



GMS Report Smart Policing Initiative (SPI) 2009-DG-BX-0118 Report Period: 01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016

The following report covers grantee reported activity for grant number 2009-DG-BX-0118 awarded to City of Los Angeles for the period 01 Oct 2009 - 30 Sep 2016. The award, in the amount of \$899,959.00, was issued as part of the BJA FY 09 Smart P 1 solicitation. Any funds reported only represent an estimate of dollars allocated or used for activities covered by this award.

This report covers 1 reporting period(s) of data, represented as follows:

• 01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016

Project Description

This program is funded under both the Edward Byrne Memorial Competitive Grant Program (Byrne Competitive Program) and the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program. Authorized by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2009 (Pub. L. 111-8), the Byrne Competitive Program helps local communities improve the capacity of state and local justice systems and provides for national support efforts including training and technical assistance programs strategically targeted to address local needs. The JAG Program (42 U.S.C. 3751(a)) is the primary provider of federal criminal justice funding to state and local jurisdictions, and JAG funds support all components of the criminal justice system. The Smart Policing Initiative seeks to build upon the concepts of 'offender-based' and 'place-based' policing and broaden the knowledge of effective policing strategies. The most convincing research demonstrates that 'place-based' or 'hotspot' policing reduces violent crime and neighborhood disorder. This initiative address the need for effective policing that requires a tightly focused, collaborative approach that is measurable, based on sound, detailed analysis and includes policies and procedures for accountability. The Los Angeles Police Department's Real-time Analysis and Critical Response Division (RACR) will employ the principles of problem-oriented policing by scanning, analyzing, responding, and assessing the problem of gun violence in selected neighborhoods in Los Angeles. They will implement a RACR strategy to reduce crimes by improving the use of analytic tools to address crime. The goal is to improve neighborhood safety by using problem solving methods and new and innovative technology to increase efficiency of police officers and investigators. CA/NCF

Grantee

The grantee indicated the award had grant activity during the report period. Performance data can be found in the "Performance Measures" section. Narrative information for the award can be found in the "Grantee Comments" and "Goals and Objectives" sections.

Award Synopsis

The following table displays whether the grantee was operational, not operational, or closed out during the report period.

Reporting Period: 01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016

Operational Not Operational Closed Out

| Grantee | Yes | | No |
|---------|-----|--|----|
|---------|-----|--|----|

Goals & Objectives

The following goals and objectives were entered by the grantee during the report period.

Direct Grantee: (Reporting Period: -)

| | | Ma. | | |
|---|------|--------|---------------------|--------------------|
| # | Goal | Status | Progress & Barriers | Planned Activities |
| | | | | |

Performance Measures

Performance measures data for the GMS report period are displayed below. Only sections with reported data are shown. "Cumulative Total" includes both quarters represented in this report and any other data reported on previous GMS reports since the start of the award.

Agency/Project Information

| Measure | 01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016 | Option Response Totals |
|--|---|--|
| 3. What was the start da | ate (month/year) of your SPI program? | |
| Month/Year | • 10/2009 | • - |
| | | |
| be working with as pa | | |
| | A. Craig Uchida B. Research partner POC information | A B. Research partner POC information |
| A. Name B. Research partner PO | A. Craig Uchida B. Research partner POC information 1. 240-687-3719 | A B. Research partner POC |
| A. Name B. Research partner POinformation | A. Craig Uchida B. Research partner POC information 1. 240-687-3719 | A B. Research partner POC information |

| ACCORDING TO A STATE OF THE CONTROL | t agency's jurisdiction(s)? This can olitically defined area, or a number | |
|---|---|------------------------|
| Jurisdiction(s) name: | City of Los Angeles | •- |
| | ulation that your law enforcement a oulation data by entering your jurisd | |
| A. Population: | A. 3792621 | A |
| 7. How does your agency plan t completion? Select all that ap | to sustain the SPI program accomploply. | lishments post-funding |
| A. Continue to invest in research partnerships | A. Continue to invest in research partnerships | A. 1 |
| B. Continue to use data analysis to inform and improve strategic and | B. Continue to use data analysis to inform and improve strategic and tactical responses | B. 1 |
| tactical responses | C. Foster community partnerships through | C. 1 |
| C. Foster community partnerships through systematic public outreach | systematic public outreach D. Systematically offer | D. 1 |
| D. Systematically offer | in-service training E. Replicate the SPI program in other divisions within the | E. 1 |
| in-service training | agency, if applicable | |

| F. Other | | |
|---|--|---|
| ersonnel | | |
| Measure | 01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016 | Cumulative Total |
| How many current full-time s staff as of the last day of the | sworn officers with general arrest po reporting period? | owers does your agency have on |
| A. Number of current full-time sworn officers with general arrest powers as of the last day of the reporting period B. Of those, the number who | A. 9,900 B. 2,000 | A. 9,900 B. 2,000 |
| are assigned to or involved in the SPI program 9. During the reporting period, program funds? | how many crime analyst positions v | vere created/added using SPI |
| A. Number of full-time crime analyst positions | A. Number of full-time crime analyst positions | A. Number of full-time crime analyst positions |
| Cumulative (since start of award) | 1. 0 | 1 |
| 2. This reporting period | 2.0 | 2. 0 |
| B. Number of part-time crime analyst positions | B. Number of part-time crime analyst positions | B. Number of part-time crim |
| Cumulative (since start of award) | 1. 0 | 1 |
| 2. This reporting period | 2. 0 | 2. 0 |

| | V | |
|---|--|----------------------------------|
| During the reporting period, (regardless of the origin of p | | were assigned to the SPI program |
| A. Number of full-time crime analyst positions assigned to SPI program | A. 10 | A. 10 |
| B. Number of part-time crime analyst positions assigned to SPI program | B. 4 | B. 4 |
| | | |
| Measure | 01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016 | Option Response Totals |
| Measure 11. During the reporting period, | 30 Sep 2016 | |
| | 30 Sep 2016 | |
| 11. During the reporting period, | 30 Sep 2016 were BJA SPI funds used | to pay for overtime hours? |

12. What problem do you plan to address with your SPI program?

| | (01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016) The LAPD is addressing the problems of violent crime and gun-related crime | |
|---|--|------------------------------------|
| easure | 01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016 | Option Response Totals |
| 13. During the reporting perio | od, did you conduct an analysis of yo | our problem's underlying causes? |
| A. Yes | A. Yes B | A. 1 |
| B. No | C | B. 0 |
| C. If No, please explain and | | C |
| skip to the Action Plan Development section. | | |
| Development section. 14. Which of the following groduring the reporting period. A. Sworn employees of the | A. Sworn employees of the | r problem's underlying causes A. 1 |
| Development section. 14. Which of the following groduring the reporting period. A. Sworn employees of the police agency B. Civilian employees of the | A. Sworn employees of the police agency B. Civilian employees of the | |
| Development section. 14. Which of the following groduring the reporting period. A. Sworn employees of the police agency | A. Sworn employees of the police agency B. Civilian employees of the police agency C. Research partner D. Outside contractor | A. 1 |
| Development section. 14. Which of the following groduring the reporting period A. Sworn employees of the police agency B. Civilian employees of the police agency | A. Sworn employees of the police agency B. Civilian employees of the police agency C. Research partner D. Outside contractor E | A. 1 B. 1 |
| Development section. 14. Which of the following groduring the reporting periods. A. Sworn employees of the police agency B. Civilian employees of the police agency C. Research partner | A. Sworn employees of the police agency B. Civilian employees of the police agency C. Research partner D. Outside contractor | A. 1 B. 1 C. 1 |

| causes during the reporting p | ources did you use for the analysi period? | s or your problem's underlying |
|---|---|--------------------------------|
| A. Official police call, crime, and arrest data (calls for service, officer-initiated | A. Official police call, crime, and arrest data (calls for service, officer-initiated | A. 1 |
| calls for service, crime incident reports, or arrest reports) | calls for service, crime incident reports, or arrest reports) | B. 1 |
| B. Internal agency pre-existing data tracking | B. Internal agency pre-existing data tracking (use of force reports, | C. 0 |
| (use of force reports, citizen complaints) | citizen complaints) | D. 1 |
| C. Community data (e.g., foreclosures, health and | D. Corrections data (e.g., | E. 0 |
| human services data, school data, or other community data) | probation and parole data) E | F. 0 |
| D. Corrections data (e.g., probation and parole data) | F | G. 1 |
| E. Prosecution data (e.g., pretrial data) | G. Offender risk assessments | H. 0 |
| F. Court data (e.g., case outcomes, convictions, | H | I. 1 |
| sentences) G. Offender risk assessments | I. Survey data (e.g., surveys of community members, officers, offenders, or | J. 0 |
| | victims) | K. 0 |
| H. Focus group data (e.g., focus groups of community members, | J | L. 0 |
| officers, or victims) | K | |
| I. Survey data (e.g., surveys of community members, officers, offenders, or victims) | L | |
| J. Systematic observations | | |

| of places by trained observers (e.g., physical disorder) | | |
|---|---|------------------------------------|
| K. Intelligence from confidential or other informants | | |
| L. Other | | |
| 16. In which of the following way the reporting period? | ys did your research partner assist | t with the problem analysis during |
| A. Provided leadership and guidance on problem analysis | A. Provided leadership and guidance on problem analysis | A. 1 |
| B. Introduced new partners to the working group to | B. Introduced new partners to the working group to assist with the problem | B. 1 |
| assist with the problem analysis | analysis C. Collected data for the | C. 1 |
| C. Collected data for the problem analysis (e.g., surveys, focus groups, | problem analysis (e.g., surveys, focus groups, interviews) | D. 1 |
| interviews) | D. Conducted problem analysis | E. 1 |
| D. Conducted problem analysis | E. Interpreted results of the problem analysis | F. 1 |
| E. Interpreted results of the problem analysis | F. Developed actionable recommendations | G. 1 |
| F. Developed actionable recommendations | G. Presented problem analysis results/recommendations to the agency and/or SPI | H. 1 |
| G. Presented problem analysis | working group partners | |
| results/recommendations to the agency and/or SPI working group partners | H. Communicated problem analysis results/recommendations to groups outside of the | |
| H. Communicated problem | agency and/or SPI project working group (e.g., local | |

analysis
results/recommendations
to groups outside of the
agency and/or SPI project
working group (e.g., local
government, community
organizations, media)

government, community organizations, media)

Action Plan Development

| Measure | 01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016 | Option Response Totals | |
|---|----------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| 17. What is the status of your SPI action plan during the reporting period? | | | |
| A. In development | A | A. 0 | |
| B. Has been submitted to BJA but not approved | В | B. 0 | |
| C. Plan has been approved | C. Plan has been approved by BJA | C. 1 | |

Problem Response

| Option Response Totals |
|-------------------------------|
| |

19. Please describe your targeted response (including identified or implemented strategies) to address the problem focus of your SPI program (e.g., increasing community policing and foot patrol in specific violent crime blocks, hiring a coordinator to serve as a community advocate between law enforcement and immigrant communities to increase police legitimacy). This is what you listed in your action plan as your long-term strategic plan, and it will only be changed if you make significant changes to your response.

| number of chronic offender bulletins and asked to watch them, surveill them, and if necessary, make arrests for outstanding warrants, probation/parole violations, or for specific crimes. | |
|--|--|
| did any information come to light to d in the previous question? | hat led to a change in the A. 0 |
| / N. = | 70 |
| B. No | B. 1 |
| C | |
| | C |
| | asked to watch them, surveill them, and if necessary, make arrests for outstanding warrants, probation/parole violations, or for specific crimes. did any information come to light to in the previous question? A |

| Measure | 01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016 | Option Response Totals |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| | os performed data analysis on the esponse activities during the reportir | |
| A. Sworn employees of the police agency | A. Sworn employees of the police agency | A. 1 |
| B. Civilian employees of the police agency | B. Civilian employees of the police agency | B. 1 |
| C. Research partner | C. Research partner D. Outside contractor | C. 1 |
| D. Outsidet | E | D. 1 |
| D. Outside contractor | F | D. I |
| E. Data was not analyzed this reporting period | | E. 0 |
| F. Official police call, crime, and arrest data (calls for service, officer-initiated calls for service, crime incident reports, or arrest reports) | | F. 0 |
| 23. Which of the following data street the reporting period? Select | sources did you use in your analysi all that apply. | s of the response activities during |
| A. Official police call, crime, and arrest data (calls for service, officer-initiated | A. Official police call, crime, and arrest data (calls for service, officer-initiated | A. 1 |
| calls for service, crime incident reports, or arrest reports) | calls for service, crime incident reports, or arrest reports) | B. 1 |
| B. Internal agency | B. Internal agency pre-existing data tracking | C. 0 |
| pre-existing data tracking | (use of force reports, | |

| (use of force reports, citizen complaints) | citizen complaints) | D. 1 |
|--|---|--------------|
| C. Community data (e.g., foreclosures, health and human services data, school data, or other | D. Corrections data (e.g., probation and parole data) | E. 0 |
| community data) | E | F. 0 |
| D. Corrections data (e.g., probation and parole data) | F | G. 1 |
| E. Prosecution data (e.g., pretrial data) | G. Offender risk assessments | H. 0 |
| F. Court data (e.g., case outcomes, convictions, sentences) | Н | <u>l. 1</u> |
| G. Offender risk assessments | I. Survey data (e.g., surveys of community members, officers, offenders, or | J. 0 |
| H. Focus group data (e.g., focus groups of community members, officers, or victims) | victims) J K | K. 0 L. 0 |
| I. Survey data (e.g., surveys of community members, officers, offenders, or victims) | L | |
| J. Systematic observations of places by trained observers (e.g., physical disorder) | | |
| K. Intelligence from confidential or other informants | | |
| L. Other | | |

| A. Working group decisionmaking | A. Working group decisionmaking | A. Working group decisionmaking |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. Not Applicable | 1 | 1.0 |
| 2. Yes | 2. Yes | 2. 1 |
| 3. No | 3 | 3. 0 |
| | | |
| B. Prosecution | B. Prosecution | B. Prosecution |
| 1. Not Applicable | 1. Not Applicable | 1. 1 |
| 2. Yes | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. No | 3 | 3. 0 |
| | | |
| C. Criminal investigations | C. Criminal investigations | C. Criminal investigations |
| 1. Not Applicable | 1 | 1. 0 |
| 2. Yes | 2. Yes | 2. 1 |
| 3. No | 3 | 3. 0 |
| | | |

