RPS Working Group and Subcommittees
Thursday, November 18, 2021 - 6:00 - 7:30 pm ET
Attendees: RPS Working Group, RPS Subcommittees, CPE Onsite team

As Per Matrix's Patrol Analysis Conclusions,
- ■ The findings demonstrate that current staffing is sufficient to handle current workloads and remain proactive at an extraordinarily high level.
- ■ While proactive time has been consistently high over the past five years, its use has diminished significantly.
- ■ To maintain a proactive time level of 59%, 26 officer positions should be budgeted for.
  - ● This incorporates an extra buffer to account for staff turnover.
  - ● At 40%, 18 officers are required.
  - ● At 50%, 21 officers are required.
  - ● At *70%*, 35 officers are required.
  - ○ The Report will be shared with our subcommittee members.

Q&A Main Takeaways:
- ● Matrix's analysis was based primarily on CAD data provided by IPD
- ● IPD affiliates find the results unrealistic. The systems used to capture this data were not designed to accurately capture how long people are on call.
  - ○ Calls take longer than is represented on CFS, and many responses do not generate a CFS, but take time. IPD has very little free time. The CAD system was not something we used with any specificity where it relates to CFS.
  - ○ The analysis centers on data from 2019, which was 2 years ago and the dynamics of policing have changed. One clear deficiency in the department's systems is the outdated CAD software, which is terrible at collecting this data. Officers are not clicking the buttons to make data reporting accurate, and its results are only as good as the data that is put in.
  - ○ The 60% proactive time is not representative of what is happening in the field. For two days this week, we had officers who were mandated to stay 4 hours after their shift time.
    - ○ IPD's current numbers hover around 22-23, and officers have little proactive time.
- ● This analysis is based on a lot of quantitative data and averages: is there any account for unpredictability and there is no real control in day to day work?
  - ○ Several parts of the analysis detail a breakdown in workload by day, week, and season.
  - ○ The peak hours for community generated calls was 4pm, which seems odd. I would imagine, based on what is happening in the city, that there would be a

higher number of calls in the evenings. Another aspect to consider is report writing: can there be any economies in that task?

- The data analysis results are generally in line with that of other police departments, and the disparity between [Matrix's] analyses and on-the-ground realities is typically not significant.
  - Across many of these analyses, there is frequently a disconnect from the experience of the officer versus what the data shows, due to variation between weeks, seasons, positions, etc.
- Community Service Officers is an alternative that the WG can consider for alternative responses to reduce IPD's workload and help flesh out these numbers. The diversion of calls that are safe for non-sworn responders to other models—i.e. CSO model, Cahoots, STAR in Denver, etc. is what we are actively discussing.
  - Over the years, a community action team—a quick response team for areas with increased criminal activity—has been explored in other cities and floated, because it is ideal for staffing fluctuations.
- This type of analysis will lead to us making recommendations for better reporting (systems) - the beauty about data is we can use it to help us make decisions about how we move forward with reporting in the dept.
  - This process is a data-driven effort. Any data analysis received now or in the future is an informing perspective, and we need different systems to collect the data and inform the Working Group's decisions.
  - This report's data will be shared with the IPD officers, and it may be shared with others. The data does not need to stay within the Working Group for our exclusive consideration.