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City of Colorado Springs

- Population of 419,848 people
- 194 square miles
- 895 Police Employees
  - 620 Sworn Officers
  - 275 Civilian Employees
- Heavy Military Presence
  - Population of ~50,000 service men and women
Analytical and Intelligence Center

8 Criminal Intelligence Analysts
  ◦ 4 Patrol Focused Analysts
  ◦ 4 Intelligence/Investigative Focused Analysts

3 Intel Unit Detectives

1 Analytical Supervisor

1 Lieutenant
Scanning & Problem Definition

- Entertainment District
  - Typical Issues
  - Increasing Challenges
    - Economic Pressures
    - More Bars = More Bar Patrons
    - Homelessness and Panhandling

- Initial Police Response
  - HOT Team
  - DART
Collaboration

- CSPD and the Military
  - Executive Forum
  - Investigative/Intelligence
  - Courtesy Patrol

- The Armed Forces Disciplinary Control Board (AFDCB)
  - Military Analysts
Opportunity

- Old Methodology outdated
  - Easy for bar owners to manipulate
  - Not comprehensive
  - Not comparable

- Development of new model
  - Analysis Driven
  - Location-Based Criminal Risk Assessment (CRA)
The data is collected and categorized by the type of activity:
  - Person
  - Property
  - Weapons
  - Liquor
  - Drugs
  - Disturbance/Disorder
  - Suspicious Activity

Each of these categories are then weighted using the *Fear of Crime* scale.
A survey is used to gather initial information

![Narcotics Unit Survey](image)

A quarterly meeting with representatives from all of the involved units/groups takes place
Collection Process

- Narcotics.xlsx
- Downtown Team Survey.xlsx
Weighting Process
- Type of Activity
- Severity of Activity
- Source Reliability & Content Validity
- Relationship with the Bar
- Public Safety Cooperation
- Non–Criminal Gang Presence
Information Flow

Crime/Event

CSPD Database

FIR Score 15%
Summons Score 25%
Case Reports Score 25%
Calls for Service Score 15%

Intel Factor 20%

Survey

Intel Meeting

Final Score
# Location-Based Criminal Risk Assessment

## Risk Assessment Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Name</th>
<th>Qtrs 2 - 2011</th>
<th>Qtrs 3 - 2011</th>
<th>Qtrs 4 - 2011</th>
<th>Qtrs 1 - 2012</th>
<th>Qtrs 2 - 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bar A</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar B</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar C</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar D</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar E</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar F</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar G</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar H</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar I</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar J</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar K</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar L</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar M</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar N</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar O</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar P</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar Q</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar S</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Working with Academia

- United States Air Force Academy
- Mutually beneficial
- Statistically valid
Impacts

- Improved Community Safety
  - More Informed Decision Making
    - AFDCB
    - CSPD
    - City Attorney/Liquor Board
  - Continuity of Operations
    - Qualitative Comparison
  - Increased Accountability
    - Bar Owners
Example Reaction of Bar A

- Traditional Police Intervention Unsuccessful
  - Bar Engages with Police to Reduce Their Score
    - Their Score is Lowered
      - Removed from Off-Limits List by AFDCB

- Bar Placed Off-Limits by AFDCB
Example Reaction of Bar B

- Bar does not want to work with police
- Bar Appears to Engage with the PD
- Bar Placed Off-Limits by AFDCB
- Homicide Occurs
- Bar Loses Liquor License
What’s Next

- CSPD
  - Hookah Bars
  - Retail Establishments
  - Apartment Complexes
  - Schools
  - Geographic Areas
  - Risk Terrain Modeling

- Replication of Model in Other Cities
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For more information, or to receive further documentation about this model, please feel free contact Josh Levin with CSPD.