24. Please indicate whether you used analysis to inform the following SPI program response

| D. Long-term crime reduction and prevention (strategic approach) | D. Long-term crime reduction and prevention (strategic approach) | D. Long-term crime reduction and prevention (strategic approach) |
|--|--|--|
| 1. Not Applicable | 1 | 1. 0 |
| 2. Yes | 2. Yes | 2. 1 |
| 3. No | 3 | 3. 0 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| E. Tactical strategies (e.g., short-term crime reduction | E. Tactical strategies (e.g., short-term crime reduction | E. Tactical strategies (e.g., short-term crime reduction |
| or prevention strategies) | or prevention strategies) | or prevention strategies) |
| 1. Not Applicable | 1 | 1. 0 |
| 2. Yes | 2. Yes | 2. 1 |
| 3. No | 3 | 3. 0 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| F. Informing the media/public | F. Informing the media/public | F. Informing the media/public |
| 1. Not Applicable | 1. Not Applicable | 1. 1 |
| 2. Yes | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. No | 3 | 3. 0 |

| 25. In which of the following activ during the reporting period? S | ities did your research partner assi Select all that apply. | st with the SPI program respons |
|---|--|---------------------------------|
| A. Provided training and/or technical assistance to agency analysts | A. Provided training and/or technical assistance to agency analysts | A. 1 |
| B. Introduced new partners to | B | B. 0 |
| the working group to assist with problem response | C. Collected data for the analysis of the problem | C. 1 |
| C. Collected data for the analysis of the problem response | D. Conducted or assisted in | D. 1 |
| D. Conducted or assisted in ongoing data analysis | ongoing data analysis E. Interpreted analysis results | E. 1 |
| E. Interpreted analysis results | F. Provided recommendations on program strategies | F. 1 |
| F. Provided recommendations on program strategies | G. Presented analysis results/recommendations to the agency and/or SPI | G. 1 |
| G. Presented analysis results/recommendations to the agency and/or SPI working group partners | working group partners H. Communicated analysis results/recommendations to groups outside of the agency and/or SPI project working group (e.g., local | H. 1 |
| H. Communicated analysis results/recommendations to groups outside of the agency and/or SPI project working group (e.g., local government, community organizations, media | government, community organizations, media | |

Response to Crime, Disorder, or Other Community Problems

| Measure | 01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016 | Option Response Totals |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| | ogram response focus on crime, diso blems, community satisfaction, comm | rder, or other community problems (e.g., nunity engagement)? |
| A. Yes | A | A. 0 |
| B. No | B. No | B. 1 |
| 27. Please describe v | vhat activities were carried out during | the reporting period (e.g., hot spot patrols |

- 27. Please describe what activities were carried out during the reporting period (e.g., hot spot patrols were conducted in high-crime areas, an abandoned building was torn down in a target area, officers were trained on crisis intervention strategies):
- 28. Which of the following crime prevention models/strategies, if any, did you use during the reporting period? Select all that apply.
- 29. Which of the following models or strategies, if any, did you use during the reporting period? Select all that apply.

Technology Demonstration

| 20. Are you implement | - 12 | |
|-----------------------|--------|-------------------------------------|
| reporting period? | | part of your SPI program during the |
| A. Yes | A. Yes | A. 1 |
| B. No | B | B. 0 |

| | Text Response(s) | |
|--|---|---|
| Spiriterature and a second respective and the second second second | ne type of technology that your SPI pro eras [BWCs], data analysis software/ha | |
| | | partner are testing the use of automated a measure of dosage in the four Division |
| ody Worn Cameras | | |
| Measure | 01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016 | Option Response Totals |
| | | |
| A. Yes B. No | A B. No | A. 0 B. 1 |
| 200 | | |
| B. No Measure 33. Please enter the | B. No 01 Jul 2016 - | B. 1 Cumulative Total e for BWCs in your agency/coalition. |

36. Please enter the number of BWCs purchased through the SPI grant funding.

Program Progress

| easure | 01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016 | Option Response Totals |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 37. Do you track your SPI pr | ogram's progress or impact using spe | ecific quantitative measures? |
| A. Yes | A. Yes B | A. 1 |
| B. No | C | B. 0 |
| C. If no, please explain: | | C |
| | | |
| leasure | 01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016 | Cumulative Total |
| | | |

| A. | A. Within the areas LAPD and the research partner are measuring dosage (amount of time in the zones by patrol officers) and crime (violent and gun-related) on a weekly basis. These data are used in Compstat meetings and 'crime control meetings' within each Division. | |
|--|---|---------------------------------|
| <i>l</i> leasure | 01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016 | Option Response Totals |
| 40. Since the beginning of you of focus? | r program, has it demonstrated a m | easurable impact on the problem |
| A. Yes, positive impact | A. Yes, positive impact B | A. 1 |
| B. Yes, negative impact | C | B. 0 |
| C. No measurable impact | D | C. 0 |
| D. Not yet been measured | E. In 2015 we began to see | D. 0 |
| E. If Yes, please explain | an uptick in violent and gun-related crime in the city of Los Angeles. We conducted analyses to determine the drivers behind the increase. We found that 50% of our homicides and 40% of our violent crime were being generated in four divisions – 77th Street, Newton, Southeast, and Southwest. Thus, we focused enforcement and crime prevention in these | E |

areas. In 2016 we emphasized the use of LASER in these areas and saw that homicides and gun-related crimes began to decrease, thus showing a positive impact of our methods.

Organizational Integration and Project Sustainability

| N easure | 01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016 | Option Response Totals |
|--|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 41. Has there been a change in partner team members duri | | significant change in the research |
| A. Yes | A | A. 0 |
| B. No | B. No | B. 1 |
| | C | |
| C. If Yes, please explain and update your research partner POC information, if applicable, in question 4 | | C |
| 42. Has there been a change in | agency or project leadership do | uring the reporting period? A. 0 |
| 74. 100 | 7.0 | 70 |
| B. No | B. No | B. 1 |
| C. If Yes, please explain | C | C |
| | | |

| 43. Has your agency adopted any policies or procedures as a result of the SPI program? | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------|--|--|
| A. Yes | A | A. 0 | | |
| B. No | B. No | B. 1 | | |
| | ogram, please identify the policies PI program. Select all that apply. | or procedures adopted by your | | |
| 45. During the reporting period, | did any of the following occur? Se | lect all that apply. | | |
| A. Discussion of SPI in command staff, COMPSTAT, or other | A. Discussion of SPI in command staff, COMPSTAT, or other | A. 1 | | |
| leadership meetings | leadership meetings B. Discussion of SPI in roll | B. 1 | | |
| B. Discussion of SPI in roll call | call C | C. 0 | | |
| C. Discussion of SPI in district meetings | D | D. 0 | | |
| D. SPI-specific training for recruits | E. SPI-specific in-service | E. 1 | | |
| E. SPI-specific in-service training | training F | F. 0 | | |
| F. SPI knowledge requirement for advancement tests/boards | G | G. 0 | | |
| G. Other | | | | |

| A. No activities have been | A | A. 0 |
|---|---|---------|
| conducted during the reporting period | | , , , , |
| B. Presented about the SPI | B. Presented about the SPI strategy at a conference | B. 1 |
| strategy at a conference | C | C. 0 |
| C. Disseminated publications to the field | | |
| about the SPI strategy | D | D. 0 |
| D. Developed fliers to inform | E | F 0 |
| the public about the SPI strategy | | E. 0 |
| E. Other | | |

Community Outreach

| Measure | 01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016 | Option Response Totals |
|---|------------------------------|--|
| 47. How often was your agency program during the reporting | I DEC | nmunity activities as part of your SPI |
| A. Hosted community meetings | A. Monthly | A. 1 |
| | B. Monthly | |
| B. Attended community meetings, advisory boards, or roundtables | C. Not Applicable | B. 1 |
| | D. Weekly | |
| | E. Daily | C. 1 |
| C. Distributed a newsletter, email, or other bulletin | F. Monthly | |
| | G. Not Applicable | D. 1 |
| D. Attended community | Н | |
| events (e.g., national night out, block parties, | | E. 1 |

| festivals) | |
|---|------|
| E. Conducted social media activities (e.g., Facebook, | F. 1 |
| Twitter) | G. 1 |
| F. Conducted outreach to minority populations (e.g., racial, ethnic, religious, LGBTQI) | Н |
| G. Other | |
| H. If other please explain | |

Working Group and Partnerships

| Measure | 01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016 | Option Response Totals |
|---|--------------------------------|--|
| 48. Did your initiative have a period? | working group to help guide to | ne SPI program during the reporting |
| A. Yes | A. Yes | A. 1 |
| B. No | В | B. 0 |
| 49. How often did your worki the response that best fit | | ings during the reporting period? Select |
| A. We did not meet this quarter | A | A. 0 |
| B. Daily | В | B. 0 |
| C. Weekly/Biweekly | C | C. 0 |

| D. Monthly E. Quarterly | D. Monthly E | D. 1 E. 0 |
|--|---|--|
| actively involved in the initia | orking group partners based on this stive this reporting period." | statement: "This partner was |
| A. Research partner | A. Research partner | A. Research partner |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1 | 1. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 5. Agree6. Strongly Agree | 6. Strongly Agree | 6. 1 |
| B. State/tribal leadership (e.g., governor's office) | B. State/tribal leadership (e.g., governor's office) | B. State/tribal leadership (e.g., governor's office) |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 5. Agree6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| C. Local leadership (e.g., mayor's office) | C. Local leadership (e.g., mayor's office) | C. Local leadership (e.g., mayor's office) |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2. 0 |

| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
|--|--|--|
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | Ç. | |
| D. Federal law enforcement agencies | D. Federal law enforcement agencies | D. Federal law enforcement agencies |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | | |
| E. State law enforcement | E. State law enforcement agencies | E. State law enforcement agencies |
| agencies | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor Disagree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| Strongly Agree F. Local law enforcement agencies (including | F. Local law enforcement agencies (including detectives/investigators) | F. Local law enforcement agencies (including detectives/investigators) |
| detectives/investigators) | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |

| 4. Neither Agree hor Disagree | 5 | 5. 0 |
|--|---|--|
| 5. Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | | |
| | | |
| G. Community-based service providers (e.g., housing, employment) | G. Community-based service providers (e.g., housing, employment) 1. NA/Not Tracked | G. Community-based service providers (e.g., housing, employment) 1. 1 |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 3 | |
| 3. Disagree | | 3. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | | |
| H. Pretrial service | H. Pretrial service organizations | H. Pretrial service organizations |
| organizations | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 5 | 5. 0 |
| Disagree 5. Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | | |
| o. Strongly Agree | I. U.S. Attorney's Office | I. U.S. Attorney's Office |
| I. U.S. Attorney's Office | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |

| 4. Neither Agree nor | 5 | 5. 0 |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Disagree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| 5. Agree | | |
| 6. Strongly Agree | J. Prosecutors | J. Prosecutors |
| J. Prosecutors | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 2 | 2. 0 |
| | | 3. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 3 | 4. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 4 | 5. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor Disagree | 5 | 6. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 6 | 0.0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | | |
| K. Public defender/indigent | K. Public defender/indigent defense | K. Public defender/indigent defense |
| defense | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 5 | 5. 0 |
| Disagree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| 5. Agree | | |
| 6. Strongly Agree | L. Courts | L. Courts |
| L. Courts | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 5 | 5. 0 |
| Disagree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| 5. Agree | | |

| 6. Strongly Agree | M. Community corrections (probation/parole) | M. Community corrections (probation/parole) |
|---|---|---|
| M. Community corrections (probation/parole) | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 5 | 5. 0 |
| Disagree 5. Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | N. Corrections | N. Corrections |
| N. Corrections | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 5 | 5. 0 |
| Disagree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| 5. Agree | | |
| 6. Strongly Agree | O. Health providers | O. Health providers |
| O. Health providers | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 5 | 5. 0 |
| Disagree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| 5. Agree | | |
| 6. Strongly Agree | P. Conducted social media | P. Conducted social media |
| P. Conducted social media | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| F. Conducted Social Media | 2 - | 2. 0 |

| | ۷ | ~ |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 2 | 3. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 3 | 4. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 4 | |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 5 | 5. 0 |
| Disagree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| 5. Agree | | |
| 6. Strongly Agree | Q. Substance abuse | Q. Substance abuse |
| | treatment providers | treatment providers |
| Q. Substance abuse | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| treatment providers | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | | 3. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 3 | |
| 3. Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 5 | 5. 0 |
| Disagree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| 5. Agree | | |
| 6. Strongly Agree | R. Child protective services | R. Child protective services |
| D OUTL 4 1 | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1.1 |
| R. Child protective services | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | | 5. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 5 | 6. 0 |
| Disagree | 6 | 0.0 |
| 5. Agree | | |
| 6. Strongly Agree | S. Community-based service | S. Community-based service |
| | providers | providers |
| S. Community-based service | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| providers | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| | | |

| 3. Disagree | 5 | 5. 0 |
|--|--|--|
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 6 | 6. 0 |
| Disagree | 0 | |
| 5. Agree 6. Strongly Agree | T. Community groups (e.g., neighborhood watch, community center) | T. Community groups (e.g., neighborhood watch, community center) |
| T. Community groups (e.g., neighborhood watch, | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| community center) | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| 5. Agree | | |
| 6. Strongly Agree | | |
| | U. Faith-based organizations | U. Faith-based organizations |
| | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1.1 |
| U. Faith-based organizations | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| 5. Agree | | |
| 6. Strongly Agree | V. Subject matter experts | V. Subject matter experts |
| | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| V. Subject matter experts | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 5 | 5. 0 |

| 4. Neither Agree nor Disagree | 6 | 6. 0 |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| 5. Agree | | |
| 6. Strongly Agree | W. Foundations/Philanthropic organizations | W. Foundations/Philanthropic organizations |
| W. Foundations/Philanthropic | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| organizations | 2 | 2.0 |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor Disagree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| 5. Agree | X. Training and technical | X. Training and technical |
| 6. Strongly Agree | assistance provider(s) | assistance provider(s) |
| X. Training and technical | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| assistance provider(s) | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| 5. Agree | Y. Tribal criminal justice | Y. Tribal criminal justice |
| 6. Strongly Agree | agencies | agencies |
| Y. Tribal criminal justice | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| agencies | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor Disagree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| 5. Agree | A@. Businesses | A@. Businesses |

| 6. Strongly Agree | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| A@. Businesses | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor Disagree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| 5. Agree | AA. K-12 schools | AA. K-12 schools |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| | 2 | 2. 0 |
| AA. K-12 schools | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor Disagree | 0 | |
| 5. Agree | AB. Public services (e.g., trash | AB. Public services (e.g., trash |
| 6. Strongly Agree | collection, public works) | collection, public works) |
| | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| AB. Public services (e.g., trash collection, public works) | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor Disagree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| 5. Agree | | |
| 6. Strongly Agree | | |

| reporting period. Select all th | at apply. | |
|---|--|------|
| A. Briefed agency leaders | A. Briefed agency leaders B. Conducted planning | A. 1 |
| B. Conducted planning meetings | meetings C | B. 1 |
| C. Discussed group membership/participation | D. Discussed resources needed/resource sharing | C. 0 |
| D. Discussed resources needed/resource sharing | E | D. 1 |
| E. Invited outside partners to speak with the members (e.g., faith based) | F | E. 0 |
| F. Planned related activities for group members | G. Planned tactical responses | F. 0 |
| G. Planned tactical responses | H. Reviewed analysis products I. Reviewed project progress | G. 1 |
| H. Reviewed analysis | J. Engaged in project-sustainability | H. 1 |
| products I. Reviewed project progress | planning K | I. 1 |
| J. Engaged in | | J. 1 |
| project-sustainability planning | | K. 0 |
| K. Other | | |

