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• Response Protocol
Why DV?

- **DV** is #2 type of CFS (after false alarms)

- **4,000** DV CFS each year (out of 65,500 citizen CFS)

- **8,000+** Patrol hours responding to DV CFS

- **16%** of violent crime is DV-related
Overall DV CFS Trend

Total Domestic Violence and Disturbance CFS: 2007-2014

Chart only includes CFS coded as 415DV, 13700R, 243DV, 273DV, 273TR, and 594DV; raw CFS numbers are an undercount, because they do not include DV-related CFS coded as 211s, 245s, etc.
DV Call Type Trends

Domestic Violence and Disturbance CFS by Type: 2007-2014

Chart only includes CFS coded as 415DV, 13700R, 243DV, 273DV, and 273TR
• Smart Policing Initiative - BJA
• 3-year project
  – 1/2 complete
• Opportunity for innovation
• Evidence-based approach

Sector 1 (experimental area)

Emphasis:
Reduce Repeat DV
• Four formal partners
• Already work together to deliver services
Innovative Strategies

- Focused deterrence – High Point, NC

  - Warning offenders what will happen if involved in future incident

  - Goal is to prevent next incident

  - Reduced recidivism from 17% to 7%-10%

  - Reduced overall DV/Family CFS by 22%
Innovative Strategies

• Tiered approach – Great Britain
  - Reduced percent of higher-level responses necessary from 34% to 2%

• Police follow-up w/offender w/in 7 and 28 days – Fremont, CA
  - Reduced repeat CFS at chronic locations by 66%
Common Themes

• Protect and support victims
  - Action driven by police, not victim

• Hold offenders accountable

• Focus limited resources on repeat suspects and victims
Management Team
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Problem Analysis

Types of Analysis Conducted

• Literature review

• Survey data and focus groups (officers)

• Internal data (CFS, crimes, etc.)

• External data (county jail, DA, etc.)

• Victim/offender perspective
Officer Survey

- **87%** of officers frustrated with repeat 415 DVs
- **76%** of officers said they were often concerned about their safety on DV calls
- **48%** of officers said arresting someone on a DV seldom helps prevent future incidents

N = 82
Background/Methods

**Data Analyzed**

- CFS/Crimes/People/DA/Jail/Probation/
  - 10,180 incidents

- Case review/CFS review – sample months
  - 97 DV cases in March 2013, 85 variables
  - 309 CFS in July 2014, 13 variables
DV Incident Flow

10,180 DV Calls for Service

2,771 Crimes (27% of DV CFS)

1,340 Arrests (48% of Crimes)

657

Issued by DA (51% of 1,298 cases submitted to DA)

567 Guilty (86% of Issued)

21% of DV crimes result in guilty verdict

Data is for 1/1/12-6/30/14
Prosecution Stats

• 45% of felony offenders pled to misd. or infraction

• Most common reasons for rejection:
  - No independent corroboration (53%)
  - In furtherance of justice (12%)
  - Other victim/witness considerations (7%)

• 51% of victims were not willing to cooperate
415 DVs Most Common

72% of DV CFS Not Crimes/No Crime Report

- 68% No Crime Report
- 27% 13730 Report
- 4% DV Crime Report
- 1% Other*

Data is for CFS from 1/1/12-6/30/14
## Residential Repeats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of DV CFS</th>
<th># of Addresses in Frequency Group</th>
<th>Total Residential DV CFS</th>
<th>% of Residential DV CFS*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,460</td>
<td>3,460</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>1,412</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,694</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,115</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5 years: 26% of residential DV addresses = 51% of residential DV CFS

Data is for 1/1/12-6/30/14
Problems w/ addresses

• 38%* of DV CFS occur at non-residential locations
  - 15% street
  - 8% business/parking lot
  - 4% apartment complex – no specific unit
  - 11% other (bars, motels, parks, trolley, etc.)

• DV incident at one person’s home, then other person’s home

• Using addresses substantially undercounts repeats

*Data is for July 2014
**Sector 1: Jan-Jun 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repeat Residential DV Addresses</th>
<th>6-mo. Total DV CFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>245 WOODLAWN AV - unit redacted</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515 GLOVER AV - unit redacted</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>875 [redacted] AV</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545 E ST - unit redacted</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>867 WOODLAWN AV - unit redacted</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425 OAKLAWN AV - unit redacted</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129 [redacted] AV</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>756 [redacted] AV</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585 OTIS ST - unit redacted</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175 E ST - unit redacted</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209 CHURCH AV - unit redacted</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>667 F ST - unit redacted</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 H ST - unit redacted</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449 D ST - unit redacted</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234 [redacted] AV</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552 D ST - unit redacted</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 WOODLAWN AV - unit redacted</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>663 E MANOR DR - unit redacted</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 WOODLAWN AV - unit redacted</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702 [redacted] AV</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274 MADRONA ST - unit redacted</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 WOODLAWN AV - unit redacted</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>837 RIVERLAWN AV - unit redacted</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*residential addresses

