During the course of the pilot program, officers would gradually transfer their problem'solving responsibilities from overtime to their regular tour of duty. Around weeks 10-12, officers would be completing most of their assignments on their regular shift. Overtime would remain available for responses requiring an officer to work time in addition to the officer's regular tour of duty.

The district coordinator would be responsible for submitting a full report to their Deputy Chief and the Chief within 30 days of the programs expiration. The report would document all identified problems, beat locations, officer's assigned, and problem solving methods used.

A conclusion should be made as to the success or failure of the attempt to problem solve. While the success or failure of the attempt is not important, the result helps to determine the value of the solution used. However, because the problem solving process establishes ties between the beat officer and the neighborhood, the process is even more important than the end result.

Prior to submitting the report, The Deputy Chief's should prepare for the second problem solving step. A shift of officers should be dedicated to problem solve full-time during their tour of duty, with some overtime being identified (as needed). Once the Pilot Program report has been submitted to the Chief, and evaluated by the Deputy Chief, the entire district should be made aware of the results and the purpose of the full-time problem solving shift.

First priority for the staffing of the shift should go to officers who participated in the voluntary program. Any additional slots should to officers who express a true interest in the program. This shift would be supervised and coordinated by the district Community Based Policing Coordinator.

It is recommended that the problem solving shift work hours that are agreeable to problem solving and community policing. On the South District the hours of 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. have been identified for the shift. This was done to maximize beat officer contact with the neighborhoods, schools, churces, businesses, etc. This was also done to facilitate the compilation of beat profiles by the officers.

It is recommended that responsibility for some of the community programs that are now being done by Community Relations personnel, be eventually handled by the problem solving shift. The shift should, at some point prior to receiving new responsibilities, receive training on how to address community meetings. They would then assume responsibility for all block club meetings, etc. This would give the beat officer more exposure to the concerns of the residents of the officer's beat.

The officers would also be responsible for interacting with the schools on the officer's particular beat. The officer would also make contacts with business and shop owners. The officer would be responsible for other varied duties such as tracking abandoned houses, etc. The officer would also ensure that problem solving was coordinated with other city agencies, and the person on the district responsible for Problem Resolution.

Assigning beat officers in this manner would also establish the problem solving shift officer as the point person responsible for problem solving, problem resolution, and community relations on their particular beat. The officer would be the Deputy Chief's liaison between the department and the neighborhoods, schools, and businesses on the beat.

It should be noted that assigning responsibility for the varied duties to the problem solving shift does not preclude officers on other shifts from performing these functions, or participating in the problem solving, or community agenda. All officers should be kept up-to-date on the program and encouraged to participate, as these duties eventually expand to all shifts.

It should also be noted, that the list of duties and responsibilities does not end here. It is up to the districts and the Deputy Chief's to be creative in problem solving and community programs. Eventually, the duties of the problem solving shift should be expanded shift by shift until all shifts on the district have officers performing these duties. Once this is achieved on every district, the department will be able to move on to the second phase of the Community Based Policing. The second phase involves full rotation into the Beat-Zone Officer Concept.

Problem Resolution and Community Relations/Service:

As explained earlier, the beat officer would be the point person for the district on a particular beat, and would be responsible for interacting with neighborhoods, schools, businesses, etc. The district Community Policing Coordinator would assist by helping the beat officer to problem solve on the beat. Both the beat officer and the coordinator would be an interactive part of the problem solving method. Who then would be responsible for tying up all the loose ends internally?

One recommendation is to expand the duties of the current Community Relations officer to include coordination of all district programs involving the following:

    Crime Watch Meetings
    Block Club Meetings
    Neighborhood Organizations
    Schools
    Businesses
    Churches
    District Newsletter
    District Task Force

The current Community Relations Officer's job should be expanded and rewritten in a supervisory capacity to include coordination of all of the job functions listed above. Officers with the expertise and job knowledge currently working in these areas on the districts should be given first consideration. Knowledge of the districts, existing block clubs, schools, businesses and neighborhood organizations is a valuable asset that already exists with these officers, and should not be overlooked.

The Community Relations/Services Supervisor would be responsible for working with the Community Based Policing Coordinators on their districts to assist beat officers to coordinate programs on their beats. The Community Relations Supervisor would be a resource person, and would.be responsible for compiling and keeping current contact lists for area schools, Crime Watch Organizations, block clubs, neighborhood organizations, and businesses (especially alarm contact persons), etc.