Training

| Measure | 01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016 | Option Response Totals |
|--|--|---|
| 52. Did staff or working reporting period? | pri Carlo Ca | ning related to your SPI program during the |
| A. Yes | A. Yes B | A. 1 |
| | | |

Research Partnership Activities

| Measure | 01 Jul 2016 - 30 Sep 2016 | Option Response Totals |
|--|--|----------------------------------|
| 54. Which of the following active period? Select all that apply | vities, if any, did your research partr y | ner conduct during the reporting |
| A. Attended project working-group meetings | A. Attended project working-group meetings | A. 1 |
| B. Observed/attended program responses (e.g., | B. Observed/attended program responses (e.g., conducted ride-alongs, | B. 1 |
| conducted ride-alongs, observed prevention/outreach services) | observed prevention/outreach services) | C. 1 |
| C. Collected data for the | C. Collected data for the program evaluation | D. 1 |
| program evaluation D. Conducted activities | D. Conducted activities related to the program evaluation | E. 1 |
| related to the program evaluation | E. Communicated with the police agency about the | F. 1 |
| E. Communicated with the police agency about the | current status of the evaluation | G. 1 |
| current status of the evaluation | F. Communicated/presented evaluation plan, | |

| and/or results to the agency and/or SPI working group partners G. Communicated/presented evaluation plan, preliminary findings, and/or results outside of the SPI project working group (e.g., conference presentations) H. Other | G. Communicated/presented evaluation plan, preliminary findings, and/or results outside of the SPI project working group (e.g., conference presentations) H | roducts (e.g., crime analysis |
|---|--|-------------------------------|
| products, progress reports, A. Yes | final report, and presentation slides A. Yes B | A. 1 |
| B. No | | B. 0 |
| C. If Yes, please list and briefly describe the products received during | C. Charts, maps, and tables have been provided by the research partner. The research partner's analyst is embedded in the organization and works | C |

56. How does your agency plan to use the results of the completed assessment/evaluation? Select all that apply.

Grantee Comments

No comments entered



GMS Report Smart Policing Initiative (SPI) 2009-DG-BX-0118 Report Period: 01 Jan 2016 - 30 Jun 2016

The following report covers grantee reported activity for grant number 2009-DG-BX-0118 awarded to City of Los Angeles for the period 01 Oct 2009 - 30 Jun 2016. The award, in the amount of \$899,959.00, was issued as part of the BJA FY 14 Sol - LE solicitation. Any funds reported only represent an estimate of dollars allocated or used for activities covered by this award.

This report covers 2 reporting period(s) of data, represented as follows:

- 01 Jan 2016 31 Mar 2016
- 01 Apr 2016 30 Jun 2016

Project Description

The Smart Policing Initiative seeks to build upon the concepts of offender-based and place-based policing and broaden the knowledge of effective policing strategies. The most convincing research demonstrates that place-based or hotspot policing reduces violent crime and neighborhood disorder. This initiative addresses the need for effective policing that requires a tightly focused, collaborative approach that is measurable, based on sound, detailed analysis and includes policies and procedures for accountability. This grant program seeks to build upon data-driven, evidence-based policing by encouraging state and local law enforcement agencies to develop effective, economical, and innovative responses to precipitous or extraordinary increases in crime, or in a type or types of crime within their jurisdictions. The Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) will utilize Smart Policing Initiative grant funds, in partnership with a research partner, to expand and institutionalize Operation LASER (Los Angeles Strategic Extraction and Restoration program). LASER was created through LAPD's first SPI award. LASER focuses on chronic hot spot locations and chronic offenders. Operation LASER will be expanded to include nine LAPD divisions. The primary goal of LASER is to reduce violent crime and property crime in specific locations and among specific chronic offenders. Each division participating in LASER will complete the following: 1) Create a Crime Intelligence Detail to collect, analyze, and use data routinely for strategic and tactical purposes; 2) Focus on chronic offenders and chronic locations; 3) Direct patrol officers and special units to work in specific areas every week to prevent and deter crime and criminal behavior; 4) Use technology to assist officers and detectives in identifying chronic offenders, finding license plates and vehicles, and in creating Chronic Offender Bulletins; and 5) Work with the research partner on evaluating the project. The Research Partner will work with the LAPD by evaluating the strategies and tactics utilized in the field in the existing and expanded LAPD divisions. NCA/NCF

Grantee

The grantee indicated the award had grant activity during the report period. Performance data can be found in the "Performance Measures" section. Narrative information for the award can be found in the "Grantee Comments" and "Goals and Objectives" sections.

Award Synopsis

The following table displays whether the grantee was operational, not operational, or closed out during the report period.

Reporting Period: 01 Jan 2016 - 31 Mar 2016

| | Operational | Not Operational | Closed Out |
|---------|-------------|-----------------|------------|
| Grantee | Yes | | No |

Reporting Period: 01 Apr 2016 - 30 Jun 2016

| | Operational | Not Operational | Closed Out |
|---------|-------------|-----------------|------------|
| Grantee | Yes | | No |

Goals & Objectives

The following goals and objectives were entered by the grantee during the report period.

Direct Grantee: (Reporting Period: 01 Apr 2016 - 30 Jun 2016)

| # | Goal | Status | Progress & Barriers | Planned Activities |
|---|--|-------------|---|--|
| 1 | Goal 1. Reduce violent crime in specific areas using data- driven strategies (LASER - Los Angeles Strategic Extraction and Restoration Program). | In progress | Violent crime and gun-related crime increased in Los Angeles in 2015 and 2016. As a result, more emphasis was placed on the LASER Zones. Additional resources in the form of analysts, investigators, and officers were deployed to assist in the effort during the period of March 20 through June 30, 2016. The LAPD established the Community Safety Operations Center (CSOC) which centralized the command over the four divisions where violent crime was increasing. A commander, investigators, officers, and analysts work closely with the division captains, investigators, and analysts to coordinate enforcement and analysis. Daily telephone conference calls increase the communication across the divisions and aid in identifying spikes in violence, gang retaliations, and other issues. As a result, the upward arc of violent crime was halted and stabilized. For example, homicides and shootings were increasing at a rate of about 15% during the first four months of 2016. By focusing on the most violent areas (LASER Zones) the LAPD was able to lessen the arc and in fact, homicides are now following the same trends as the previous two years instead of going up. Shootings have decreased as well. | Similar activities are planned as noted above. CSOC will continue to operate at a central location as it has proven to reduce and stabilize violent crime. |
| 2 | Goal 2. Increase the use of analytics for strategic and tactical purposes. | In progress | To increase the use of analytics, Crime Intelligence Details (CIDs) are created within each division that is using LASER. Four new divisions were added to the LASER program Harbor, Hollenbeck, Northeast, and Rampart. In each division personnel were trained in using hot spot analyses and in identifying chronic offenders. Each analyst reports on dosage of the interventions on a weekly basis. | Similar activities are planned for the CID. |

Other Goals and Objectives Measures (Reporting Period: 01 Apr 2016 - 30 Jun 2016)

| Option Text Response(s) | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Did you receive or do you desire any assistance from BJA or a Bassistance providers can be found at https://www.bjatraining.org/. | · | | | | |
| A. Yes, we received assistance | A. Yes, we received assistance | | | | |
| B. Yes, we would like assistance or additional assistance | | | | | |
| C. No | | | | | |
| If yes to A or B above, please explain: | | | | | |
| D. If Yes, please explain | D. We requested training and technical assistance on Social Network Analysis. On July 12, Professor Andrew Fox and Major Joe McHale provided TTA to the department. Previously, TTA was requested on GIS and | | | | |
| BJA likes to showcase grantees who are working on successful, i noteworthy accomplishments, success stories, or program results | | | | | |
| A. Yes | B. No | | | | |
| B. No | | | | | |

Performance Measures

Performance measures data for the GMS report period are displayed below. Only sections with reported data are shown. "Cumulative Total" includes both quarters represented in this report and any other data reported on previous GMS reports since the start of the award.

Agency/Project Information

| Measure | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 | Reporting Period: Apr - Jun 2016 | Option Response Totals | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| 3. What was the start date (month/year) of your SPI program? | | | | |
| Month/Year | • 10/2009 | • 10/2009 | • - | |

| Please provide the primal its SPI program. | ry point of contact (POC) for the res | earch partner that your agency will | be working with as part of | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| A. Name | A. Craig Uchida | A. Craig Uchida | A | | | |
| B. Research partner POC information 1. Telephone number 2. E-mail 3. Address | B. Research partner POC information 2. cduchida@jssinc.org 3. PO Box 6188, Silver Spring, MD 20916 | B. Research partner POC information 2. cduchida@jssinc.org 3. PO Box 6188, Silver Spring, MD 20916 | B. Research partner POC information 1. 0 2. 0 3. 0 | | | |
| | nent agency's jurisdiction(s)? This c a number of politically defined areas | | ownship, state, tribe, other | | | |
| Jurisdiction(s) name: | City of Los Angeles | City of Los Angeles | • - | | | |
| | oopulation that your law enforcemen isdiction's name at http://factfinder2. | | ions, population data can be | | | |
| A. Population: | A. 3792621 | A. 3792621 | A | | | |
| 7. How does your agency plan to sustain the SPI program accomplishments post-funding completion? Select all that apply. | | | | | | |
| Continue to invest in research partnerships | Continue to invest in research partnerships | Continue to invest in research partnerships | A. 2 | | | |
| B. Continue to use data analysis to inform and improve strategic and | B. Continue to use data analysis to inform and improve strategic and | B. Continue to use data analysis to inform and improve strategic and | B. 2 | | | |

| tactical responses C. Foster community partnerships through systematic public outreach | tactical responses C. Foster community partnerships through systematic public outreach | tactical responses C. Foster community partnerships through systematic public outreach | C. 2 |
|--|--|--|------|
| D. Systematically offer inservice training | D. Systematically offer inservice training | D. Systematically offer inservice training | D. 2 |
| E. Replicate the SPI program in other divisions within the agency, if applicable | E. Replicate the SPI program in other divisions within the agency, if applicable | E. Replicate the SPI program in other divisions within the agency, if applicable | E. 2 |
| F. Other | F | F | F. 0 |

Personnel

| leasure | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 | Reporting Period: Apr - Jun 2016 | Cumulative Total |
|---|---|---|--|
| How many current full-time the reporting period? | ne sworn officers with general ar | rest powers does your agency ha | eve on staff as of the last day of |
| A. Number of current full- time sworn officers with general arrest powers as of the last day of the B. Of those the number reporting period that are assigned to or involved in the SPI program | A. 10,000 B. 2,400 | A. 9,900 B. 1,000 | A. 19,900 B. 3,400 |
| 9. During the reporting period | od, how many crime analyst posi | tions were created/added using \$ | SPI program funds? |
| | | | |
| Number of full-time crime analyst positions 1. Cumulative (since start of award) | Number of full- time crime analyst positions 1. 0 | Number of full- time crime analyst positions 1. 0 | Number of full- time crime analyst positions 1 |
| crime analyst positions 1. Cumulative (since start of | time crime analyst positions | time crime analyst positions | time crime analyst positions |
| crime analyst positions 1. Cumulative (since start of award) 2. This reporting | time crime analyst positions 1. 0 | time crime analyst positions 1. 0 | time crime analyst positions 1 |

| | award) 2. This reporting period | 2. 0 | 2. 0 | 2. 0 |
|------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 10. | During the reporting period funds)? | d, how many crime analysts were | assigned to the SPI program (reg | gardless of the origin of program |
| A. | Number of full-time crime analyst positions assigned to SPI program | A. 10 | A. 2 | A. 12 |
| В. | Number of part-time crime analyst positions assigned to SPI program | B. 2 | B. 0 | B. 2 |
| Meas | ure | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 | Reporting Period: Apr - Jun 2016 | Option Response Totals |
| 11. | During the reporting perior | d, were BJA SPI funds used to pa | ay for overtime hours? | |
| A. | Yes | A | A | A. 0 |
| В. | No | B. No | B. No | B. 2 |
| C. | If Yes, how many overtime hours | C | C | C |

