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INTRODUCTION

The primary purpose of this report is to educate the Uptown Consortium Public Safety Subcommittee and their partners about the crime trends within the Uptown area neighborhoods of: Avondale, North Avondale, Clifton, Corryville, Mount Auburn, and Clifton Heights/University Heights/Fairview (CUF). In addition, the analysis allows the committee members, security personnel, and its law enforcement partners to prevent future crime and to develop effective interventions for both existing and emerging crime hot spots. Any conclusions and/or recommendations made by the Institute of Crime Science (ICS) team are based off the current report as well as the monthly subcommittee presentations (orally presented), with the overall goal of improving public safety in the Uptown neighborhoods.

The current report is annual summary of Uptown’s crime trends between January 1 and December 31, 2015, compared to the previous year (2014) and the previous 3-year averages (2012-2014). Primarily using crimes reported to the Cincinnati Police Department (CPD) and University of Cincinnati Police Department (UCPD), the report pairs general crime trends with geographic analysis of crime “hot spots” for all Part I crimes, property, and violent crime. The ICS analysis heavily focuses on areas with disproportionately high levels of crime compared to other geographic areas, as it is our feelings these areas offer the most efficient way of reducing crime. After presenting these specific geographic areas, the ICS team presents several evidence-based practices the Uptown Consortium members can use to address high-crime areas and support ongoing local law enforcement actions.

---

1 An area is deemed a “hot spot” if it contains a disproportionately high number of crimes compared to the rest of the Uptown neighborhoods. Areas with “high” clustering represent those that contain approximately 20% of the area’s crime.
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EXECUTIVE REPORT

Total Part I Crimes

• General trends. From year-to-date (January 1 to December 31), 2015 (YTD 2015), the overall Part I crime counts for the Uptown area decreased by 12.3% when compared to YTD 2014, and were more pronounced when compared to the 3-year average (which showed a 16.6% overall reduction).

• Geographic trends. In 2015, two “hot spot” areas overlapped, in terms of both violent and property crimes. One was located in Avondale along the Reading Rd corridor, and accounted for 12.4% of Uptown’s total Part I crimes. The second was located on the borders of CUF, Corryville, and Mount Auburn, and accounted for 18.2% of Uptown’s total Part I crimes. Together, these two areas accounted for 30.6% of the yearly total of Uptown’s Part I crimes.

Violent Crime

• General trends. From YTD 2015, the violent crime count decreased by 9.9% (43 fewer violent crimes) compared to 2014, and decreased 15.3% (71 fewer violent crimes) compared to the 3-year average. While general decreases occurred throughout the Uptown area, major (and statistically significant) decreases were found in (1) Clifton, (2) Corryville, and (3) CUF.

• Monthly trends. With exception of three months (February, April, and June), all 2015 monthly violent crime counts were below those of 2014 and the 3-year average. The last four months (September-December) showed dramatically lower violent crime counts, which included a historical low in December despite a consistent peak in each of the prior years.

• Geographic trends. Violent crime in 2015 was highly concentrated in one specific area, Avondale along the Reading Rd corridor, and to a lesser extent on the borders of CUF, Corryville, and Mount Auburn. The “Reading Road Hot Spot”, a half square mile area, accounted for nearly a quarter (24.4%) of Uptown’s total violent crime.

Property Crime

• General trends. From YTD 2015, property crime decreased by 12.6% (344 fewer property crimes) compared to 2014 and 16.8% (479 fewer property crimes) when compared to the 3-year average. While all of the Uptown neighborhoods experienced some reductions in property crime, the decrease was driven by the current reductions in the Clifton, CUF, and Corryville neighborhoods.

• Monthly trends. Only three months (January, February, and April) had property crime counts higher than those in 2014 and the 3-year average, but never differed by more than 25 incidents. All other months were below the totals in 2014 and also the 3-year average. The biggest numeric difference occurred in October, which is the month Uptown property crime historically peaks.

