



Intervening in Violent Retaliatory Disputes

Smart Policing Initiative: Rochester, NY

Chris Delaney, Capt. Wayne Harris, & John Klofas, Ph.D.

April 16, 2013

This project was supported by Grant No. 2009-DG-BX-K021 awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance. The Bureau of Justice Assistance is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Office for Victims of Crime. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

About Us

- Geography: 37.1 square miles (between Buffalo and Syracuse)
- City population: 210,565 Metro: 1 million
- 2012 crime
 - 13,361 part 1 crimes
 - Firearm violent crime: 33 per 100,000 (3rd in the state of New York)
 - 218 shooting victims
 - 36 murders (28 from firearm) down from 50s as recently as 2007
 - Significant local gang/street crew activity
- 2011 crime
 - 31 total homicides, 19 involved a dispute - 8 of which involved a precipitating action at least two hours prior (5 with firearm)
- Team
 - Rochester Police Department
 - Rochester Institute of Technology
 - Secondary partners across other initiatives

2

Opportunities for Intervention in Firearm Violence

- By typology
 - Robberies
 - Disputes
 - Immediate vs. Ongoing
 - Types:
 - Simple interpersonal (insult, girls, etc.)
 - Domestic
 - Gang
 - Drug business-related
 - Limited opportunities for intervention on immediate disputes
 - Ongoing disputes are essentially crime patterns for assault



Project Goals

1. To improve our understanding on the scope and nature of retaliatory violence involving firearms
2. To formalize a method to assess and prioritize disputes at risk for retaliatory firearm violence
3. To create and test a violent retaliatory dispute intervention strategy

Project Phases

- Phase 1: Analyze Shooting Data
- Phase 2: Develop a retaliatory dispute “risk assessment tool” for field use
- Phase 3a: Devise intervention strategy
- Phase 3b: 1-year implementation of strategy
- Phase 3c: Evaluate strategy
- Phase 4: Communicate outcomes

Phase 1 and 2: Inform the Strategy

- Conduct a typology analysis
 - Data acquisition, coding and analysis
 - Conduct incident reviews of retaliatory shootings
- What risk factors make one dispute more likely than another to follow a pattern of retaliatory violence?
- Develop a retaliatory dispute “risk assessment tool” for field use

Phase 1

Goal	Objective	Activity	Completion Date	Responsibility
To improve our understanding on the scope and nature of violent retaliatory disputes, especially as they relate to shooting violence	<i>PHASE 1: Conduct Typology Analysis of Shootings</i>	Obtain and Code Data	End Feb 2013	Research Partner
		Data Analysis	End Q1 2013	Research Partner
		Kickoff Meeting and Assemble Project Steering Committee	End Feb 2013	Research Partner, Project Manager, RPD Investigators, Officers, Parole & Probation Officers, Pathways To Peace Outreach Workers, MCAC Analysts
		Conduct Incident Reviews of Shootings	End Q1 2013	Research Partner, Project Manager, RPD Investigators, Officers, Parole & Probation Officers, Pathways To Peace Outreach Workers, MCAC Analysts
	<i>PHASE 1: To develop and document a standard typology for describing and collecting data on violent retaliatory disputes.</i>	Document Findings	End Q2 2013	Research Partner

Phase 2

Goal	Objective	Activity	Completion Date	Responsibility
To formalize a method for dispute risk assessment that can be used by police to identify and prioritize disputes at high-risk for retaliation	PHASE 2: Formalizing a risk assessment tool	Review Relevant Literature	Q2 2013	Research Partner
		Develop Assessment Tool	End Q2 2013	Research Partner
		Solicit Feedback from Police Officers	Q3 2013	Research Partner & Project Manager
		Document Findings	End Q3 2013	Research Partner

Phase 3: Develop the Strategy

- Establish business processes and workflow for regular and specialized operations
 - Intel-gathering
 - Intervention
 - Maintenance and Follow-up
 - Problem identification via incident reviews
- Identify and train a “Retaliation Intervention Team”
- Create a tactical toolbox of best practices

Elements of Violent Dispute Management

Time Contexts

On-Scene/
Immediate (First 8
Hours)

Next Day
(8-24 Hours)

First Week
(1-7 Days)

Second Week
(8-14 Days)

Ongoing
(Monitoring)

Intelligence-Gathering

- Goals:
- Identify key players, associates, motives & locations.
- Assess likelihood of retaliation and seriousness of risk for further violence

Case Investigation

- Goal:
- Arrest suspects in primary case(s)

Enforcement (player targeting)

- Goal:
- Pre-emptive arrest of key players who may be at high-risk for further violent retaliatory acts, and are currently involved in narcotics activity, have pending warrants, or probation/parole violations

Prevention (location targeting)

- Goal:
- Deter key players from engaging in violent retaliations by focusing police resources at locations where retaliations are likely to occur

Intervention (dispute mediation)

- Goal:
- Engage key players, offer dispute mediation services
- Deter key players through personal contacts and relationship-building



Violent Dispute Assessment Tool and Action Item Worksheet

For On-Scene Commanders (DRAFT- 07/2010)



QUESTION 1: DOES THE INCIDENT INVOLVE A VIOLENT EVENT IN WHICH ONE PARTY IS TARGETED AS PART OF AN ONGOING DISPUTE THAT INVOLVED RETALIATORY EVENTS BETWEEN THE PARTIES?