Problem Identification and Understanding

| Measure | Text Response(s) | | | | | |
|------------------|--|-------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 12. What problem | do you plan to address with your SPI pr | ogram? | | | | |
| | (01 Jan 2016 - 31 Mar 2016) | | | | | |
| | The LAPD is addressing the problems of violent crime and gun-related crime | | | | | |
| | (01 Apr 2016 - 30 Jun 2016) | | | | | |
| | The LAPD is addressing the problems of violent crime and gun-related crime | | | | | |
| | Reporting Period: | Reporting Period: | | | | |

| Measure | Jan - Mar 2016 | Apr - Jun 2016 | Option Response Totals | | | |
|--|--|--|----------------------------|--|--|--|
| 13. Have you completed an in-depth analysis of your problem's underlying causes during the reporting period? | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| A. Yes | A | A | A. 0 | | | |
| B. No, but it is currently in progress | B. No, but it is currently in progress | B. No, but it is currently in progress | B. 2 | | | |
| C. No, it is not in progress. | C | C | C. 0 | | | |
| D. If No it is not in progress, Please Explain | D | D | D | | | |
| 14. Which of the following gro | ups performed data analysis for th | ne SPI program during the reporti | ng period? | | | |
| A. Sworn employees of the | A. Sworn employees of the | A. Sworn employees of the | A. 2 | | | |
| police agency | police agency | police agency | | | | |
| B. Civilian employees of the police agency | B. Civilian employees of the police agency | B. Civilian employees of the police agency | B. 2 | | | |
| C. Research partner | C. Research partner | C. Research partner | C. 2 | | | |
| D. Outside contractor | D. Outside contractor | D. Outside contractor | D. 2 | | | |
| E. Data was not analyzed this reporting period | E | E | E. 0 | | | |
| F. Other | F | F | F. 0 | | | |
| 15. Which of the following dat | a sources did you use for your SF | PI project during the reporting peri | od? Select all that apply. | | | |
| A. Official police call, crime, and arrest data (calls for | A. Official police call, crime, and arrest data (calls for | A. Official police call, crime, and arrest data (calls for | A. 2 | | | |

| service, officer-initiated calls for service, crime B. Internal agency, per arrest existing data tracking | service, officer-initiated calls for service, crime B. Internal apports, PGF arrest existing data tracking | existing data tracking | B. 2 |
|--|---|--|-----------------------------|
| (use of force reports, citizen complaints) C. Community data (e.g., foreclosures, health and | (use of force reports, citizen complaints) C | (use of force reports, citizen complaints) C | C. 0 |
| human services data, school data, or other D. Corrections data (e.g., probation and parole data) | D. Corrections data (e.g., probation and parole data) | D. Corrections data (e.g., probation and parole data) | D. 2 |
| E. Prosecution data (e.g., pretrial data) | E | E | E. 0 |
| F. Court data (e.g., case outcomes, convictions, sentences) | F | F | F. 0 |
| G. Offender risk assessments | G. Offender risk assessments | G. Offender risk assessments | G. 2 |
| H. Focus group data (e.g., focus groups of community members, | н | Н | Н. 0 |
| officers, or victims) I. Survey data (e.g., surveys of community members, officers, | I | Survey data (e.g., surveys of community members, officers, | I.: 1 |
| offenders, or victims) J. Systematic observations of places by trained observers (e.g., physical | J | offenders, or victims) J | J. 0 |
| disorder) K. Intelligence from confidential or other informants | K | К | K. 0 |
| L. Other | L | L | L. 0 |
| 16. In which of the following ac Select all that apply. | ctivities did your research partner | assist for the problem analysis du | uring the reporting period? |
| A. Provided leadership and guidance on how to conduct problem | A. Provided leadership and guidance on how to conduct problem | A. Provided leadership and guidance on how to conduct problem | A. 2 |
| analysis B. Conducted the problem analysis | analysis B. Conducted the problem analysis | analysis B. Conducted the problem analysis | B. 2 |

| C. Introduced new partners to the working group to assist with the problem | C. Introduced new partners to the working group to assist with the problem | C. Introduced new partners to the working group to assist with the problem | C. 2 |
|---|---|--|------|
| analysis D. Collected data for the problem analysis (e.g., surveys, focus groups, | analysis D. Collected data for the problem analysis (e.g., surveys, focus groups, | analysis D. Collected data for the problem analysis (e.g., surveys, focus groups, | D. 2 |
| interviews) E. Interpreted the problem analysis results | interviews) E. Interpreted the problem analysis results | interviews) E. Interpreted the problem analysis results | E. 2 |
| F. Provided actionable recommendations | F. Provided actionable recommendations | F. Provided actionable recommendations | F. 2 |
| G. Presented problem analysis results to the agency and/or SPI | G. Presented problem analysis results to the agency and/or SPI | G. Presented problem analysis results to the agency and/or SPI | G. 2 |
| working group partners H. Communicated problem analysis results to | working group partners H | working group partners H. Communicated problem analysis results to | H. 1 |
| groups outside of the agency and/or SPI I. Other working group | I | groups outside of the agency and/or SPI I. project working group | I. 0 |
| (e.g., local government, community | | (e.g., local government, community | |
| organizations, media) | | organizations, media) | |

| Measure | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 | Reporting Period: Apr - Jun 2016 | Option Response Totals |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 17. What is the status of your | SPI action plan during the report | ing period? | |
| | | | |
| A. In development | A | A | A. 0 |
| | | | |
| B. Has been submitted to BJA but not approved | В | В | B. 0 |
| C. Plan has been approved | C. Plan has been approved | C. Plan has been approved | C. 2 |
| by BJA | by BJA | by BJA | |
| 18 Please select the develop | ment status of each of the following | ng SPI action plan activities durin | a the reporting period |

| Meas | ure | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 | Reporting Period: Apr - Jun 2016 | Option Response Totals |
|------|--|--|--|--|
| 19. | Has your agency identified program? | strategies aimed at addressing t | he underlying causes of the probl | em identified by your SPI |
| Α. | Yes | A. Yes | A. Yes | A. 2 |
| В. | No | В | В | B. 0 |
| 20. | SPI program (e.g., increas as a community advocate | eted response (including identified ing community policing and foot policing and foot policing and immunity policing and immunity policing and immunity policing and as your long-term strategic pla | patrol in specific violent crime bloc migrant communities to increase p | ks, hiring a coordinator to serve police legitimacy). This is what |
| A. | your response. | A. LAPD has identified "hot spot corridors" and chron | A. LAPD has identified "hot spot corridors" and chron | A |
| 21. | During the reporting period previous question? | d, did any information come to ligh | nt that led to a change in the resp | onse strategies reported in the |
| Α. | Yes | A | A | A. 0 |
| В. | No | B. No | B. No | B. 2 |
| C. | If Yes, please explain | C | C | C |
| 22. | Did your SPI program imp | lement any strategies during the r | reporting period? | |
| Α. | Yes | A. Yes | A. Yes | A. 2 |
| В. | No | В | В | B. 0 |

| Meas | ure | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 | Reporting Period: Apr - Jun 2016 | Option Response Totals |
|------|--|--|---|--------------------------------|
| 23. | Which of the following gro | ups performed data analysis for th | ne SPI program during the reporti | ng period? |
| A. | Sworn employees of the police agency | A. Sworn employees of the police agency | Sworn employees of the police agency | A. 4 |
| В. | Civilian employees of the police agency | B. Civilian employees of the police agency | B. Civilian employees of the police agency | B. 4 |
| C. | Research partner | C. Research partner | C. Research partner | C. 4 |
| D. | Outside contractor | D | D. Outside contractor | D. 3 |
| E. | Data was not analyzed this reporting period | E | E | E. 0 |
| F. | Other | F | F | F. 0 |
| 24. | Which of the following dat | a sources did you use to inform y | our SPI project during the reportir | ng period? Select all that app |
| Α. | Official police call, crime, and arrest data (calls for service, officer-initiated | A. Official police call, crime, and arrest data (calls for service, officer-initiated | A. Official police call, crime, and arrest data (calls for service, officer-initiated | A. 2 |
| В. | calls for service, crime Interioral agency, PCF arrest existing data tracking (use of force reports, | calls for service, crime B. Internal agency, PGF arrest existing data tracking (use of force reports, | B. incident reports, or arrest reports) | B. 1 |
| C. | citizen complaints) Community data (e.g., foreclosures, health and human services data, | citizen complaints) | C | C. 0 |
| D. | school data, or other | D. Corrections data (e.g., probation and parole data) | D. Corrections data (e.g., probation and parole data) | D. 2 |
| E. | Prosecution data (e.g., pretrial data) | E | E | E. 0 |

| F. Court data (e.g., case | | | |
|--|--|--|----------------------------------|
| outcomes, convictions, sentences) | F | F | F. 0 |
| G. Offender risk assessments | G. Offender risk assessments | G | G. 1 |
| H. Focus group data (e.g., focus groups of community members, | Н | Н | H. 0 |
| officers, or victims) I. Survey data (e.g., surveys of community members, officers, | Survey data (e.g., surveys of community members, officers, | Survey data (e.g., surveys of community members, officers, | I. 2 |
| offenders, or victims) J. Systematic observations of places by trained observers (e.g., physical | offenders, or victims) J | offenders, or victims) J | J. 0 |
| disorder) K. Intelligence from confidential or other informants | K | К | K. 0 |
| L. Other | L | L | L. 0 |
| 25. Please indicate whether you period. | ou used analysis to inform the foll | owing SPI program response acti | vities during the reporting |
| A. Working group decisionmaking 1. Not Applicable | A. Working group decisionmaking 1 | A. Working group decisionmaking 1 | Working group decisionmaking |
| 2. Yes | | | 1. 0 |
| | 2. Yes | 2. Yes | 1. 0 2. 2 |
| 3. No | 2. Yes 3 | 2. Yes 3 | |
| 3. No | | | 2. 2 |
| No S. No B. Prosecution 1. Not Applicable | | | 2. 2 |
| B. Prosecution | 3 B. Prosecution | 3 B. Prosecution | 2. 2 3. 0 B. Prosecution |

| C. Criminal investigations 1. Not Applicable | C. Criminal investigations 1 | C. Criminal investigations 1 | C. Criminal investigations 1. 0 |
|---|---|---|--|
| 2. Yes | 2. Yes | 2. Yes | 2. 2 |
| 3. No | 3 | 3 | 3. 0 |
| | | | |
| D. Long-term crime reduction and prevention (strategic approach) 1. Not Applicable | D. Long-term crime reduction and prevention (strategic approach) 1 | D. Long-term crime reduction and prevention (strategic approach) 1 | D. Long-term crime reduction and prevention (strategic approach) 1. 0 |
| 2. Yes | 2. Yes | 2. Yes | 2. 2 |
| 3. No | 3 | 3 | 3. 0 |
| | | | |
| E. Tactical strategies (e.g., short-term crime reduction or prevention strategies) 1. Not Applicable | E. Tactical strategies (e.g., short-term crime reduction or prevention strategies) 1 | E. Tactical strategies (e.g., short-term crime reduction or prevention strategies) 1 | E. Tactical strategies (e.g., short-term crime reduction or prevention strategies) 1. 0 |

| 2. Yes | 2. Yes | 2. Yes | 2. 2 |
|---|---|---|------------------------------|
| 3. No | 3 | 3 | 3. 0 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| F. Informing the | F. Informing the | F. Informing the | F. Informing the |
| media/public 1. Not Applicable | media/public | media/public 1 | media/public 1. 0 |
| 2. Yes | 2 | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. No | 3. No | 3. No | 3. 2 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 26. Which of the following acti period? Select all that app | vities did your research partner de | o to assist with the SPI program re | esponse during the reporting |
| | | | |
| A. Introduced new partners to the working group | A. Introduced new partners to the working group | A | A. 1 |
| | | | |
| B. Conducted or assisted in data collection (e.g., | B. Conducted or assisted in data collection (e.g., | B. Conducted or assisted in data collection (e.g., | B. 2 |
| survey, focus groups, interviews) C. Conducted or assisted in | survey, focus groups, interviews) C. Conducted or assisted in | survey, focus groups, interviews) C. Conducted or assisted in | C. 2 |
| ongoing data analysis | ongoing data analysis | ongoing data analysis | |
| D. Provided training and/or | D. Provided training and/or | D. Provided training and/or | D. 2 |
| technical assistance to agency analysts | technical assistance to agency analysts | technical assistance to agency analysts | |
| E. Interpreted analysis | E. Interpreted analysis | E. Interpreted analysis | E. 2 |

| results | results | results | |
|---|--|---|------|
| | | | |
| F. Provided recommendations on program strategies | F. Provided recommendations on program strategies | F. Provided recommendations on program strategies | F. 2 |
| G. Communicated analysis results to the working group | G. Communicated analysis results to the working group | G. Communicated analysis results to the working group | G. 2 |
| H. Communicated analysis results to partners outside of the SPI | H. Communicated analysis results to partners outside of the SPI | Н | H. 1 |
| project working group I. (e.g., local government, community organizations, media) | project working group I. (e.g., local government, community organizations, media) | l | 1. 0 |

Response to Crime, Disorder, or Other Community Problems

| Measure | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 | Reporting Period: Apr - Jun 2016 | Option Response Totals |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | rogram response focus on crime, dis action, community engagement)? | order, or other community proble | ms (e.g., mental health problems, |
| A. Yes | A. Yes | A | A. 1 |
| B. No | В | B. No | B. 1 |
| | what activities were carried out durin abandoned building was torn down ir | | |
| Α. | A. In the four original LASER divisions Captains assigned officers to work in | A | A |
| 29. During the report awareness mode | ting period, did the strategies in see analysts created ne chronic offender bulletins, and arrest | w s, | prevention, development, or |
| A. Yes | A. field interviews, and Yes other police activitie were undertaken. For additional divisions of the field interviews, and Yes other police activities. | s A our | A. 1 |
| | | | |

| | Northeast, and Harbor. | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------|---|
| | Trainings were held in | | |
| 30. Which of the following r | each Division, Captains models/strategies did you use during we're given briefings, and command staff were informed of the plan. | the reporting period? Plea | se select all that apply. |
| A. Situational crime prevention and crime | A | A | A. 0 |
| prevention through environmental design | | | |
| B. Strategies elapproaches properties de la company de la | | В | B. 0 |
| C. C | C | C | C. 0 |
| D. prantie, assemble and complete and comple | y D | D | D. 0 |
| E. Community rapiding— broughts that promote aggression defense community cohesion, including public safety | E | E | E. 0 |
| F. Other pattnerships between the community and elements of the crimina justice system; for | F. Other | F | F. 1 |
| 31. Exaringlen en expertinglight country!. | tiod, did the strategies implemented | focus efforts around any of | f the following models? Select all that |
| A. Community-oriented approach (community policing) | A | A | A. 0 |
| B. Geographic focus (hot spots policing) | B. Geographic focus (hot spots policing) | В | B. 1 |
| C. High-rate offender focu (focused deterrence) | C. High-rate offender focus (focused deterrence) | C | C. 1 |
| D. High-rate group/gang focus (pulling levers) | D. High-rate group/gang focus (pulling levers) | D | D. 1 |
| E. Intelligence-led policing (decision-making based on information and analysis) | d (decision-making based on information and | E | E. 1 |
| F. Problem-solving approach (problem- | analysis) F. Problem-solving approach (problem- | F | F. 1 |

| oriented policing such as the Scanning, Analysis, G. Respolled instice (evaluating people of period (evaluating people of period) | oriented policing such as the Scanning, Analysis, G. Response and Evaluation (SARA) model) | G | G. 0 |
|---|--|---|------|
| and just) H. Restorative justice | Н | Н | H. 0 |
| | | | |
| I. Other | 1 | l | 1. 0 |
| | | | |