• Geographic trends. Property crime did not concentrate to the same degree as violent crime, but clustered around the University of Cincinnati in two major locations. One concentration was South of UC (between 200-250 Calhoun Street and the residential housing area between McMillan and Warner Streets). The other concentration was Southeast of UC at a single address, Kroger/Walgreens (1 W Corry Street). Together, these 2 hot spots accounted for
19.1% of Uptown’s total property crime in 2015.

AGGREGATED PART I CRIMES

Uptown and City Trends
Table 1\(^2\) displays the crime in the Uptown neighborhoods as well as in the City, both excluding the Uptown neighborhoods and as a whole, with City and Uptown neighborhoods combined. It compares all Part I crimes and pulls apart violent and property crimes in 2015 to their respective categories for 2014 and the 3-year average for each geographic unit. Three major findings are highlighted below:

- Overall, Uptown displayed a 12.3% reduction in Part I crimes in 2015 compared to 2014 and a 16.6% 3-year average reduction. This reduction is significant when compared to the City alone, which saw a 1.2% increase in 2015 compared to 2014, and only a 4.1% decrease when compared to the 3-year average.

- Despite nearly equivalent reductions in violent and property crime in 2015 when compared to the 3-year average (15.3% and 16.8% respectively), the difference between 2015 and 2014 was largely driven by decreases in property crime. In 2015, Uptown saw a reduction of 344 property crime incidents when compared to 2014 property crime figures.

- In 2015, Uptown neighborhoods saw a consistent steep decrease in violent crime, while the City alone has seen a smaller decrease over the same time period, and even a small increase in 2015 when compared to 2014.

Table 1. YTD Uptown and City Part I Crime Trends, Jan 1 – Dec 31, 2012-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Change from 2014</th>
<th>Change from 3-year average(^3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violent Offenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uptown Total</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>-9.9%</td>
<td>-15.3%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Total</td>
<td>2,271</td>
<td>2,182</td>
<td>1,917</td>
<td>1,927</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>-9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City &amp; Uptown Total</td>
<td>2,753</td>
<td>2,654</td>
<td>2,164</td>
<td>2,362</td>
<td>-9.1%</td>
<td>-6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Offenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uptown Total</td>
<td>3,110</td>
<td>2,736</td>
<td>2,720</td>
<td>2,376</td>
<td>-12.6%</td>
<td>-16.8%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Total</td>
<td>15,596</td>
<td>14,818</td>
<td>14,177</td>
<td>14,364</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>-3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City &amp; Uptown Total</td>
<td>18,706</td>
<td>17,554</td>
<td>15,416</td>
<td>16,740</td>
<td>-8.6%</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Part I Crimes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uptown Total</td>
<td>3,592</td>
<td>3,208</td>
<td>3,155</td>
<td>2,768</td>
<td>-12.3%</td>
<td>-16.6%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Total</td>
<td>17,867</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>16,094</td>
<td>16,291</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>-4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City &amp; Uptown Total</td>
<td>21,459</td>
<td>20,208</td>
<td>19,249</td>
<td>19,059</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>-6.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) Within the tables reporting percent changes, these percent changes are not reported if the number of incidents is very small (e.g. lower than 10).

\(^3\) ** indicate statistically significant values (by using basic t-tests and 95% confidence intervals). See the methods manual for more information on this process.
Geographic Concentration of Part I Crime

Overlaid Hot Spot Maps  Figure 1 and Figure 2 display the geographic concentration of violent and property crime and Calls for Service (CFS) in 2015.

In Figure 1, all calls for service are mapped and displayed (with the exception of parking complaints and vehicular crashes). In Figure 2, property crime concentrations (blue hues) and violent concentrations (red hues) are overlaid to display areas with a disproportionately high number of both violent and property crimes. These areas are important for two reasons. (1) These areas and their populaces are at a greater risk for both property crime and violent crime victimization. (2) Because of the overlapping density, a narrowly focused area intervention could address both problems (violent and property crime) with the same amount of resources.