IF THE ANSWER TO Q1 IS "YES", THEN QUESTION 2: DO ANY OF THE FOLLOWING SITUATIONS EXIST WITH REGARD TO THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE VICTIM, SUSPECT, AND CLOSE ASSOCIATES (VSA)?

1. Are the VSA active members/associates of a gang? If yes, do these gangs have a history of violence with each other?
2. Do the VSA have a history of shootings and/or weapon possession?
3. Are the VSA or Witnesses at the scene/hospital highly agitated and making threats or saying they will take care if it themselves?
4. Is there credible Officer information that the VSA are involved in/or likely to take part in further violent acts as a means of retaliation?

If the answer to both questions above is YES, the on-scene supervisor is directed to execute the following steps that are appropriate for this incident and ensure that the need for additional steps is communicated to other Division resources:

INTELLIGENCE-GATHERING

1. Gather current case info on VSA to include possible motives, "at-risk" locations, and/or persons
2. Contact On-Duty MCAC Analyst to complete reviews of VSA
3. Contact SIS to determine if they have any active cases involving VSA or their residences and request that they develop CI information.
4. Ensure that a request is made for FIOs to interview appropriate persons and/or monitor communications
5. Ensure that on-duty officers relay their knowledge of the VSAs and document same on appropriate report.

CASE INVESTIGATIONS

1. Ensure that the primary investigator not only focuses on the immediate event but also develops intelligence related to key individuals, cause for dispute, dispute timeline, individuals likely to retaliate, and potential locations for retaliation.
2. Ensure that city cameras at incident location and possible locations for retaliatory event are checked an/or monitored.
3. Review ShotSpotter Activity at known key locations
4. Prepare a shift hand-off plan to ensure continuation of investigation with no delay (including documentation of investigative effort)
5. Ensure that the next shift and Division Command is aware of current case status, current action plan, and recommended action plan

ENFORCEMENT (PLAYER TARGETING)

1. Targeted Warrant/Wanted service on VSAs (Coordinate with MCAC to identify targets).
2. Contact Probation/Parole and request they conduct case reviews, interviews, and home searches on VSAs. Ensure they have an RPD contact for follow-up.
- 3.

INTERVENTION (DISPUTE MEDIATION)

1. Contact Pathways-to-Peace if their presence would help diffuse groups at the location of the violent event or hospital, and request that they develop information related to the VSAs.
2. Ensure that hospitals and "at-risk" locations are aware of situation and that they have an RPD contact.
3. Use FACT resources with family if deemed beneficial
4. Consider group "Call-in" and/or other mediation options.
5. Ensure DA's office is made aware of gravity of situation to ensure proper case management.

PREVENTION (LOCATION TARGETING)

1. Consider detailing officers to key locations immediately after events as an immediate deterrent.
2. Make contact with VSA and advise them that further retaliation will not be tolerated (Call-in Speech)

Phase 3A

Goal	Objective	Activity	Completion Date	Responsibility
To create, test, evaluate, and document a violent retaliatory dispute intervention strategy which can be extensible to other departments	PHASE 3A:Develop Strategy	Identify Personnel for "Retaliation Intervention Team"	End Q2 2013	Steering Committee
		Conduct Officer Training on Intelligence Collection and Risk Assessment Tools	End Q3 2013	Steering Committee
		Convene Dispute Intelligence Working Group	End Q4 2013	Steering Committee
		Identify Offender-Based Intervention Tactics	End Q4 2013	Steering Committee
		Identify Place-Based Intervention Tactics	End Q4 2013	Steering Committee
		Identify Other Relevant Tactical Approaches	End Q4 2013	Steering Committee
		Implement all Strategy Elements	End Q4 2013	Steering Committee

Phase 3: Implement and Evaluate

- 1 Year implementation period
 - Monthly steering meetings
 - Ongoing shooting incident review process
- Identify and train a “Retaliation Intervention Team”
- Create a tactical toolbox of best practices
- Conduct evaluation and communicate outcomes

Phase 3B, 3C, and 4

Goal	Objective	Activity	Completion Date	Responsibility
To create, test, evaluate, and document a violent retaliatory dispute intervention strategy which can be extensible to other departments	PHASE 3B: Implement Strategy	Conduct Monthly Overview Meetings	Q4 2013-EndQ3 2014	Steering Committee, "Retaliation Intervention Team" Supervisor
		Conduct Evaluation	End Q4 2014	Research Partner
	PHASE 3C: Evaluate Strategy	Write Documentation	End Q1 2015	Research Partner
		Complete Publications	End Q2 2015	Research Partner
	PHASE 4: Communicate results to other agencies	Website goes live	End Q1 2015	Research Partner
		Conduct Conference Presentations	End Q2 2015	Research Partner & Project Manager

Next Steps

- Complete data analysis
- Conduct incident review on fatal and non-fatal retaliatory shootings (last 3 years)
- Document findings

Questions?