Technology Demonstration

| Measure | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 | Reporting Period: Apr - Jun 2016 | Option Response Totals |
|--------------------|---|--|---|
| 32. Are you implem | nenting or testing a new technology as | part of your SPI program during | the reporting period? |
| A. Yes | A. Yes | A. Yes | A. 2 |
| B. No | B | B | B. 0 |
| Measure | Text Response(s) | | |
| | the type of technology that your SPI poftware/hardware, ShotSpotter). | program is implementing or testing | g (e.g., body-worn cameras [BWCs] |
| | measure of dosage in the (01 Apr 2016 - 30 Ju | artner are testing the use of autor four Divisions that are implement an 2016) | - |
| | | artner are testing the use of autor four Divisions that are implement | mated vehicle locators (AVL) as a ting SPI. |

Body Worn Cameras

| Measure | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 | Reporting Period: Apr - Jun 2016 | Option Response Totals |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 34. Did you use SF | PI funding to implement or test BWCs | during the reporting period? | |

| A. Yes | A | A | A. 0 | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|--|--|
| B. No | B. No | B. No | B. 2 | | |
| Measure | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 | Reporting Period: Apr - Jun 2016 | Cumulative Total | | |
| 35. Please enter the total number of sworn positions eligible for BWCs in your agency/coalition. | | | | | |
| 36. Please enter the number of sworn positions that have received BWCs: | | | | | |
| 36. Please enter the number of | of sworn positions that have receive | ved BWCs: | | | |

38. Please enter the number of BWCs purchased through the SPI grant funding.

Program Progress

| Measure | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 | Reporting Period: Apr - Jun 2016 | Option Response Totals |
|--|--|--|------------------------|
| 39. Do you track your SPI pr | ogram's progress or impact using | specific quantitative measures? | |
| A. Yes | A. Yes | A. Yes | A. 2 |
| B. No | В | В | B. 0 |
| C. If no, please explain: | C | C | C |
| D. If Yes, please describe the target area(s) and specific population(s) | D. The target areas are hot spot corridors or LASER Zones that have been | D. The target areas are hot spot corridors or LASER Zones that have been | D |

| В. | No If Yes, please explain and update your research partner POC information, if applicable, | B. No C in agency or project leadership | B. No C | B. 2 C |
|------|---|--|---|-------------------------------|
| | | B. No | B. No | B. 2 |
| Α. | 165 | | | |
| | Yes | A | A | A. 0 |
| 41. | Has there been a change the reporting period? | in your SPI research partner or | a significant change in the research | n partner team members during |
| Meas | sure | Reportିମିସ୍ପି ^{tip} eriod: Jan - Mar 2016 | Reporting Period: Apr - Jun 2016 | Option Response Totals |
| rgan | izational Integration and Pr | oject Sustainability overall impact has been | • | |
| | | violent crime has | in specific LASER | |
| | | decrease in crime. In subsequent years, | individual has led to a decrease in violent crime | |
| E. | If Yes, please explain | E. In Newton Division in 2012, LASER showed a | E. Focusing on the targeted areas and targeted | E |
| D. | Not yet been measured | D | D | D. 0 |
| C. | No measurable impact | C | C | C. 0 |
| В. | Yes, negative impact | control meetings' within each Division. B | control meetings' within each Division. B | B. 0 |
| Α. | Yes, positive impact | basis. These data are used in Compstat A. Yes, positive impact meetings and crime | basis. These data are used in Compstat A. Yes, positive impact meetings and crime | A. 2 |
| 40. | this question, please cons | ider you rthesideseinlang abba researchib aidas When awswel | a measu iabe ib hoet a selic pro bl l/or imple d hostide postuntable na fing this allessalate d) on a weekly | |
| | measures that you are tracking | E. Within the areas of the and the case with a street of the street of t | are measuringadesagen Gameutinsitme in the | |
| E. | If Yes, please list the | identified by using | [\\/\!\\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ | E |

| A. | Yes | A | A | A. 0 |
|-----|--|---|---|---------------------------------|
| В. | No | B. No | B. No | B. 2 |
| C. | If Yes, please explain | C | C | C |
| 43. | Has your agency adopted a | any policies or procedures as a r | result of the SPI program? | |
| A. | Yes | A | A | A. 0 |
| В. | No | B. No | B. No | B. 2 |
| 44. | Since the start of the SPI program. Select all that ap | | ies or procedures adopted by you | r agency as a result of the SPI |
| 45. | During the reporting period | , did any of the following occur? | Select all that apply. | |
| | Discussion of SPI in command staff, COMPSTAT, or other leadership meetings Discussion of SPI in roll call | A. Discussion of SPI in command staff, COMPSTAT, or other leadership meetings B. Discussion of SPI in roll call | A. Discussion of SPI in command staff, COMPSTAT, or other leadership meetings B. Discussion of SPI in roll call | A. 2 B. 2 |
| C. | Discussion of SPI in district meetings | C | C | C. 0 |
| D. | SPI-specific training for recruits | D | D | D. 0 |
| E. | SPI-specific in-service training | E. SPI-specific in-service training | E | E. 1 |
| F. | SPI knowledge requirement for advancement | F | F | F. 0 |

| tests/boards G. Other | G | G | G. 0 |
|--|--|---|-------------------------------|
| | d, has your agency implemented a trategy? Select all that apply. | any of the following activities arou | nd advancing knowledge to the |
| A. No activities have been conducted during the reporting period | A | A | A. 0 |
| B. Presented about the SPI strategy at a conference | B. Presented about the SPI strategy at a conference | B. Presented about the SPI strategy at a conference | B. 2 |
| C. Disseminated publications to the field about the SPI strategy | C | C | C. 0 |
| D. Developed fliers to inform the public about the SPI strategy | D | D | D. 0 |
| E. Other | E | E | E. 0 |

Community Outreach

| leasure | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 | Reporting Period: Apr - Jun 2016 | Option Response Totals |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 47. How often was your ager period? | ncy involved in the following of | community activities as part of yo | ur SPI program during the reporting |
| A. Hosted community meetings | A. Not Applicable | A. Not Applicable | A. 2 |
| B. Attended community meetings, advisory boards, or roundtables | B. Not Applicable | B. Not Applicable | B. 2 |
| C. Distributed a newsletter, email, or other bulletin | C. Not Applicable | C. Not Applicable | C. 2 |
| D. Attended community events (e.g., national night out, block parties, | D. Not Applicable | D. Not Applicable | D. 2 |
| festivals) E. Conducted social media | E. Not Applicable | E. Not Applicable | E. 2 |

| activities (e.g., Facebook, Twitter) | | | |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|------|
| F. Conducted outreach to minority populations (e.g., racial, ethnic, | F. Not Applicable | F. Not Applicable | F. 2 |
| religious, LGBTQI) G. Other | G. Not Applicable | G. Not Applicable | G. 2 |
| H. If other please explain | H | Н | H |

Working Group and Partnerships

| Measure | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 | Reporting Period: Apr - Jun 2016 | Option Response Totals |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 48. Did your initiative have | ve a working group to help guide | the SPI program during the report | ing period? |
| A. Yes | A. Yes | A. Yes | A. 2 |
| B. No | В | В | B. 0 |
| 49. How often did your w | orking group hold organized mee | etings during the reporting period? | Select the response that best fits. |
| A. We did not meet this quarter | A | A | A. 0 |
| | | | |
| B. Daily | В | В | B. 0 |
| B. Daily C. Weekly/Biweekly | B C | B C | B. 0 C. 0 |
| | | | |

| . Research partner | A. Research partner | A. Research partner | A. Research partner |
|---|--|--|--|
| NA/Not Tracked | 1 | 1 | 1. 0 |
| | | | |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3 | 3. 0 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 4 | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 5 | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6. Strongly Agree | 6. Strongly Agree | 6. 2 |
| | | | |
| State/tribal leadership (e.g., governor's office) 1. NA/Not Tracked | B. State/tribal leadership(e.g., governor's office)1. NA/Not Tracked | B. State/tribal leadership (e.g., governor's office) 1. NA/Not Tracked | B. State/tribal leadership (e.g., governor's office 1. 2 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree 5. Agree | 5 | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | | |
| Local leadership (e.g., mayor's office) 1. NA/Not Tracked | C. Local leadership (e.g., mayor's office) 1. NA/Not Tracked | C. Local leadership (e.g., mayor's office) 1. NA/Not Tracked | C. Local leadership (e.g mayor's office) 1. 2 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3 | 3. 0 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 4 | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 5 | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6 | 6. 0 |

50. Please rate the following working group partners based on this statement: "This partner was actively involved in the initiative

| D. Federal law enforcement agencies 1. NA/Not Tracked | D. Federal law enforcement agencies 1 | D. Federal law enforcement agencies 1. NA/Not Tracked | D. Federal law enforcement agencies 1. 1 |
|--|--|--|---|
| 1. IVAVINOL HACKEU | 1 | 1. INAVINOL HACKED | 1. 1 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3 | 3. 0 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 4 | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 5. Agree | 5 | 5. 1 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | | |
| E. State law enforcement | E. State law enforcement | E. State law enforcement | E. State law enforcement |
| agencies 1. NA/Not Tracked | agencies 1. NA/Not Tracked | agencies 1. NA/Not Tracked | agencies 1. 2 |
| 1. INA/INOT Tracked | 1. NA/NOT Tracked | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 2 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree 5. Agree | 5 | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | | |
| F. Local law enforcement | F. Local law enforcement | F. Local law enforcement | F. Local law enforcement |
| agencies (including | agencies (including | agencies (including | agencies (including |
| detectives/investigators) | detectives/investigators) | detectives/investigators) | detectives/investigators) |
| NA/Not Tracked | NA/Not Tracked | NA/Not Tracked | 1. 2 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree 5. Agree | 5 | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| G. Community-based service providers (e.g., housing, employment) 1. NA/Not Tracked | G. Community-based service providers (e.g., housing, employment) 1. NA/Not Tracked | G. Community-based service providers (e.g., housing, employment) 1. NA/Not Tracked | G. Community-based service providers (e.g., housing, employment) 1. 2 |
|---|---|---|--|
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3 | 3. 0 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 4 | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 5 | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| H. Pretrial service organizations 1. NA/Not Tracked | H. Pretrial service organizations 1. NA/Not Tracked | H. Pretrial service organizations 1. NA/Not Tracked | H. Pretrial service organizations 1. 2 |
| Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2 | 2. 0 |
| | 3 | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | | | 4. 0 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 4 | 4 | |
| 5. Agree | 5 | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | | |
| I. U.S. Attorney's Office 1. NA/Not Tracked | U.S. Attorney's Office NA/Not Tracked | U.S. Attorney's Office NA/Not Tracked | I. U.S. Attorney's Office 1. 2 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree 5. Agree | 5 | 5 | 5. 0 |
| | | | 6. 0 |

| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6 | |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | | | |
| J. Prosecutors | J. Prosecutors | J. Prosecutors | J. Prosecutors |
| NA/Not Tracked | NA/Not Tracked | NA/Not Tracked | 1. 2 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3 | 3. 0 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 4 | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 5 | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | | |
| K. Public defender/indigent | K. Public defender/indigent | K. Public defender/indigent | K. Public defender/indigent |
| defense | defense | defense | defense |
| NA/Not Tracked | 1. NA/Not Tracked | NA/Not Tracked | 1. 2 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3 | 3. 0 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 4 | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 5 | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | | |
| L. Courts | L. Courts | L. Courts | L. Courts |
| Ourts NA/Not Tracked | NA/Not Tracked | NA/Not Tracked | 1. 2 |
| 1. 147 VINOT TRACKEU | 1. 147 VINOL HAGNEU | 1. 147 VIVOL TTACKEU | 1. 2 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3 | 3. 0 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 4 | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 5 | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | | |

| M. Community corrections (probation/parole) M. Communi |
|--|
| 3. Disagree 3 3 3. 0 4. Neither Agree nor Disagree 5. Agree 5 5 5. 0 6. Strongly Agree N. Corrections 1. NA/Not Tracked N. Corrections 1. NA/Not Tracked 2. Strongly Disagree 2 2. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor Disagree 5. Agree 5. Agree 5 6. Strongly Agree N. Corrections 1. NA/Not Tracked N. Corrections 1. NA/Not Tracked N. Corrections 1. NA/Not Tracked 2. Strongly Disagree O. 4 4. 0 5. 0 6. 0 N. Corrections 1. NA/Not Tracked N. Corrections 1. NA/Not Tracked 1. 2 2. 0 |
| Disagree 5. Agree 5 5 5. 0 6. Strongly Agree 6 6 6 6. 0 N. Corrections 1. NA/Not Tracked 1. NA/Not Tracked 2. Strongly Disagree 2 2. 0 |
| 5. Agree 5 5. 0 6. Strongly Agree 6 6 N. Corrections N. Corrections N. Corrections 1. NA/Not Tracked 1. NA/Not Tracked 1. NA/Not Tracked 2. Strongly Disagree 2 2. 0 |
| N. Corrections |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked 1. NA/Not Tracked 1. NA/Not Tracked 1. 2 2. Strongly Disagree 2 2. 0 |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked 1. NA/Not Tracked 1. NA/Not Tracked 1. 2 2. Strongly Disagree 2 2. 0 |
| |
| 3. Disagree 3 3. 0 |
| |
| 4. Neither Agree nor 4 4 4. 0 Disagree |
| 5. Agree 5 5 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree 6 6 |
| |
| |
| O. Health providers |
| 2. Strongly Disagree 2 2 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree 3 3 3. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor 4 4 4. 0 Disagree |
| 5. Agree 5 5 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree 6 6 |
| |
| |

| P. Mental health providers 1. NA/Not Tracked | P. Mental health providers 1. NA/Not Tracked | P. Mental health providers 1. NA/Not Tracked | P. Mental health providers 1. 2 |
|---|---|--|--|
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree 5. Agree | 5 | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | | |
| Q. Substance abuse treatment providers 1. NA/Not Tracked | Q. Substance abuse treatment providers 1. NA/Not Tracked | Q. Substance abuse treatment providers1. NA/Not Tracked | Q. Substance abuse treatment providers 1. 2 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree 5. Agree | 5 | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | | |
| R. Child protective services 1. NA/Not Tracked | R. Child protective services 1. NA/Not Tracked | R. Child protective services 1. NA/Not Tracked | R. Child protective services 1. 2 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3 | 3. 0 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 4 | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 5 | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | | |
| S. Community-based service providers | S. Community-based service providers | S. Community-based service providers | S. Community-based service providers |
| NA/Not Tracked | NA/Not Tracked | NA/Not Tracked | 1. 2 |

| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2 | 2. 0 |
|---|---|---|--|
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree 5. Agree | 5 | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | | |
| T. Community groups (e.g., neighborhood watch, community center) 1. NA/Not Tracked | T. Community groups (e.g., neighborhood watch, community center) 1. NA/Not Tracked | T. Community groups (e.g., neighborhood watch, community center) 1. NA/Not Tracked | T. Community groups (e.g., neighborhood watch, community center) 1. 2 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree 5. Agree | 5 | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | | |
| U. Faith-based | U. Faith-based | U. Faith-based | U. Faith-based |
| organizations 1. NA/Not Tracked | organizations 1. NA/Not Tracked | organizations 1. NA/Not Tracked | organizations 1. 2 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree 5. Agree | 5 | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | | |
| V. Subject matter experts | V. Subject matter experts | V. Subject matter experts | V. Subject matter experts |

| NA/Not Tracked | 1. NA/Not Tracked | NA/Not Tracked | 1. 2 |
|---|--|--|---|
| 1. IVA/NOL HACKED | i. INAVINUL Hacked | i. iv//inot iracked | |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3 | 3. 0 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 4 | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 5 | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | | |
| W. Foundations/Philanthropic organizations 1. NA/Not Tracked | W. Foundations/Philanthropic organizations 1. NA/Not Tracked | W. Foundations/Philanthropic organizations 1. NA/Not Tracked | W. Foundations/Philanthropic organizations1. 2 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3 | 3. 0 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 4 | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 5 | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6 | 6. 0 |
| X. Training and technical assistance provider(s) 1. NA/Not Tracked | X. Training and technical assistance provider(s) 1. NA/Not Tracked | X. Training and technical assistance provider(s) 1. NA/Not Tracked | X. Training and technical assistance provider(s) 1. 2 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3 | 3. 0 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 4 | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 5 | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6 | 6. 0 |
| Y. Tribal criminal justice agencies 1. NA/Not Tracked | Y. Tribal criminal justice agencies 1. NA/Not Tracked | Y. Tribal criminal justice agencies 1. NA/Not Tracked | Y. Tribal criminal justice agencies 1. 2 |

| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2 | 2. 0 |
|---|---|---|---------------------------------|
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree 5. Agree | 5 | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Z. Businesses1. NA/Not Tracked | Z. Businesses1. NA/Not Tracked | Z. Businesses1. NA/Not Tracked | Z. Businesses 1. 2 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree | 5 | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 5. Agree | | | 6. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6 | |
| | | | |
| AA. K-12 schools | AA. K-12 schools | AA. K-12 schools | AA. K-12 schools |
| NA/Not Tracked | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 2 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree 5. Agree | 5 | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| AB. Public services (e.g., | AB. Public services (e.g., | AB. Public services (e.g., | AB. Public services (e.g., |
| trash collection, public works) | trash collection, public works) | trash collection, public works) | trash collection, public works) |
| NA/Not Tracked | NA/Not Tracked | NA/Not Tracked | 1. 2 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2 | 2. 0 |

| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3 | 3. 0 |
|--|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 4 | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 5 | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 51. Please indicate which of th | e following activities, if any, the wo | orking group carried out during the | reporting period. Select all tha |
| apply. | | | |
| A. Briefed agency leaders | A. Briefed agency leaders | A. Briefed agency leaders | A. 2 |
| | | | |
| B. Conducted planning | B. Conducted planning | B. Conducted planning | B. 2 |
| meetings | meetings | meetings | |
| C. Discussed group membership/participation | C. Discussed group membership/participation | C | C. 1 |
| D. Discussed resources | D. Discussed resources | D. Discussed resources | D. 2 |
| needed/resource sharing | needed/resource sharing | needed/resource sharing | D. 2 |
| E. Invited outside partners | E | E | E. 0 |
| to speak with the members (e.g., faith | | | |
| based) F. Planned related activities for group members | F. Planned related activities for group members | F | F. 1 |
| ioi group members | for group members | | |
| G. Planned tactical responses | G. Planned tactical responses | G. Planned tactical responses | G. 2 |
| H. Daviawad analysis | H. Daviewed englysis | H. Pavioused analysis | H. 2 |
| H. Reviewed analysis products | H. Reviewed analysis products | H. Reviewed analysis products | П. Z |
| I. Reviewed project | I. Reviewed project | Reviewed project | l. 2 |
| progress | progress | progress | |
| J. Engaged in project- | J. Engaged in project- | J. Engaged in project- | J. 2 |

| sustainability planning | sustainability planning | sustainability planning | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------|
| K. Other | K | К | K. 0 |
| | | | |

Training

| Measure | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 | Reporting Period: Apr - Jun 2016 | Option Response Totals |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 52. Did staff or working group members attend or host training related to your SPI program during the reporting period? | | | |
| A. Yes | A. Yes | A. Yes | A. 2 |
| B. No | В | В | B. 0 |

Research Partnership Activities

| Measure | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 | Reporting Period: Apr - Jun 2016 | Option Response Totals |
|--|---|--|---------------------------|
| 54. Which of the following | activities did your research partner | conduct during the reporting period | d? Select all that apply. |
| A. No activity was completed this reporting period | A | A | A. 0 |
| B. Attended project working-group meeting | B. Attended project gs working-group meetings | B. Attended project working-group meetings | B. 2 |
| C. Observed/attended program responses (conducted ride-alongs | conducted ride-alongs, | conducted ride-alongs, | C. 2 |
| observed D. Brevensied specific da from the agency or working group partner | trom the agency or | observed D. Requested specific data trowthe pagency or working group partners | D. 2 |
| E. Conducted interviews focus groups | or E | E | E. 0 |
| F. Communicated with the | ne F. Communicated with the | F. Communicated with the | F. 2 |

| loseout Question (Last Reportir | Reporting Period: period and provides graphs and chertien Response Totals Department command 56. How does your agency plan to use the results of the completed assessment that apply. | | |
|--|--|--|--------------|
| loseout Question (Last Reportir | ng Period Only) | LASER divisions. Further, JSS analyzes data over an 11-year | |
| C. If Yes, please list and briefly describe the products received during the reporting period | C. Computer generated maps with violent crimes exa | C. The research partner, JSS, provided power point slides about violent crime in each of the 8 | C |
| A. Yes B. No | A. Yes B | A. Yes | A. 2 B. 0 |
| group (e.g., local government, community organizations, media) 55. Has your research partner | r provided you with any SPI project lides) during the reporting period? | | |
| evaluation G. Communicated/presented evaluation plan, preliminary findings, and/or results to the H. Communicated/presented evaluation plan, project working, group preliminary findings, and/or results outside of I. Other SPI project working | evaluation plan, preliminary findings, and/or results to the | current status of the evaluation G. Communicated/presented evaluation plan, preliminary findings, and/or results to the H. agency and/or the SPI project working group | G. 2 H. 0 |

Grantee Comments

No comments entered



GMS Report Smart Policing Initiative (SPI) 2009-DG-BX-0118 Report Period: 01 Jan 2016 - 31 Mar 2016

The following report covers grantee reported activity for grant number 2009-DG-BX-0118 awarded to City of Los Angeles for the period 01 Oct 2009 - 31 Mar 2016. The award, in the amount of \$899,959.00, was issued as part of the BJA FY 14 Sol - LE solicitation. Any funds reported only represent an estimate of dollars allocated or used for activities covered by this award.

This report covers 1 reporting period(s) of data, represented as follows:

01 Jan 2016 - 31 Mar 2016

Project Description

The Smart Policing Initiative seeks to build upon the concepts of offender-based and place-based policing and broaden the knowledge of effective policing strategies. The most convincing research demonstrates that place-based or hotspot policing reduces violent crime and neighborhood disorder. This initiative addresses the need for effective policing that requires a tightly focused, collaborative approach that is measurable, based on sound, detailed analysis and includes policies and procedures for accountability. This grant program seeks to build upon data-driven, evidence-based policing by encouraging state and local law enforcement agencies to develop effective, economical, and innovative responses to precipitous or extraordinary increases in crime, or in a type or types of crime within their jurisdictions. The Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) will utilize Smart Policing Initiative grant funds, in partnership with a research partner, to expand and institutionalize Operation LASER (Los Angeles Strategic Extraction and Restoration program). LASER was created through LAPD's first SPI award. LASER focuses on chronic hot spot locations and chronic offenders. Operation LASER will be expanded to include nine LAPD divisions. The primary goal of LASER is to reduce violent crime and property crime in specific locations and among specific chronic offenders. Each division participating in LASER will complete the following: 1) Create a Crime Intelligence Detail to collect, analyze, and use data routinely for strategic and tactical purposes; 2) Focus on chronic offenders and chronic locations; 3) Direct patrol officers and special units to work in specific areas every week to prevent and deter crime and criminal behavior; 4) Use technology to assist officers and detectives in identifying chronic offenders, finding license plates and vehicles, and in creating Chronic Offender Bulletins; and 5) Work with the research partner on evaluating the project. The Research Partner will work with the LAPD by evaluating the strategies and tactics utilized in the field in the existing and expanded LAPD divisions. NCA/NCF

Grantee

The grantee indicated the award had grant activity during the report period. Performance data can be found in the "Performance Measures" section. Narrative information for the award can be found in the "Grantee Comments" and "Goals and Objectives" sections.

Award Synopsis

The following table displays whether the grantee was operational, not operational, or closed out during the report period.

Reporting Period: 01 Jan 2016 - 31 Mar 2016

| | Operational | Not Operational | Closed Out |
|---------|-------------|-----------------|------------|
| Grantee | Yes | | No |

Goals & Objectives

The following goals and objectives were entered by the grantee during the report period.

Direct Grantee: (Reporting Period: -)

| # | Goal | Status | Progress & Barriers | Planned Activities |
|---|------|--------|---------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | |

Performance Measures

Performance measures data for the GMS report period are displayed below. Only sections with reported data are shown. "Cumulative Total" includes both quarters represented in this report and any other data reported on previous GMS reports since the start of the award.

Agency/Project Information

| Measure | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 | Option Response Totals | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|
| 3. What was the start date (month/year) of your SPI program? | | | | | |
| Month/Year | • 10/2009 | • - | | | |
| Please provide the primary point of contact (POC) for the research partner that your agency will be working with as part of its SPI program. | | | | | |
| A. Name | A. Craig Uchida | A | | | |

| B. Research partner POC information1. Telephone number2. E-mail3. Address | B. Research partner POC information 2. cduchida@jssinc.org 3. PO Box 6188, Silver Spring, MD 20916 | B. Research partner POC information 1. 0 2. 0 3. 0 |
|--|--|---|
| | | |
| | gency's jurisdiction(s)? This can be a city a, or a number of politically defined area | |
| Jurisdiction(s) name: | City of Los Angeles | • - |
| | ion that your law enforcement agency se our jurisdiction's name at http://factfinder | erves? For most jurisdictions, population 2.census.gov. |
| A. Population: | A. 3792621 | A |
| How does your agency plan to s that apply. | ustain the SPI program accomplishment | ts post-funding completion? Select all |
| A. Continue to invest in research partnerships | Continue to invest in research partnerships | A. 1 |
| B. Continue to use data analysis to inform and improve strategic and tactical responses | B. Continue to use data analysis to inform and improve strategic and tactical responses | B. 1 |
| C. Foster community partnerships | C. Foster community partnerships | C. 1 |

| through systematic public outreach | through systematic public outreach | |
|--|--|------|
| D. Systematically offer in-service training | D. Systematically offer in-service training | D. 1 |
| E. Replicate the SPI program in other divisions within the agency, if applicable | E. Replicate the SPI program in other divisions within the agency, if applicable | E. 1 |
| F. Other | F | F. 0 |
| | | |

Personnel

| analyst positions 1. Cumulative (since start of award) 2. This reporting period 2. 0 Number of part-time crime analyst positions 1. Cumulative (since start of award) 2. 0 Number of part-time crime analyst positions Number of part-time Number of part-time | Measure | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 | Cumulative Total |
|--|---|---|--|
| sworn officers with general arrest powers as of the last day of the reporting period B. Of those, the number that are assigned to or involved in the SPI program 9. During the reporting period, how many crime analyst positions were created/added using SPI program Number of full-time crime analyst positions 1. Cumulative (since start of award) 2. This reporting period Number of full-time crime analyst positions 1. 0 1. 0 1 2. 0 Number of part-time crime analyst positions Number of part-time crime analyst positions | • | n officers with general arrest powers o | does your agency have on staff as of the |
| Number of full-time crime analyst positions 1. Cumulative (since start of award) 2. This reporting period Number of full-time crime analyst positions 1. 0 2. 0 Number of part-time crime analyst positions Number of full-time crime analyst positions 1. 0 2. 0 Number of part-time crime analyst positions Number of part-time crime analyst positions Number of part-time crime analyst positions | sworn officers with general arrest powers as of the last day of the reporting period B. Of those, the number that are assigned to or involved in the | | |
| Analyst positions 1. Cumulative (since start of award) 2. This reporting period Number of full-time crime analyst positions 1. 0 2. 0 Number of part-time crime analyst positions 1. 0 1 2. 0 Number of part-time crime analyst positions 1. Cumulative (since or part-time crime analyst positions crime analyst positions crime analyst positions crime analyst positions | 9. During the reporting period, how | many crime analyst positions were cr | eated/added using SPI program funds? |
| analyst positions 1. Cumulative (since Number of part-time Number of part-time crime analyst positions Number of part-time crime analyst positions | analyst positions 1. Cumulative (since start of award) | crime analyst positions 1. 0 | |
| | analyst positions 1. Cumulative (since | - | Number of part-time crime analyst positions |

| | 1. 0 | 1 | | |
|---|--|------------------------|--|--|
| | 2. 0 | 2. 0 | | |
| | 2. 0 | 2. 0 | | |
| | | | | |
| 10. During the reporting period, how origin of program funds)? | 10. During the reporting period, how many crime analysts were assigned to the SPI program (regardless of the origin of program funds)? | | | |
| A. Number of full-time crime analyst positions assigned to SPI program | A. 10 | A. 10 | | |
| B. Number of part-time crime analyst positions assigned to SPI program | B. 2 | B. 2 | | |
| Measure | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 | Option Response Totals | | |
| 11. During the reporting period, were BJA SPI funds used to pay for overtime hours? | | | | |
| A. Yes | A | A. 0 | | |
| B. No | B. No | B. 1 | | |
| C. If Yes, how many overtime hours | C | C | | |