The following, draws from the two maps and details the two overlapping crime areas and their characteristics:

- Figure 1 showed a slightly different picture than all of the following crime analyses:
  - 3652 Reading Road (Entowne Manor) was in the top five locations for calls for service in 2015 with the police being summoned there 249 times.
  - On the Northeast by East edge of Mount Auburn, the intersection of McGregor and Reading Road and its immediately surrounding streets were moderately clustered.
    - This area accounted for the largest concentration of drug-related calls for service, 226 in 2015, or 14.2% of all Uptown’s drug-related CFS.
- Figure 2 shows the Reading Road Hot Spot located near the intersection of Reading Road and Hutchins Avenue in Avondale. This area was identified as a highly concentrated violent crime hot spot and a moderately concentrated property crime hot spot in 2015.4
  - This small area (0.47 square miles) accounted for 12.4% of Uptown’s total Part I crimes (24.4% of violent crime and 10.4% of property crime).
  - Additionally, this area generated 14.8% of Uptown’s total Calls for Service.
  - The majority of crime occurring in this location was concentrated in the two shopping centers on each side of Reading Road.
- Figure 2 also highlights the Vine and McMillan Streets Hot Spot located Northwest of Inwood Park and Southwest of the University of Cincinnati. Violent crime moderately clustered and property crime highly clustered in this area.
  - This small area (0.44 square miles) accounted for 18.2% of Uptown’s total Part I crimes (13.2% of violent crime and 19.1% of property crime).
  - Additionally, this area generated 11.9% of Uptown’s total Calls for Service.
  - The majority of crime, occurring at this location was attributed to the Kroger/Walgreens (1 W Corry Street), which was demolished in October 2015.
    - Since the Kroger/Walgreens demolition and the start of new construction, there were no crimes reported and only one call for service.

---

4 The specifics of each property and violent crime hot spots will be discussed in further detail in their respective sections. Here, only the overlapping characteristics are discussed.
Figure 1. Density of Total Calls for Service in Uptown Neighborhoods, Jan 1 – Dec 31, 2015

Total Calls For Service in Uptown Neighborhoods
Year-To-Date, Jan 1 - Dec 31, 2015
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The crime displayed includes all Calls for Service occurring in 2015, with the exception of parking violations and vehicle accidents. Kernel Density parameters include cell size: 15 ft, search radius: 1000 ft; classification method displays top 50% equal interval categories.
Density of Property and Violent Crime in Uptown Neighborhoods
Year-To-Date, Jan 1 - Dec 31, 2015
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Density of property and violent crime are overlaid to show relative locations. Equal interval classification was used to identify the last three deciles, indicating the top 30% most concentrated areas. Parameters for kernel density include cell size=50 ft, search radius=1000 ft.

Figure 2. Density of Violent and Property Crime in Uptown Neighborhoods.
Micro-Place Concentration  

Table 2 and Table 3 display the number of crimes reported and calls for service at the top 10 hottest Uptown streets and facilities. The streets and addresses listed indicate those locations with the highest number of either crimes reported or calls for service and drive the criminal activity in their immediate surrounding areas.

Using Table 2, two major findings are presented below.

- In 2015, the top ten street segments with the most reported crimes accounted for 14.0% of all Uptown Part I crimes, most of which were property crimes.
  - 2918-3099 Burnet Ave was mainly driven by 3030 Burnet Ave (accounting for 71.4% of Part I crime in this block).

- 3500-3519 and 3521-3548 Reading Rd are adjoining street segments that accounted for 45 and 22 Part I crimes, respectively. Together, these segments drove the “Reading Road Hot Spot” activity. Appendix A-1 shows a map of this area and the street view of the facilities at this street segment.
  - 3500-3519 Reading Rd facilities include: Wireless Plus One, Hook Fish & Chicken, Buddy’s Beauty Outlet, and Family Dollar Plus.
  - 3520-3549 Reading Rd facilities include: Ponciana Apartments, Cricket Wireless, Burger King, Citi Trends, and City Gear.