The Community Relations/Services Supervisor would be responsible for training beat officers to address organizations, and would coordinate and schedule beat officers attendance at such functions. The Supervisor would also be responsible for initiating proactive programs with the organizations, and be responsible for coordinating the assignment of beat officers with the shift supervisor.

Initially, the Supervisor would assist the beat officers. As time progressed and officers become more proficient at handling meetings, the current need for Community Relations' people to expend overtime at evening meetings would be eliminated.

The Supervisor would also be responsible for coordinating the Crime Watch programs on the district, and would serve as a district supervisor to the Crime Watch Coordinator. The Supervisor and the Crime Watch Coordinator would set agendas and schedule all Crime Watch presentations in conjunction with beat programs.

The supervisor would also be responsible for scheduling district Task Force meetings and setting agendas. The Community Relations/Service Supervisor would also assume responsibility for publishing the district newsletter.

The use of the Community Relations/Services Supervisor as opposed to the current role of community relations personnel, would show that the department is committed to Community Based Policing and that community relations is one of the most important aspects of the Community Based Policing agenda.

Expanding the role of the Community Relations Officer to a supervisory position would also extend the duties of the Supervisor from that of a participant to a trainer and coordinator. Instead of two administrative community relations employees being responsible for addressing over 200 groups and organizing programs on an officer's beat, the Supervisor would coordinate beat officers addressing groups and programs on their beat.

The net result would be to spread the duties of dealing with neighborhoods and groups to the beat officer during rgular duty hours, while at the same time releasing the department from its obligation to pay Community Relations personnel overtime for night/weekend meetings (as is currently being done).

In addition to all of the new duties as mentioned above, the Community Relations/Services Supervisor would be the Problem Resolution person on the district. From potholes to speed signs, the Supervisor would be responsible for ensuring that complaints and requests for action that filtered through beat officers from neighborhoods, block clubs, schools, businesses, etc., were forwarded to the proper city agency. The Supervisor would also be responsible for forwarding responses back through the beat officer to the submitting group.

The Community Relations/Services Supervisor would also be responsible for ensuring that district resource centers (mini-stations) are supplied with information pertaining to IPD and district services. They should also make an attempt to work out of the resource centers on a regularly scheduled basis.

Commitment to Manpower and Training:

As discussed earlier, manpower constraints and proper training are two very important issues. It cannot be stressed enough that for officers to perform in the Problem Solving and Community Based Policing modes, proper training is essential.

The Indianapolis Police Department needs to identify a proper curriculum for Problem Solving and Community Based Policing, and even more important needs to identify an instructor with credibility to coordinate and initiate training. The department needs to make a commitment to properly train the instructor and then ensure that training curriculum is consistent with the department's goals and objectives.

Manpower is an entirely different issue. No one argues that the department needs more police officers. The questions are "how many officers does the department need?" and "how many officers can the department afford?"

The advantage of the proposal chronicled within, is that as the districts move to implement problem solving first on a volunteer basis and then by shift, not only would the cost effectiveness and time savings become evident, but so would the numbers of officers necessary to move from one shift to two, from Phase One to Phase Two, become evident also. Not only would the numbers be clear, but the justification for additional officers would be already done.

Not increasing staffing levels as needed would create an endless loop. The program would not lose any momentum, but the program would not gain any momentum, either. And Community Based Policing would almost certainly not be able to move to full implementation, department-wide on every shift.

CONCLUSION:

This Master Plan is not intended to be a panacea for all that ails the Indianapolis Police Department. Certainly there are numerous side issues that need to be addressed that are not dealt with in this report.

It is however, the intention of this Master plan to address the implementation of Community Based Policing on the Indianapolis Police Department, and the speed and commitment with which implementation has already been attempted. It should be obvious that Problem Solving is a key element of a successful Community Based Policing Program. Commitment and training are other key issues. Failure to define and pursue these areas have set the department behind schedule.

While following all the basic tenets of Community Based Policing and addressing all the issues in a Problem Solving format could lead to a successful Community Based Policing Program, there is one element that could defeat even the best intentions. That is a lack of commitment from the leadership of the Indianapolis Police Department.

If the district Deputy Chief's are not committed to Community Based Policing on their districts, and support and strict guidelines do not emanate from the Chief of Police, then Community Based Policing is doomed to fail in Indianapolis.