Problem Identification and Understanding

| Measure | Text Response(s) | |
|--|--|--|
| 12. What problem do you plan to address with your SPI program? | | |
| | (01 Jan 2016 - 31 Mar 2016) The LAPD is addressing the problems of violent crime and gun-related crime | |
| | | |

| Meas | ure | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 | Option Response Totals |
|--|--|--|------------------------|
| 13. Have you completed an in-depth analysis of your problem's underlying causes during the reporting period? | | | |
| Α. | Yes | A | A. 0 |
| В. | No, but it is currently in progress | B. No, but it is currently in progress | B. 1 |
| C. | No, it is not in progress. | C | C. 0 |
| D. | If No it is not in progress, Please Explain | D | D |
| 14. Which of the following groups performed data analysis for the SPI program during the reporting period? | | | |
| A. | Sworn employees of the police agency | A. Sworn employees of the police agency | A. 1 |
| В. | Civilian employees of the police agency | B. Civilian employees of the police agency | B. 1 |
| C. | Research partner | C. Research partner | C. 1 |
| D. | Outside contractor | D. Outside contractor | D. 1 |
| E. | Data was not analyzed this reporting period | E | E. 0 |
| F. | Other | F | F. 0 |

| | Which of the following data sourcapply. | es did you use for your SPI project duri | ing the reporting period? Select all that |
|-----------|---|--|---|
| 8 B. Į | Official police call, crime, and arrest data (calls for service, officer-initiated calls for service, crime incident reports, laternal agency pre-existing data tracking (use of force reports, citizen complaints) | A. Official police call, crime, and arrest data (calls for service, officer-initiated calls for service, crime incident reports, Internal agency pre-existing data tracking (use of force reports, citizen complaints) | A. 1 B. 1 |
| f | Community data (e.g., foreclosures, health and human services data, school data, or | C | C. 0 |
| D. (| other community data) Corrections data (e.g., probation and parole data) | D. Corrections data (e.g., probation and parole data) | D. 1 |
| | Prosecution data (e.g., pretrial data) | E | E. 0 |
| (| Court data (e.g., case outcomes, convictions, sentences) | F | F. 0 |
| G. (| Offender risk assessments | G. Offender risk assessments | G. 1 |
| Q | Focus group data (e.g., focus groups of community members, officers, or victims) | Н | H. 0 |
| (| Survey data (e.g., surveys of community members, officers, offenders, or victims) | l | I. 0 |
| ŗ | Systematic observations of places by trained observers (e.g., physical disorder) | J | J. 0 |
| | Intelligence from confidential or other informants | K | K. 0 |
| L. (| Other | L | L. 0 |

| period? Select all that apply | | |
|--|--|------|
| A. Provided leadership and guidance on how to conduct problem analysis | A. Provided leadership and guidance on how to conduct problem analysis | A. 1 |
| 3. Conducted the problem analysis | B. Conducted the problem analysis | B. 1 |
| C. Introduced new partners to working group to assist with problem analysis | The state of the s | C. 1 |
| D. Collected data for the problem analysis (e.g., surveys, focus groups, interviews) | | D. 1 |
| E. Interpreted the problem analysis results | E. Interpreted the problem analysis results | E. 1 |
| F. Provided actionable recommendations | F. Provided actionable recommendations | F. 1 |
| G. Presented problem analysis results to the agency and/o SPI working group partners | | G. 1 |
| H. Communicated problem analysis results to groups outside of the agency and/o | | H. 0 |
| SPI project working group (I. Other government, communi organizations, media) | | I. 0 |

Action Plan Development

| Measure | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 | Option Response Totals |
|-------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| 17. What is the status of you | ur SPI action plan during the reporting | period? |
| A. In development | A | A. 0 |

| B. Has been submitted to BJA but not approved | В | B. 0 | |
|---|----------------------------------|------|--|
| C. Plan has been approved by BJA | C. Plan has been approved by BJA | C. 1 | |
| 18. Please select the development status of each of the following SPI action plan activities during the reporting period. | | | |

Problem Response

| leasure | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 | Option Response Totals |
|---|---|---|
| 19. Has your agency iden your SPI program? | tified strategies aimed at addressing the | e underlying causes of the problem identified by |
| A. Yes | A. Yes | A. 1 |
| B. No | В | B. 0 |
| focus of your SPI prog hiring a coordinator to | gram (e.g., increasing community policing serve as a community advocate between | or implemented strategies) to address the problet g and foot patrol in specific violent crime blocks en law enforcement and immigrant communities on plan as your long-term strategic plan, and it |
| A. only be changed if you | u make significant changes to delifficap corridors" and chron | A8P€pot A |
| 21. During the reporting p reported in the previous | • | that led to a change in the response strategies |
| A. Yes | A | A. 0 |

| B. No | B. No | B. 1 | |
|--|--------|------|--|
| C. If Yes, please explain | C | C | |
| 22. Did your SPI program implement any strategies during the reporting period? | | | |
| A. Yes | A. Yes | A. 1 | |
| B. No | B | B. 0 | |

Data Analysis to Assist and Improve Response Activities

| <i>l</i> leasure | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 | Option Response Totals |
|--|--|---|
| 23. Which of the following | g groups performed data analysis for the | ne SPI program during the reporting period? |
| A. Sworn employees of agency | the police A. Sworn employees o | f the police A. 2 |
| B. Civilian employees of agency | the police B. Civilian employees agency | of the police B. 2 |
| C. Research partner | C. Research partner | C. 2 |
| D. Outside contractor | D | D. 1 |
| E. Data was not analyze reporting period | ed this E | E. 0 |
| F. Other | F | F. 0 |

| 24. | Which of the following data source that apply. | ces did you use to inform your SPI proje | ct during the reporting period? Select all |
|-----|--|---|--|
| Α. | Official police call, crime, and arrest data (calls for service, officer-initiated calls for | A. Official police call, crime, and arrest data (calls for service, officer-initiated calls for | A. 1 |
| В. | service, crime incident reports, Internal agency pre-existing Of arrest reports data tracking (use of force reports, citizen complaints) | service, crime incident reports, B. Internal agency pre-existing data tracking (use of force reports, citizen complaints) | B. 1 |
| C. | Community data (e.g., foreclosures, health and human services data, school data, or | C | C. 0 |
| D. | other community data) Corrections data (e.g., probation and parole data) | D. Corrections data (e.g., probation and parole data) | D. 1 |
| E. | Prosecution data (e.g., pretrial data) | E | E. 0 |
| F. | Court data (e.g., case outcomes, convictions, sentences) | F | F. 0 |
| G. | Offender risk assessments | G. Offender risk assessments | G. 1 |
| Н. | Focus group data (e.g., focus groups of community members, officers, or victims) | Н | H. 0 |
| I. | Survey data (e.g., surveys of community members, officers, offenders, or victims) | Survey data (e.g., surveys of community members, officers, offenders, or victims) | I. 1 |
| J. | Systematic observations of places by trained observers (e.g., physical disorder) | J | J. 0 |
| K. | Intelligence from confidential or other informants | K | K. 0 |
| L. | Other | L | L. 0 |

| reporting period. | analysis to inform the following SPI pro | gram response activities during the |
|---|--|--|
| Working group decisionmaking Not Applicable | A. Working group decisionmaking 1 | A. Working group decisionmaking 1. 0 |
| 2. Yes | 2. Yes | 2. 1 |
| 3. No | 3 | 3. 0 |
| | | |
| 3. Prosecution 1. Not Applicable | B. Prosecution 1 | B. Prosecution 1. 0 |
| 2. Yes | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. No | 3. No | 3. 1 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| C. Criminal investigations 1. Not Applicable | C. Criminal investigations 1 | C. Criminal investigations 1. 0 |
| 2. Yes | 2. Yes | 2. 1 |
| 3. No | 3 | 3. 0 |

| D. Long-term crime reduction and prevention (strategic approach) 1. Not Applicable | D. Long-term crime reduction and prevention (strategic approach) 1 | D. Long-term crime reduction and prevention (strategic approach) 1. 0 |
|---|--|--|
| 2. Yes | 2. Yes | 2. 1 |
| 3. No | 3 | 3. 0 |
| | | |
| E. Tactical strategies (e.g., short- term crime reduction or prevention strategies) 1. Not Applicable | E. Tactical strategies (e.g., short-term crime reduction or prevention strategies)1 | E. Tactical strategies (e.g., short- term crime reduction or prevention strategies) 1. 0 |
| 2. Yes | 2. Yes | 2. 1 |
| 3. No | 3 | 3. 0 |
| | | |

| F. Informing the media/public 1. Not Applicable | F. Informing the media/public 1 | F. Informing the media/public 1. 0 |
|--|--|--|
| 2. Yes | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. No | 3. No | 3. 1 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 26. Which of the following activities or reporting period? Select all that a | did your research partner do to assist wi apply. | th the SPI program response during the |
| A. Introduced new partners to the working group | A. Introduced new partners to the working group | A. 1 |
| B. Conducted or assisted in data collection (e.g., survey, focus groups, interviews) | B. Conducted or assisted in data collection (e.g., survey, focus groups, interviews) | B. 1 |
| C. Conducted or assisted in ongoing data analysis | C. Conducted or assisted in ongoing data analysis | C. 1 |
| D. Provided training and/or technical assistance to agency analysts | D. Provided training and/or technical assistance to agency analysts | D. 1 |
| E. Interpreted analysis results | E. Interpreted analysis results | E. 1 |
| | | |
| F. Provided recommendations on program strategies | F. Provided recommendations on program strategies | F. 1 |
| G. Communicated analysis results to the working group | G. Communicated analysis results to the working group | G. 1 |

| H. Communicated analysis results to partners outside of the SPI project working group (e.g., local government, community I. Orber organizations, media) H. Communicated analysis results to partners outside of the SPI project working group (e.g., local government, community organizations, media) H. 1 to partners outside of the SPI project working group (e.g., local government, community organizations, media) |
|--|
|--|

Response to Crime, Disorder, or Other Community Problems

| erime, disorder, or other community problems (e.g., mental health by engagement)? A. 1 B. 0 out during the reporting period (e.g., hot spot patrols were |
|--|
| B. 0 |
| |
| out during the reporting period (e.g., hot spot patrols were |
| ed building was torn down in a target area, officers were trained on |
| e four original LASER A ions Captains assigned ers to work in chronic tions, analysts created new |
| gimpfenderted letius efforts around crime prevention, developmen sts, field interviews, and r police activities were ertaken. Four additional |
| ions were included in ER - Hollenbeck, Rampart, heast, and Harbor. hings were held in each |
| sion, Captains were given B. 0 ings, and command staff |
| r pertioner in the control of the co |

| A. Situational crime prevention | A | A. 0 |
|--|---|---|
| and crime prevention through | | |
| environmental design strategies | | |
| —approaches that change the Youth development it is regrams that e.g. and the second control of the second con | B | B. 0 |
| behavior in youth; for example, complete the street of the | C | C. 0 |
| parking lots or improved awareness of a crime problem, lincluding solutions to prevent D. Increase personal safetyck it or programs of that provide instruction on increasing | D | D. 0 |
| personal safety; for example, a E. Community building programs that promote community cohesion, including public | E | E. 0 |
| safety partnerships between F. Other community and elements of the criminal justice system; for example, National Night Out™. | F. Other | F. 1 |
| | | |
| 31. During the reporting period, did Select all that apply. | the strategies implemented focus efforts | around any of the following models? |
| | the strategies implemented focus efforts A | around any of the following models? A. 0 |
| Select all that apply. A. Community-oriented approach | | · |
| A. Community-oriented approach (community policing) B. Geographic focus (hot spots | A B. Geographic focus (hot spots | A. 0 |
| A. Community-oriented approach (community policing) B. Geographic focus (hot spots policing) C. High-rate offender focus | A B. Geographic focus (hot spots policing) C. High-rate offender focus | A. 0 B. 1 |
| A. Community-oriented approach (community policing) B. Geographic focus (hot spots policing) C. High-rate offender focus (focused deterrence) | A B. Geographic focus (hot spots policing) C. High-rate offender focus (focused deterrence) D. High-rate group/gang focus | A. 0 B. 1 C. 1 |
| A. Community-oriented approach (community policing) B. Geographic focus (hot spots policing) C. High-rate offender focus (focused deterrence) D. High-rate group/gang focus (pulling levers) E. Intelligence-led policing (decision-making based on | A B. Geographic focus (hot spots policing) C. High-rate offender focus (focused deterrence) D. High-rate group/gang focus (pulling levers) E. Intelligence-led policing (decision-making based on | A. 0 B. 1 C. 1 |

| (problem-oriented policing such as the Scanning, Analysis, Response and Evaluation G. Procedural justice (ensuring people feel law enforcement is fair and just) | (problem-oriented policing such as the Scanning, Analysis, Response and Evaluation G. (SARA) model) | G. 0 |
|--|--|------|
| H. Restorative justice | Н | H. 0 |
| I. Other | I | 1. 0 |

Technology Demonstration

| Measure | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 | Option Response Totals | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| 32. Are you implement | ing or testing a new technology as part of | your SPI program during the reporting period? | |
| A. Yes | A. Yes | A. 1 | |
| B. No | B | B. 0 | |
| Measure | Text Response(s) | | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | type of technology that your SPI program data analysis software/hardware, ShotSpot | is implementing or testing (e.g., body-worn ter). | |
| | (01 Jan 2016 - 31 Ma | nr 2016) | |
| | LAPD and the research partner are testing the use of automated vehicle locators (AVL) as a measure of dosage in the four Divisions that are implementing SPI. | | |

Body Worn Cameras

| | Reporting Period: | | |
|---------|-------------------|------------------------|--|
| Measure | Jan - Mar 2016 | Option Response Totals | |

| 34. Did you use SPI funding to implement or test BWCs during the reporting period? | | | | | |
|--|--|-------|------|--|--|
| Α. | Yes | A | A. 0 | | |
| В. | No | B. No | B. 1 | | |
| Meas | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 Cumulative Total | | | | |
| 35. | 35. Please enter the total number of sworn positions eligible for BWCs in your agency/coalition. | | | | |
| 36. Please enter the number of sworn positions that have received BWCs: | | | | | |
| 37. | 37. Please enter the total number of BWCs proposed to be purchased as part of the SPI grant funding. | | | | |
| 38. | 38. Please enter the number of BWCs purchased through the SPI grant funding. | | | | |