### Table 2. YTD Hot Streets in Uptown Area, Jan 1 – Dec 31, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Segment</th>
<th>Crimes Reported to CPD</th>
<th>Calls for CPD Service (% of All CFS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Part I Crime</td>
<td>Violent Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2918-3099 BURNET AV</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500-3519 READING RD</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-19 W CORRY ST</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212-299 CALHOUN ST</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3312-3337 CLIFTON AV</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-799 W MLK JR DR</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-231 GOODMAN ST</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3326-3399 BURNET AV</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500-2521 VINE ST</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3520-3549 READING RD</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>691-736 RIDDLE RD</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-210 CALHOUN ST</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Hot streets refer to street segments (also known as street faces, accounting for the area on both sides of a street between each intersection) that have a disproportionately high number of crime reports. Hot facilities refers to specific addresses (an exact address) that has a disproportionately high number of crime reports.

6 We have added supplementary findings drawn from raw data that are not necessarily contained in the tables in this report.
Using Table 3, three findings are highlighted below:

- In 2015, the Corryville Kroger/Walgreens had the most reported Part 1 crimes (41), with a majority of them property crimes (40). After the building was demolished in October, no crimes were reported.
- Gas Station/convenience stores, such as United Dairy Farmers (UDF) and Family Dollar Discount (FDD), had a disproportionately high number of reported crimes. A majority of these crimes were classified as “All Other Crimes”, indicating shoplifting as the main problem.
- In 2015, three of the repeat crime addresses were hospitals (UC Medical Center, Cincinnati Children’s Hospital, and Christ Hospital) and collectively they accounted for 66 Part I offenses. Of these offenses, approximately 87% were crimes occurring at the hospital itself, mainly thefts from waiting lobbies, patient rooms, or employee offices/lockers;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Facility at Address</th>
<th>Reported Crimes to CPD</th>
<th>Calls for CPD Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 W CORRY ST</td>
<td>Kroger/Walgreens</td>
<td>41 1 40</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030 BURNET AVE</td>
<td>United Dairy Farmers</td>
<td>35 2 33</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3325 CLIFTON AVE</td>
<td>United Dairy Farmers</td>
<td>26 0 26</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3504 READING RD</td>
<td>Family Dollar Discount</td>
<td>26 3 23</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234 GOODMAN ST</td>
<td>UC Medical Center</td>
<td>26 3 23</td>
<td>602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707 W MLK DR</td>
<td>Forum Apartments</td>
<td>24 2 12</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3333 BURNET AVE</td>
<td>Cincinnati Children's Hospital</td>
<td>23 6 17</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2139 AUBURN AVE</td>
<td>Christ Hospital</td>
<td>17 1 16</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>688 RIDDLE RD</td>
<td>Mont Michel Apartments</td>
<td>15 0 15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601 MAPLE AVE</td>
<td>Maple Tower Apartments</td>
<td>13 5 8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205 CALHOUN ST</td>
<td>Shell Service Station</td>
<td>12 1 11</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141 W MCMILLAN ST</td>
<td>Stop-N-Go Foods Store</td>
<td>10 0 10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3583 ALASKA AVE</td>
<td>Alaska Ave Apartments</td>
<td>10 3 7</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIOLENT CRIMES

Violent Crime Counts by Crime Type

Table 4 and Table 5 below list the Part I violent crimes reported YTD 2015 compared to YTD 2014 and the 3-year average within the Uptown neighborhoods. The Table 4 highlights the following findings:

- In 2015, Uptown violent crime decreased by 9.9% compared to 2014 and 15.3% compared to the 3-year average.
- The largest reductions were seen in robbery offenses. There are consistent yearly reductions resulting in the amount of robberies being reduced by 26.9% since 2012.
- Despite a small reduction in rape offenses compared to 2014, in 2015, Uptown had an increase of 12.8% in rape offenses compared to the 3-year average. A quarter of these rape offenses were concentrated within a quarter mile radius of the University of Cincinnati.