Therefore, it is recommended that the Community Services Branch of the Chief's Office assume responsibility for all research, training, and implementation of Community Policing Programs department-wide. The Community Services Branch would be responsible for ensuring that all districts adhere to the proposals contained herein, and that proper training and education of participants is completed.

The Branch would be responsible for researching and writing all job descriptions pertaining to new job characteristics under this proposal. In addition, the branch would also act as a resource and service center for the districts, and complete tasks as directed by the district Deputy Chief's.

Additionally, as an arm of the Chief's Office, the Branch would be given the authority to set realistic deadlines for meeting the criteria contained within, and would be given the authority by the Chief to hold district Deputy Chief's responsible for any failure to comply.

A reasonable goal would be for all districts to have completed the pilot phase, and have one shift of Community Based Policing operational and actively problem solving, by February 1, 1994.

To ensure compliance, progress reports should be submitted by the Community Service Branch Commander every thirty days to the Chief, the Director of Public Safety, and the Mayor.

While this Master plan pertains to the responsibilities of the police districts, other peripheral programs relating to the implementation of Community Based Policing such as the department's mission statement performance evaluations, career pathing, etc., should also be addressed. Additionally, while this Master Plan provides a blueprint for Community Based Policing in Indianapolis, it does not preclude involving employees in the discussion, planning and implementation phases.

Prepared by Lieutenant Brian Nanavaty
        for Executive Deputy Chief Donald Christ

Submitted: February 15, 1993

INDIANAPOLIS POLICE DEPARTMENT
PROBLEM ANALYSIS REPORT

v

SUBMITTED BY _____ BEAT _____ UNIT _____

B.   PROBLEM EXAMINATION (ANALYSIS)

Data sources used: (Include internal as well as external sources. These sources can be Crime Analysis, citizen surveys, personal observations, community groups, business people or police informants. Please Indicate all sources used.)

Has the problem changed based on the analysis?

Signature of Supervisor_____Date _____

,PD Form No> **6-6-84**

SUBMITTED BY_____BEAT_____UNIT._____

C. STRATEGIES (RESPONSES)

List short and long term goals:

Police response recommendations:

Police actions taken:

Community/Business response recommendations:

Community/Business actions taken:

Signature of Supervisor_____ Date _____

)PD Form No# 6.^4

INDIANAPOLIS POUI,CE DEPARTMENT
PROBLEM ANALYSIS REPORT

SUBMITTED BY _____   BEAT _____   UNIT._____

D.   EVALUATIONS (ASSESSMENT)

What evaluation method has been used?   (Calls for service, number of citizen complaints, reduction of criminal complaints, etc.)

Did you get the results you expected?

[   ] Yes   [   ] No   [   ] Partially   [   ] Temporarily

Give details:

Will periodic maintenance be required? _____ If yes explain what action:

Estimated number of hours involved in project: _____

Were overtime hours required for this project? _____

(if so) Amount of overtime used:_____

Signature of Supervisor,_____   Date _____

IPD Form No. 6-8-64

INDIANAPOLIS POUCE DEPARTMENT
PROBLEM ANALYSIS REPORT

1.   SUBMITTED BY: _____

2.   Date Submitted: _____

A-   PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION (SCANNING) t

---

3.   Describe the Problem: (Who, what, when, where, how, and why)

4.   Problem Reported by: _____,_____ _____

5.   Location of Problem: ADDRESS _____ BEAT _____

6*.   Datc(s) and Time(s)Problcm(s) occurring ^ ^ ^ _ ^ _ ^ ^ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ ^ _ ^ ^ _____

B.   PROBLEM EXAMINATTON (ANALYSIS):

---

7.   Shifts affected: (Circle)   DAY   MIDDLE   LATE

8.   Information Sources: *(Jhls* list does not include all possible information sources. There may be
     other places where you can get information. Please indicate all sources.)