Just 23 DV addresses* (6%) = at least 19% of DV CFS*

Preventive visits could help
# CFS vs. % That Repeat

It gets harder to prevent repeats with each subsequent incident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of DV CFS to an Address</th>
<th>% That Repeat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data is for 1/1/12-6/30/14
## 515 Glover Av - [unit # redacted]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DispDate/Time</th>
<th>DV CFS Category</th>
<th>Arrested Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/26/2014 21:35</td>
<td>415DV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/21/2014 17:15</td>
<td>243DV Crime Report</td>
<td>Arrested on Scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/26/2014 7:33</td>
<td>415DV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/05/2014 19:46</td>
<td>415DV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/12/2014 0:17</td>
<td>415DV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/13/2014 16:42</td>
<td>415DV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/10/2014 2:27</td>
<td>415DV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extra Benefit of DV Focus

(Total of 20,379 CFS over 2.5 years)

• 4,000 DV CFS per year = 8,000 CFS of any type per year (12% of all citizen CFS)
Repeat Crimes - People

• **13%** of DV suspects/arrestees (299) are repeats and account for **29%** of DV crime reports (792)

• **21%** of DV victims are repeats and account for **39%** of DV victimizations

• **6%** of DV offenders were transient, but **25%** of 3-time+ offenders were transient

• DV crimes account for **16%** of all Part 1 Crimes

(repeat %s based on 2,277 unique suspects; 2,881 unique victims)

Data is for 1/1/12-6/30/14 - 2.5-year period
Home Addresses

Suspects

Victims

(San Diego County)
Most non-resident suspects/victims south of I-8
**Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>% Citywide Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>% DV Victims</th>
<th>% DV Suspects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Male Suspects</th>
<th>% Female Suspects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on crime reports and 13730 reports; unique suspects only; percents were rounded and may not add to 100%*
Timing of Repeats

Days Between Repeat CFS/Crimes at Residential Addresses

- 0 days: 6.3%
- 1 day: 10.7%
- 2 days: 12.9%
- 3 days: 14.3%
- 7 days: 20.1%
- 14 days: 27.0%
- 21 days: 32.7%
- 28 days: 37.6%
- 45 days: 46.3%
- 60 days: 52.3%
- 90 days: 62.2%
- 120 days: 68.6%
- 150 days: 73.6%
- 180 days: 78.1%
- 270 days: 85.3%
- 365 days: 91.6%
Timing of Follow-Ups

• 3-Day Theory
• 86% of repeats occurred after 3 days
• Bruises fully developed
• Median time in jail
  - 1.5 days (misdemeanor DV suspects)
  - 3.7 days (felony DV suspects)
  - VINE notification
Predicting Repeats

Portland Police Bureau study
- Prior 415DV or 415FAM (esp. in past year)
- Prior arrests – any offense
- Prior suspect in violent offense
- Prior alcohol/drug offenses

Other Repeat Risk Factor
- Employment status

Chula Vista Data
- Homeless/transient suspect
Additional Findings

• Most common triggers for DV Reports
  - Jealousy/infidelity (24%)
  - Children (15%)
  - Alcohol or drinking behavior (14%)

• Most common RPs in CFS
  - Victim/subject (41%)
  - Neighbor (15%)
  - Passerby (13%)
# Type of DV Incidents (generally) | Suspect/Subject | Victim/Subject
---|---|---
**LEVEL 1:** 1st ever 415 DV | Education message | Education message
**LEVEL 2:** Repeat 415 DVs/ 1st 13730 | Stronger message; sign handout | Stronger message; sign handout
**LEVEL 2+:** Chronic 415DV/ 13730s | Handout; contact neighbors - “cocoon watch” | Handout; contact neighbors - “cocoon watch”
**LEVEL 3:** DV Crime (current or past) | Face-to-face jail warning/ 3-day follow-up | Let victim know specifics of suspect warning
**LEVEL 4:** New DV CFS/crime after Level 3 warning | Call-ins; jail time; 28-day follow-up | Let victim know about call-in
**LEVEL 5:** Most Serious Suspects | Target for prison with DA | Victim support
Domestic Abuse Response Team

- 30+ patrol officers volunteered
- 24/7 coverage of test sector
- Implementing 5-level response protocol
Domestic Violence Project

- Level Assignment and Data Collection
- Record Search By Date and Incident # (On Screen)
- CAD Report Manager
- Prior Warnings By Name

Do Not Use on MDCs For use 10-19 only
- Reports (Pending 3 day and 28 day follow-ups, officer activity reports, etc.)
- Run DV Master Report

Admin Use Only
- Admin Reports

Exit
Assign Incident Level

Incident Date: 07/06/2015  
LNumber (Must enter 'L'): L999  
Officer ID: 745

If both subjects fled, continue to Incident tab

Was today's incident: Not a crime, just a CFS

Have there been other DV incidents (CFS or crimes) involving this couple since 1/1/12?