### Table 4. YTD Violent Crime in the Uptown Area, Jan 1 – Dec 31, 2012-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Name</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Change from 2014</th>
<th>Change from 3-yr average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homicide/Murder</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-6.4%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>-14.8%</td>
<td>-26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agg. Assault</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uptown Violent Total</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>-9.9%</td>
<td>-15.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Violent Crime Counts by Neighborhood

Table 5 below describes violent crime counts for each Uptown neighborhood. Below are the key findings derived from the table:

- With the exception of Mount Auburn and North Avondale, all neighborhoods saw reductions in violent crime in 2015 when compared to 2014.
- Mount Auburn and North Avondale, despite percent increases, only saw increases of four violent crime offenses each when 2015 counts were compared to 2014.
- The largest reduction in violent crime occurred in Clifton with a 38.6% reduction in 2015 compared to 2014 and a 44.1% reduction compared to the 3-year average.

### Table 5. YTD Violent Crime in Uptown Neighborhoods, Jan 1 – Dec 31, 2012-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>% Change from 2014</th>
<th>Change from 3-yr average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avondale</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>-6.1%</td>
<td>-8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-38.6%</td>
<td>-44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corryville</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-23.7%</td>
<td>-23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUF</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-16.9%</td>
<td>-31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Auburn</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Avondale</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Violent Crime</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>-9.9%</td>
<td>-15.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Recall, within the tables reporting percent changes, these percentage changes are not reported if the number of incidents is very small (i.e. lower than 10).
Violent Crime Hot Spots

Figure 3 and Figure 4 show the areas in Uptown that contain a disproportionately high amount of violent crime compared to the rest of the Uptown area. Red depicts high clustering, orange depicts moderate clustering, and green indicates low cluster. Collectively, the colored locations depict the areas containing approximately 33% of Uptown’s total violent crime offenses.

Using Figure 4, several key findings describe the Uptown area’s full geographic distribution of violent crime:

- In 2015, violent crime heavily concentrated in one main area, the Reading Road corridor in Avondale (94 violent crimes). This area is known to and being actively addressed by the Cincinnati Police Department using a variety of interventions.
  - Violent crime is highly clustered, specifically along the shopping centers and an apartment complex at 3500-3530 Reading Road, and moderately clustered at the apartment complexes located at 600-649 Maple Street and 700-799 Ridgeway Avenue.
- In addition, violent crime was moderately clustered along 2200-2400 Vine Street near Inwood Park (16 violent crimes). 8
  - 64.3% of these offenses were robberies.
- Lastly, violent crime (19 violent offenses) was moderately clustered in North Avondale, around the Martin Luther King Jr. Park area, along Reading Road, Fred Shuttlesworth Avenue and Greenwood Street.
  - 68% of these violent criminal offenses were felonious assaults.

Using Figure 5, the Reading Road Hot Spot in 2015 was more closely examined. Below, we have highlighted findings from this analysis:

- In 2015, the Reading Road Hot Spot (94 violent crimes in an approximately .47 square mile area) accounted for 24.4% of Uptown’s Part I violent crime total.
- As discussed above in hot street segments, a large portion of the violent crimes (specifically robberies) clustered in the two shopping centers located at 3500-3530 Reading Road.
  - From CPD incident reports, there are no clear behavioral patterns of street robbery. In some cases, victims are approached from behind by multiple suspects; in others, victims are approached from the front demanding specific goods and injured before suspects fled. With the exception a few cases, most used or threatened force and/or weapon.
  - From CPD incident reports, four of the offenses (in this area) were robberies of local businesses, specifically the Family Dollar Discount and PLS Check Cashing.

---

8 On the all maps, the hot spot location is slightly misleading; the addresses of the crime correspond with Vine St, North of Inwood Park between McMillan and Hollister, not between McMillan and William H Taft.
Figure 3. Violent Crime Hot Spot in Uptown Area, YTD 2015
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Violent crime includes homicide, rape, robbery, and felonious assault. Equal interval classification was used to identify the most concentrated areas. Kernel density parameters include cell size: 15ft, search radius: 1000 ft.
Figure 4. Reading Road Violent Crime Hot Spot in Avondale, YTD 2015

Violent Crime in Avondale/Reading Rd Hot Spot
Year-To-Date, Jan 1 - Dec 31, 2015

Legend
- Street
- Building
- Park

Crime Type
- ▲ Homicide/Murder
- ★ Rape
- ● Robbery
- ▲ Felonious Assault

Map showing hot spot locations along Reading Road in Avondale.
Changes in Violent Crime Compared to 2014