     [] Crime Analysis Unit   [] Parole Office
     [3 Vice   [] Investigations
     [] Crime Watch   [] Neighborhood Canvass
     [] literature Search   [] Citizen Complaints
     [ ] Personal Observations   [ ] Surveys
     [] Police Informants   [] Churches
     [] Schools   [] Media
     [3 Central Records   [3 Community Leaders
     [] Local Businesses   [] BMV
     [ ] Other Law Enforcement Agencies
     [] Government Agencies, list _____

     [] Other, list _____

9.   Findings: (Based on the information you have collected, describe the problem.)

C   STRATEGIES (RESPONSES):

10. Goals and Objectives: (What do you expect to accomplish?)

11. Recommend strategies: (How do you expect to obtain the above results?)

12. Date and time for implementation:_____ _____
13- Expected date and time for termination: _____
14. Expected number of officers needed:___ _____
15. Expected number of vehicles needed: _____ ; _____Types: _____

D. SUPERVISORY REVIEW OF STRATEGIESt

[] Approved   [] Disapproved

Recommendations:

Date:_____Supervisor:_____Comp#: _____

E.   EVALUATION (ASSESSMENT)!

16. Did you get the results you expected?

    [] Yes   [] No   [] Partially   [] Temporarily

17. Actual number of Officers used: _____
18. Actual number of Vehicles used: _____
19. Actual number of Hours used: _____

20. Describe the results of what happened.

21. Is any further action required? If yes, explain.

22. Additional comments:

1ND1ANAPOUS POLICE DEPARTMENT

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">OFFICER'S NAME «• J.D.</td><td>DATE</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">PROJECT NUMBER AND STATUS</td></tr>
<tr><td>BEAT _____</td><td colspan="2">SHIFT _____</td></tr>
</table>

DAILY

ACTIVITY LOG

MANHOURS EXTENDED	Cod*	HOURS	HOURS	HOURS	HOURS
High Visibility Patrol - Car	H1				
High Visibility Patrol - Bicycle	H2				
High Visibility Patrol - Foot	H3				
Conduct Formal Survey	H4				
Conduct Informal Survey	H5				
Meetings	H6				
Community Problem Solving	H7				
Criminal-Traffic Inv. / Enforcement	H3				
Project Development/ Investigation	H9				
Perform Crime Prevention Activity	H10				
Assist (Back-Up) Other Operation	H11				
Special Event	H12				
	H13				
	H14				
Assist (Back-Up) Non-Project Hrs.	H15				

ACTIVITIES PERFORMED	NOS-PROJ.	Cod*	QUAN.	PEOPLE	QUAN.	PEOPLE	QUAN,	PEOPLE
Informal Survey - Residential		A1						
Informal Survey - Business		A2						
Formal Community Survey		A3						
Other Survey		A4						
Other Citizen Contacts		A5						
Criminal / Civil / Juvenile Clt.		A6						
Traffic Citations		A7						
Traffic Warnings		A8						
Parking Violation Notice		A9						
Field Interview Report		A10						
Application - Warrant / Sum.		A11						
Crime Prevention (Explain:)		A12						
Arrest		A13						
Offense Reports		A14						
Other (Explain) _____		A15						
Other (Explain) _____		A16						

IPO Form No. 6-6-67

HIGH VISIBILITY - ROUTINE OR SELECTED PATROL lty PROJECT AREA.

CONDUCT FORMAL SURVEY - TIME SPENT IN PROJECT AREA CONDUCTING FORMAL SURVEY.

CONDUCT INFORMAL SURVEY - TIME SPENT IN PROJECT AREA CONDUCTING INFORMAL SURVEY.

MEETINGS - INCLUDES MEETINGS WITH PUBLIC OR OTHER AGENCIES.

COMMUNITY PROBLEM SOLVING - WORK DONE TO SOLVE PROBLEMS OR MEET GOALS IN THE COMMUNITY. INCLUDES INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS, DISTRIBUTING INFORMATION, WORKING WITH OTHER AGENCIES, ETC. DOES NOT INCLUDE ROUTINE HIGH VISIBILITY PATROL.

CRIMINAL /TRAFFIC INVESTIGATION AND ENFORCEMENT; TIME SPENT ON CALLS FOR SERVICE, PHYSICAL ARREST, ISSUING CITATIONS, ETC. AND RELATED PAPERWORK THAT TOOK PLACE IN THE PROJECT AREA OR IS RELATED TO THE PROJECT. ALSO INCLUDES PROJECT RELATED COURT.

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT - TIME SPENT GATHERING STATISTICS, MAKING ROUTINE TELEPHONE CONTACTS, WRITING ACTION PLANS AND FINAL EVALUATIONS.

ASSIST - BACKING UP DISTRICT OR TRAFFIC UNITS REGARDLESS OF LOCATION.

COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

INDIANAPOLIS POLICE DEPARTMENT *i,*

C.O.P.

PROBLEMIDENTIFICA TION
INTERVIEW
BUSINESS/SHOPPING AREA

BEAT

Address/Location Of Interview	*Type Of Business*	*Num. P*ron Mrvkwit*	*SUWi Oit>*ru>n(*}lntfrvl*w«t*
			☐ Owned/ Manager ☐ Employee ☐ Shopper

Years E«f>UWi«MI LOMMNI (Bmln—— Only)	*Wtrt* Looatton (Shoppft Only)*		
Dss. O'- ● «● ☐ More Than 5	☐ KMTDM OnuPar UMIM	☐ Ot>e*P*fUonUi	☐ Less Than Once Per Month

40* Or«up Of fft*spondent(s)
W« ☐ I»™ **nr** ☐ *Jto ● *at* ☐ Mar

1 WHEN YOU THINK OF PROBLEMS OR CRIME WITHIN THIS IMMEDIATE BUSINESS COMMUNITY/ SHOPPING AREA, WHAT ARE YOUR CONCERNS?

2 HOW OFTEN DOES THIS PROBLEM(S) OCCUR?
• CONSTANTLY • FREQUENTLY • PERIODICALLY • ISOLATED INCIDENT

3 DOES THIS PROBLEM(S) CAUSE YOU TO FEEL FEAR, WORRY OR FEEL UNSAFE? Q YES LJNO
(IF YES) HOW OFTEN? • CONSTANTLY • FREQUENTLY • SOMETIMES

4 HAS THIS PROBLEM(S) INCONVENIENCED OR CHANGED:
(FOR BUSINESS) THE WAY YOU OPERATE OR CONDUCT BUSINESS? DYES QNO HOW?
(FOR SHOPPERS) THE MANNER IN WHICH YOU SHOP? DYES QNO HOW?

5 WHAT DO YOU FEEL IS THE CAUSE OF THIS PROBLEM(S)?

6 WHAT DO YOU FEEL YOU SHOULD OR COULD DO TO CORRECT THIS PROBLEM(S)?
WHAT DO YOU FEEL THE POLICE COULD DO?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

7 ARE YOU AFRAID OR WORRIED ABOUT _____ OCCURRING IN THIS
IMMEDIATE BUSINESS/SHOPPING AREA?   [^YES   ☐NO

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

BASED ON YOUR INTERVIEWS AND OBSERVATIONS, DO YOU FEEL THAT A FEAR PROBLEM EXISTS IN
THIS BUSINESS COMMUNITY? Q Y E S   Q N O   (IF YES, WHAT DO YOU FEEL IS THE MAJOR PROBLEM?)

	INTERVIEWING OFFICER	TIME	DATE
		Fnmt *•••* .... *Tot'''*	

COMMUNITY SURVEY

1. How do you feel about the safety and security of your community?

_____
_____
_____
_____

2. When you think of neighborhood problems, what are your concerns?

_____
_____
_____
_____

3. How often does this problem occur?   (Circle your choice)

  a. Daily   e. After school hours
  b. Weekends   f. After dark
  c. Once or twice a week   •   g. Isolated incidents
  d. Monthly

  Specie hours of occurrence:_____:_____

4. What do you feel is the cause of the problem?

_____
_____
_____
_____

5. What do you think the neighborhood should/could do to correct this problem?

_____
_____
_____
_____

6. What do you think the police should/could do to correct this problem?

_____
_____
_____
_____

7. Do you currently participate in any crime prevention program?

  _____YES_____NO

  If not, would you be interested in participating?

  _____YES_____NO

8. Is there a community organization established^ your neighborhood?

_____YES_____NO

If so, are you an active member? ·

_____YES_____NO

If no community organization is established, would you be interested in starting one?

_____YES_____NO

When could you be contacted if an organization were formed?