Program Progress

| Measure | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 | Option Response Totals |
|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 39. Do you track your SPI program's progress or impact using specific quantitative measures? | | |
| A. Yes | A. Yes | A. 1 |
| B. No | В | B. 0 |

| C. If no, please explain: | C | C |
|--|--|------------------------|
| D. If Yes, please describe the target area(s) and specific population(s) | D. The target areas are hot spot corridors or LASER Zones that have been identified by using | D |
| E. If Yes, please list the measures that you are tracking | violent crime and gun-related E. Within data areas the Postand the respective at the respective of the | E |
| answering this question, please of | ram, has in deviolent and a unestable ram, has in deviolent and a unestable consider of the consideration of the consid | |
| A. Yes, positive impact | within each Division. A. Yes, positive impact | A. 1 |
| B. Yes, negative impact | В | B. 0 |
| C. No measurable impact | C | C. 0 |
| D. Not yet been measured | D | D. 0 |
| E. If Yes, please explain | E. In Newton Division in 2012, LASER showed a decrease in crime. In subsequent years, violent crime has fluctuated, | E |
| Organizational Integration and Project S | but the overall impact has been positive. ustainability | |
| Measure | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 | Option Response Totals |
| 41. Has there been a change in your SPI research partner or a significant change in the research partner team members during the reporting period? | | |
| A. Yes | A | A. 0 |

| B. | No | B. No | B. 1 | |
|-----|--|---|---------------|--|
| C. | If Yes, please explain and update your research partner POC information, if applicable, in question 4 | C | C | |
| 42. | Has there been a change in ager | ncy or project leadership during the repo | rting period? | |
| A. | Yes | A | A. 0 | |
| | No | B. No | B. 1 | |
| C. | If Yes, please explain | C | C | |
| 43. | 43. Has your agency adopted any policies or procedures as a result of the SPI program? | | | |
| A. | Yes | A | A. 0 | |
| В. | No | B. No | B. 1 | |
| 44. | 44. Since the start of the SPI program, please identify the policies or procedures adopted by your agency as a result of the SPI program. Select all that apply. | | | |
| 45. | During the reporting period, did a | any of the following occur? Select all tha | t apply. | |
| Α. | Discussion of SPI in command staff, COMPSTAT, or other leadership meetings | A. Discussion of SPI in command staff, COMPSTAT, or other leadership meetings | A. 1 | |
| В | Discussion of SPI in roll call | B. Discussion of SPI in roll call | B 1 | |

| C. | Discussion of SPI in district meetings | C | C. 0 | |
|-----|--|---|------|--|
| D. | SPI-specific training for recruits | D | D. 0 | |
| E. | SPI-specific in-service training | E. SPI-specific in-service training | E. 1 | |
| F. | SPI knowledge requirement for advancement tests/boards | F | F. 0 | |
| G. | Other | G | G. 0 | |
| 46. | 46. During the reporting period, has your agency implemented any of the following activities around advancing knowledge to the field regarding your SPI strategy? Select all that apply. | | | |
| A. | No activities have been conducted during the reporting period | A | A. 0 | |
| В. | Presented about the SPI strategy at a conference | B. Presented about the SPI strategy at a conference | B. 1 | |
| C. | Disseminated publications to the field about the SPI strategy | C | C. 0 | |
| D. | Developed fliers to inform the public about the SPI strategy | D | D. 0 | |
| E. | Other | E | E. 0 | |
| | | | | |

Community Outreach

| Reporting Period: | |
|-------------------|--|
| Reporting Feriod. | |
| 1 | |
| | |

| Measure | Jan - Mar 2016 | Option Response Totals | |
|---|-------------------|------------------------|--|
| 47. How often was your agency involved in the following community activities as part of your SPI program during the reporting period? | | | |
| A. Hosted community meetings | A. Not Applicable | A. 1 | |
| B. Attended community meetings, advisory boards, or roundtables | B. Not Applicable | B. 1 | |
| C. Distributed a newsletter, email, or other bulletin | C. Not Applicable | C. 1 | |
| D. Attended community events (e.g., national night out, block parties, festivals) | D. Not Applicable | D. 1 | |
| E. Conducted social media activities (e.g., Facebook, Twitter) | E. Not Applicable | E. 1 | |
| F. Conducted outreach to minority populations (e.g., racial, ethnic, religious, LGBTQI) | F. Not Applicable | F. 1 | |
| G. Other | G. Not Applicable | G. 1 | |
| H. If other please explain | H | Н | |

Working Group and Partnerships

| Measure | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 | Option Response Totals |
|---|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 48. Did your initiative have a working group to help guide the SPI program during the reporting period? | | |
| A. Yes | A. Yes | A. 1 |

| B. No | B | B. 0 |
|--|--|---|
| 49. How often did your working grobest fits. | oup hold organized meetings during the | he reporting period? Select the response tha |
| A. We did not meet this quarter | A | A. 0 |
| B. Daily | В | B. 0 |
| C. Weekly/Biweekly | C | C. 0 |
| D. Monthly | D. Monthly | D. 1 |
| E. Quarterly | E | E. 0 |
| 50. Please rate the following worki the initiative this reporting period | | ement: "This partner was actively involved in |
| A. Research partner 1. NA/Not Tracked | A. Research partner 1 | A. Research partner 1. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree 5. Agree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6. Strongly Agree | 6. 1 |
| | | |
| | | |

| B. State/tribal leadership (e.g., governor's office)1. NA/Not Tracked | B. State/tribal leadership (e.g., governor's office)1. NA/Not Tracked | B. State/tribal leadership (e.g., governor's office) 1. 1 |
|--|--|--|
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | |
| C. Local leadership (e.g., mayor's office) | C. Local leadership (e.g., mayor's office) | C. Local leadership (e.g., mayor's office) |
| NA/Not Tracked | NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | |
| D. Federal law enforcement agencies | D. Federal law enforcement agencies | D. Federal law enforcement agencies |
| NA/Not Tracked | 1 | 1. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 5. Agree | 5. 1 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | |

| E. State law enforcement agencies | E. State law enforcement agencies | E. State law enforcement agencies 1. 1 |
|---|---|---|
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| 2. Chronaly Diograp | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 3. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 4. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | |
| Disagree | | 5. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 5 | 6. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | |
| | | |
| | | |
| F. Local law enforcement | F. Local law enforcement | F. Local law enforcement agencies |
| agencies (including detectives/investigators) | agencies (including detectives/investigators) | (including detectives/investigators) |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| 2 Strongly Diaggree | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | Z | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree | | |
| 5. Agree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| G. Community-based service | G. Community-based service | G. Community-based service |
| providers (e.g., housing, | providers (e.g., housing, | providers (e.g., housing, |
| employment) | employment) | employment) |
| NA/Not Tracked | NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| · · | | |

| 4 N. W. A | | 4.0 |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 3 - 3 | | |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| H. Pretrial service organizations | H. Pretrial service organizations | H. Pretrial service organizations |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| 2 Chronaly Diagrap | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| | | 4. 0 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| G. 7.1g. 00 | . | 6. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| I. U.S. Attorney's Office | I. U.S. Attorney's Office | I. U.S. Attorney's Office |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| 0.00 | | 2. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| - | | 4.0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree 5. Agree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| J. Agree | J | |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| J. Prosecutors | J. Prosecutors | J. Prosecutors |
| NA/Not Tracked | NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| | | |

| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2. 0 |
|---|---|--|
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree 5. Agree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | |
| | | |
| K. Public defender/indigent defense | K. Public defender/indigent defense | K. Public defender/indigent defense1. 1 |
| NA/Not Tracked | NA/Not Tracked | 2. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 3. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 4. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 5. 0 |
| Disagree 5. Agree | 5 | 6. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | |
| | | |
| L. Courts | L. Courts | L. Courts |
| NA/Not Tracked | NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

| M. Community corrections (probation/parole)1. NA/Not Tracked | M. Community corrections (probation/parole)1. NA/Not Tracked | M. Community corrections (probation/parole) 1. 1 |
|---|---|---|
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | |
| N. Corrections | N. Corrections | N. Corrections |
| 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | |
| | | |
| O. Health providers 1. NA/Not Tracked | O. Health providers 1. NA/Not Tracked | O. Health providers 1. 1 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree 5. Agree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | |
| | | |

| P. Mental health providers 1. NA/Not Tracked | P. Mental health providers 1. NA/Not Tracked | P. Mental health providers 1. 1 |
|---|---|--|
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree 5. Agree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | |
| | | |
| Q. Substance abuse treatment providers | Q. Substance abuse treatment providers | Q. Substance abuse treatment providers |
| NA/Not Tracked | NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree 5. Agree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | |
| R. Child protective services | R. Child protective services | R. Child protective services |
| NA/Not Tracked | NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree 5. Agree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | |

| S. Community-based service providers 1. NA/Not Tracked | S. Community-based service providers 1. NA/Not Tracked | S. Community-based service providers 1. 1 |
|--|--|--|
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| · | | 4. 0 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 4 | 5. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 5 | |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | |
| T. Community groups (e.g., neighborhood watch, community center)1. NA/Not Tracked | T. Community groups (e.g., neighborhood watch, community center)1. NA/Not Tracked | T. Community groups (e.g., neighborhood watch, community center) 1. 1 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| U. Faith-based organizations 1. NA/Not Tracked | U. Faith-based organizations 1. NA/Not Tracked | U. Faith-based organizations 1. 1 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| | | |

| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4. 0 |
|---|---|--|
| Disagree 5. Agree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| - | | 6. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | |
| | | |
| | | |
| V. Subject matter experts1. NA/Not Tracked | V. Subject matter experts1. NA/Not Tracked | V. Subject matter experts 1. 1 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2. 0 |
| | | 3. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | |
| | | |
| W. Foundations/Philanthropic | W. Foundations/Philanthropic | W. Foundations/Philanthropic |
| organizations 1. NA/Not Tracked | organizations 1. NA/Not Tracked | organizations 1. 1 |
| | | 2. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree 5. Agree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | |
| | | |
| X. Training and technical assistance provider(s) | X. Training and technical assistance provider(s) | X. Training and technical assistance provider(s) |
| NA/Not Tracked | NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| | | 2. 0 |

| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | |
|---|---|--|
| | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | J | |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | |
| | | |
| Y. Tribal criminal justice agencies1. NA/Not Tracked | Y. Tribal criminal justice agencies 1. NA/Not Tracked | Y. Tribal criminal justice agencies 1. 1 |
| | | |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree 5. Agree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| | | 6. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Z. Businesses1. NA/Not Tracked | Z. Businesses1. NA/Not Tracked | Z. Businesses 1. 1 |
| | | 2. 0 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree 5. Agree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| U. Strongly Agree | 0 | |
| | | |
| | | |
| AA. K-12 schools 1. NA/Not Tracked | AA. K-12 schools 1. NA/Not Tracked | AA. K-12 schools 1. 1 |
| | | |

| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2. 0 |
|--|--|--|
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| 4. Neither Agree nor | 4 | 4. 0 |
| Disagree 5. Agree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | |
| AB. Public services (e.g., trash collection, public works) | AB. Public services (e.g., trash collection, public works) | AB. Public services (e.g., trash collection, public works) |
| NA/Not Tracked | NA/Not Tracked | 1. 1 |
| 2. Strongly Disagree | 2 | 2. 0 |
| 3. Disagree | 3 | 3. 0 |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 4 | 4. 0 |
| 5. Agree | 5 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Strongly Agree | 6 | 6. 0 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 51. Please indicate which of the follo Select all that apply. | wing activities, if any, the working group | carried out during the reporting period. |
| A. Briefed agency leaders | A. Briefed agency leaders | A. 1 |
| B. Conducted planning meetings | B. Conducted planning meetings | B. 1 |
| | | |

| C. Discussed group membership/participation | C. Discussed group membership/participation | C. 1 |
|---|---|------|
| D. Discussed resources needed/resource sharing | D. Discussed resources needed/resource sharing | D. 1 |
| E. Invited outside partners to speak with the members (e.g., faith based) | E | E. 0 |
| F. Planned related activities for group members | F. Planned related activities for group members | F. 1 |
| G. Planned tactical responses | G. Planned tactical responses | G. 1 |
| H. Reviewed analysis products | H. Reviewed analysis products | H. 1 |
| I. Reviewed project progress | I. Reviewed project progress | I. 1 |
| J. Engaged in project- sustainability planning | J. Engaged in project- sustainability planning | J. 1 |
| K. Other | K | K. 0 |
| | | |

Training

| Measure | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 | Option Response Totals |
|---|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 52. Did staff or working group members attend or host training related to your SPI program during the reporting period? | | |
| A. Yes | A. Yes | A. 1 |
| B. No | В | B. 0 |

Research Partnership Activities

| Measure | Reporting Period: Jan - Mar 2016 | Option Response Totals |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| 54. Which of the following activities apply. | did your research partner conduct during | the reporting period? Select all that |
| A. No activity was completed this reporting period | A | A. 0 |
| B. Attended project working-group meetings | B. Attended project working-group meetings | B. 1 |
| C. Observed/attended program responses (e.g., conducted ride-alongs, observed | C. Observed/attended program responses (e.g., conducted ride-alongs, observed | C. 1 |
| D. Requested specific data from the agency or working group partners | prevention/outreach services) D. Requested specific data from the agency or working group partners | D. 1 |
| E. Conducted interviews or focus groups | E | E. 0 |
| F. Communicated with the police agency about the current status of the evaluation | F. Communicated with the police agency about the current status of the evaluation | F. 1 |
| G. Communicated/presented evaluation plan, preliminary findings, and/or results to the | G. Communicated/presented evaluation plan, preliminary findings, and/or results to the | G. 1 |
| agency and/or the SPI project H. Communicated/presented evaluation plan, preliminary findings, and/or results outside | agency and/or the SPI project H. working group | H. 0 |
| of the SPI project working I. Other (e.g., local government, community organizations, media) | l | I. 0 |

Page: 35 of 36

| A. Yes | A. Yes | A. 1 |
|---|--|------|
| B. No | В | B. 0 |
| C. If Yes, please list and briefly describe the products received during the reporting period | C. Computer generated maps with violent crimes exa | C |

Closeout Question (Last Reporting Period Only)

| | Reporting Period: | |
|----------------------|--|--|
| Measure | - | Option Response Totals |
| 56. How does your ag | ancy plan to use the results of the complete | d assessment/evaluation? Select all that apply |

56. How does your agency plan to use the results of the completed assessment/evaluation? Select all that apply.

Grantee Comments

No comments entered

Page: 36 of 36