If yes, how many prior 415DV CFS incidents? 1
If yes, how many prior 13730 incidents? 0
If yes, how many prior DV crime incidents? 0

Has this couple received a prior warning? No

Suggested Incident Level: Level 2
Officer Assigned Level:

Note on why you think the suggested incident level is not appropriate:
### Domestic Violence-Related CFS History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and Time</th>
<th>CFS Code</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Dispo</th>
<th>L#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/05/2015 23:03</td>
<td>415DVJ</td>
<td>**********15YO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>RPS MOTHER AND BOY FRIEND IN VERBAL NO WEAPONS IN HOME NO ALC/DRUG NO MENTAL ILLNESS **********37YO HM BBAP BLU SHIRT JEANS - DRIVES BLK DODG DURANGO WITH GRN TAILGATE POSS HAS WARRANT FOR DV MOTHER-**********WF UNKN CLOTHING 2 YO IN HOME. STILL VERBAL WARRANT FOR **********243E1 M154139DV SUBJ LEFT IN VEH ON F ST UNITS 10-4 ON UPDATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/17/2015 14:25</td>
<td>13700R</td>
<td>**********</td>
<td>150008151</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>L176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>STEP FATHER THOWING THINGS AT RP MOM. IS 11-42. STEP FATHE R KNOWS RP IS CALLING PD. NO WEAPONS NO ALCOHOL RECEIVED ANOTHER CALL, NOTHING CHANGED SECOND CALL WAS ACCIDENTAL INSIDE THE HOUSE WITH THE RP THE MALE IS GOA CODE 4 DVRT ADVISED AND ERNT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other CFS History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and Time</th>
<th>CFS Code</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Dispo</th>
<th>L#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/20/2015 10:44</td>
<td>415NOI</td>
<td>**********</td>
<td></td>
<td>CK</td>
<td>1122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wants/Warrants/TRO/ONS MA09, Name Summary R101, Dist. Atty's DA09
(Last-,First-,Middle-Name and DOB Combined Inquiry)

Name-Match-Type
Last Name: hermosillo
First Name: israel
Middle Name: 
Date of Birth: 

NOTE: Full or partial name along with date of birth is required.

If the person being searched has a birth date between Jan 1, 1995 through to Dec 31, 2005, please use this DOB, '00000000'. Failure to do so may result in a failure to find matching records.

Search  Clear Form

Policy Notice:

- Use of this system is authorized for San Diego Sheriff's users and other authorized law enforcement agencies only. Individuals attempting to use this system without authority, and/or in excess of their authority, are subject to arrest and prosecution. All users of this system are hereby notified that all activities of this system are monitored and recorded.
DV Offender Master Name Report

Last Name: [Redacted]  First Name: WILLIAM  DOB: [Redacted]

CFS Data

Received Date: 20140907  CFS Type: 415DVN  Beat: 12  Location: 706 F ST [Redacted]
CaseNo: [Redacted]  Disposition: CK  Victim or Suspect: SUB

Call Narrative: OPEN LINE ON 911, FEMALE YELLING HER ADDRESS, SOUNDED LIKE 706 F ST APT 11. MALE HEARD SAYING, IM LEAVING AND NOW NO SOUNDS. FEMALE WONT RESPOND WHEN I TRY TO GET HER ATTENTION TO VERIFY THE ADDRESS AND GET FURTHER INFORMATION. LINE JUST DISCONNECTED, RECALLED, FEMALE ANSWERED SAYS BOYFRIEND WAS THERE ARGUING BUT HAS LEFT ON FOOT. 37 YR OLD WHITE MALE, LIVES WITH RP LEFT UNKNOWN DIRECTION. C4

Received Date: 20140930  CFS Type: 415DVN  Beat: 11  Location: 706 F ST [Redacted]
CaseNo: [Redacted]  Disposition: CK  Victim or Suspect: SUB

Call Narrative: FEMALE ADVISE DOMESTIC DISPUTE AND HUNG UP C4 VERBAL

Received Date: 20141014  CFS Type: 13700R  Beat: 12  Location: 706 F ST [Redacted]
CaseNo: 140013458  Disposition: CR  Victim or Suspect: SUS