_____

Please complete the following:

Name:_____

Address:_____

Name of Community/Development where you live: _____

_____

_____

How long have you lived there? _____

Number of persons in household? _____

Name:_____

Address:_____

Name of Community/Development where you live: _____

_____

_____

How long have you lived there? _____

Number of persons in household? _____

Name:_____

Address:_____

Name of Community/Development where you live: _____

_____

_____

How long have you lived there? _____

Number of persons in household? _____

ENVIRONMENTAL SURVEY

LOCATION: _____

TIME OF DAY		**P A Y OF WEEK**	**MONTH**	**SECURITY INDICATORS**

TIME OF DAY

☐ 0100	☐ 1300
☐ 0200	☐ 1400
☐ 0300	☐ 1500
☐ 0400	☐ 1600
☐ 0500	☐ 1700
☐ 0600	☐ 1SO0
☐ 0700	☐ 1900
☐ 0800	☐ 2000
☐ 0900	☐ 2100
☐ 1000	☐ 2200
☐ 1100	☐ 2300
☐ 1200	☐ 2400

PAY OF WEEK

| ☐ MONDAY |
| ☐ TUESDAY |
| ☐ WEDNESDAY |
| ☐ THURSDAY |
| ☐ FRIDAY |
| ☐ SATURDAY |
| ☐ SUNDAY |

HOLIDAY

☐ YES
M NO

MONTH

| ☐ JAN |
| ☐ FEB |
| ☐ MAR |
| ☐ APR |
| ☐ MAY |
| ☐ JUN |
| ☐ JUL |
| ☐ AUG |
| ☐ SEP |
| ☐ OCT |
| ☐ NOV |
| ☐ DEC |

SECURITY INDICATORS

| ☐ PRIVATE SECURITY |
| ☐ SECURITY CAMERAS |
| ☐ VISITOR PASS SYSTEM |
| ☐ NEIGHBORHOOD WATCH |
| ☐ me INSTALL'N OF ALARM |
| ☐ me INSTALL'N BARS ON WINDOWS/DOORS |
| ☐ FEWER "INNOCENTS" OUT AFTER DARK |
| ☐ INC LOITERING |
| ☐ ACCESS TO PUBLIC PHONE |
| ☐ TRESPASS AGREEMENT |
| ☐ OTHER _____ |

☐ **PAYDAY**   **Q** SOCIALSECURTTY/DCFSVETC CHECKS

LIGHTING

STREET	☐ ADEQUATE	☐ BROKEN/MISSING	☐ INSTALL ADDITIONAL
SIDEWALK	☐ ADEQUATE	☐ BROKEN/MISSING	☐ INSTALL ADDITIONAL
PARKING LOT	☐ ADEQUATE	☐ BROKEN/MISSING	☐ INSTALL ADDITIONAL
COMMONSVPLAYGRND	☐ ADEQUATE	☐ BROKEN/MISSING	☐ INSTALL ADDITIONAL
RESIDENTIAL	☐ ADEQUATE	☐ BROKEN/MISSING	☐ INSTALLADDITIONAL
GARAGE	☐ ADEQUATE	☐ BROKEN/MISSING	☐ INSTALL ADDITIONAL
BUSINESS	☐ ADEQUATE	☐ BROKEN/MISSING	☐ INSTALL ADDITIONAL

LANDSCAPE

YARDS, LAWNS	☐ TRIMMED	☐ NEED TRIMMING	
TREES, SHRUBS	☐ TRIMMED	☐ NEEDTRJMMING	**Q** REMOVE*
COMMONStfLAYGRND	☐ NEED FENCING	☐ NEEDMAINT	
FENCES	☐ NEED REPAIR	☐ REMOVE/MOVE	**Q** INSTALL ADDITIONAL
BLDG EXTERIORS	☐ NEED PAINT/ CLEAN/REPAIR	☐ GRAFFTn	

DOORS	☐ BROKEN# ___	☐ BOARDED *0* ___	
WINDOWS	☐ BROKEN# ___	☐ BOARDED *0* ___	
ABANDONED SrTES	☐ OPEN *0* ___	☐ BOARDED *0* ___	☐ LONG TERM PROBLEM
ABANDONED CARS	☐ NONE	☐ 1-3	☐ LONG TERM PROBLEM
LITTER PICK-UP	☐ ADEQUATE	☐ INADEQUATE	☐ LARGE ITEM PROBLEM
TRAFFIC FLOW	☐ EASY CONTROL	☐ DIFFICULT CONTROL	☐ NEED SIGNS
	☐ NEED BARRIERS	☐ RESIDENT/VISITOR PARKING TAGS IN USE	

☐ **PHOTOGRAPHIC DOCUMENTATION**   **Q** VIDEO DOCUMENTATION

BY: _____   **DATE:** _____

209