Call Narrative: FEMALE CALLED ON 911 STATES SHE AND HER BABY IFO THE RESI FEELS LIKE SHE IS IN DANGER THINKS HER CHILDS FATHER CAN OR WILL HARM HER AND THE CHILD RP HUNG UP ON CALL BACK FEMALE PICKS UP AND HANGS UP AIREP RP RECALLING ADVISED OFFICER ASKING IF SHE IS IN THE APT OR STILL OUT FRONT? RP RECALLED AND SAID THAT IF WE DIDN'T GET THERE SOON THERE WOULD BE ANOTHER STABBING AS SOMEONE WAS GOING KILL HER. RP WILL BE IN [Redacted] WHICH IS NEAR THE OFFICE, RECALLED AND ADVISED THAT OFFICERS ARE ON THEIR WAY. MAKING CONTACT IN UNIT 15. OFFICER CONFIRMED THERE WAS NOT STABBING TO NIGHT CLEARING THE APT REQ. DVRVT RESPOND TO THE SCENE DVRVT ADVISED AND ENTER/DISPO 11-10 13700 PC DVRVT ON SCENE SAYING IT IS A GATED COMMUNITY AND THEY NEED SOMEONE TO LET THEM IN UNITS W DVRVT

NetRMS Data

Case # 1214519.1  Occurred On: 11/4/2012 9:32:00 PM  Location: 706 F St  Victim/Suspect: Arrestee
Violation: THREATEN CRIME W/INTENT TO TERRORIZE (F)  Code Section: 422

Case # 1311549.1  Occurred On: 8/17/2013 6:35:00 AM  Location: 706 F St, Apt [Redacted]  Victim/Suspect: Arrestee
Violation: BATTERY:SPOUSE/EX SPOUSE/DATE/ETC (M)  Code Section: 243 (E)(1)
Main Message Points

• What happened today is **not** okay

• Harmful to you, children, neighbors

• We take this type of incident very seriously

• We are taking a new approach to DV

• Police will be checking in on you

Question

• Likelihood of repeat – scale 1 to 10
Level 2 Protocol

Message/Handout

- Level 2 handout is more strongly worded
- Requests signature by subject
Same as Level 2, plus “Cocoon watch”

- Tell subjects police will be asking people in the area to call police if they hear any domestic disturbances
- Ask neighbors to call police right away if they hear any disturbances
- Ask neighbors for history/details on disturbances
Follow Up Texts

- All Level 2+ at 3 days
- Any Level 3 incidents where officers can’t make follow up contact
- At 30 days for all Level 1 and 2 subjects
- Exact content still being revised – will not include officer name/#

Recent Domestic Disturbance
Hi Nanci - I wanted to check on your safety due to the recent domestic disturbance. If I can help in any way, please call or text me. Officer Xanthe Rosario 619-889-1885. If you are in danger call 911 right away.
Level 3 Protocol

- Jail or face-to-face warning
- In person follow-up visit
- Any future offenses a priority
- If flee, 30-officer team will find you
- New approach driven by POLICE, not victim
Level 4/5 Protocol

- Only if received Level 3 warning and had another DV incident
- Follow through on consequences promised in Offender Warning
- Two in person follow visits in 28 days
- Prioritize for prosecution
Protocol is Priority

Reasons

• Arrest in and of itself does not show impact

• Project is to test alternative responses
  – Tailored messages
  – Warnings
  – 3-day follow-ups
Follow Ups

• Weekend officers pass to weekday officers

• Graves officers pass to days and swings

• DV officer coordinates with each patrol team
Next Steps

- Pilot test: 8/18-9/14
- Debrief and refine protocol/database/handouts
- Identify residences with 3+ DV CFS in past 6 months – preemptive visits/custom problem-solving
- Test for 12 to 15 months
- Evaluate impact
Evaluation Plan

• Rigorous evaluation design – quasi experiment

• Primary impact measures
  – Reduced # of repeat DV CFS
  – Reduced # of chronic victims and offenders
  – Increased time between repeat calls
  – Reduced offense severity

• Quarterly measurements
  • Cost-benefit analysis
Helpful Questions

• Is DV a top CFS type for your agency?

• How many DV CFS per year in your jurisdiction? What percent are not crimes?

• How does DV call volume translate into patrol/investigative workload?

• How effective is current approach? What do the long-term trends look like?

• What % of addresses/people account for what % of DV CFS?
Questions/Ideas?

Nanci Plouffe, 619-409-5965
nplouffe@chulavistapd.org

Karin Schmerler, 619-409-5410
kschmerler@chulavistapd.org