Monthly Violent Crime Trends. Figure 5 presents monthly Part I violent crime counts for YTD 2012-2015. Only one month (June 2015) had significantly more violent crime than the 3-year average (increase of three crimes); six months (January, May, September, October, November, and December) were all significantly lower than the 3-year average. The last four months of the year had record-low counts when compared to the last three years. Most notably, October and December 2015 saw the biggest drop in comparison to 2014 and the 3-year average, despite being consistent peaks in the past three years.

Figure 5. Uptown Monthly Part I Violent Crime Counts, Jan 1 – Dec 31, 2012-2015

Changes in Geographic Distribution Figure 6 depicts how the concentration of violent has changed from 2014 to YTD 2015. As marked in Figure 6, the 2015 Reading Road Hot Spot has slowly moved South down Reading Road since 2014, depicted by a cooling effect near the Reading Road /Lexington Avenue area (four fewer crimes) and a heating effect near Reading Road /Rockdale Avenue area (11 more crimes). In addition, there are less extensive emerging hot spots (not present in 2014) near Hale Avenue and Fred Shuttlesworth Place (nine more violent offenses).

There was a major cooling of violent crime in 2015 North of the Cincinnati Zoo, along Vine Street. In 2014, there were 16 violent crimes, 11 of which were robbery offenses and in 2015, there were only four violent crimes, none of which were robbery offenses. In addition, the area Southwest of the University Cincinnati, which was a moderate robbery hot spot in 2014, saw a reduction in the concentration of violent crime in 2015 compared to 2014 (eight fewer violent crimes).

9 The degree of coloration depicts the intensity of change, whether cooling or heating up. Red hues show increases in the concentration of crime; blue hues show decreases in the concentration of crime. Beige colors depict little/no change, which includes a consistently high, moderate, or low clustering.
Figure 6. Changes in the Concentration of Violent Crime in Uptown Area, 2014 – 2015
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Note: Raster calculator was used to show how the concentration of crime changed from 2014 YTD to 2015 YTD. Blue colors show a decrease in concentration, indicative of a hot spot in 2014, but not in 2015. Red colors show an increase in concentration, indicative of a hot spot in 2015 that was not present in 2014. Beige depicts areas with little change.
PROPERTY CRIME

Property Crime Counts by Crime Type

Table 6 below shows the YTD fluctuations in property crime for the Uptown area from 2015 compared to 2014 and the 3-year average (2012-2014). The table highlights are presented below:

- Overall, property crime decreased by 12.6% in 2015 when compared to 2014 and 16.8% when compared to the 3-year average, with reduction in every crime category except other theft (which remained the same in 2015 and 2014).
- The largest reduction in 2015, when compared to 2014, was seen in a 24.7% reduction in theft from auto offenses and a 22.1% reduction from the three-year average.
- From 2012 - 2014, there were between 760 and 907 burglaries reported in the Uptown area. Burglary was reduced by 26.0% in 2015 compared to the three-year average.

Table 6. YTD Property Crime Counts in Uptown Area, Jan 1 – Dec 31, 2012-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Name</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Change from 2014</th>
<th>Change from 3-yr avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>-16.6%</td>
<td>-26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from Auto</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>-24.7%</td>
<td>-22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>-16.0%</td>
<td>-31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Theft</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Property Crime</td>
<td>3,110</td>
<td>2,736</td>
<td>2,720</td>
<td>2,376</td>
<td>-12.6%</td>
<td>-16.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Property Crime Counts by Neighborhood

Table 7 displays the YTD Part I property crimes reported in the Uptown area, broken down by neighborhood. The table highlights the following:

- In 2015, all Uptown neighborhoods saw reductions in property crime, ranging from 5.5% in Avondale to 25.9% in Clifton, when compared to 2014. In most cases these property crime reductions were even higher when compared to the 3-year average.
- All Uptown neighborhoods saw a double digit reduction in property crime when compared to the 3-year average.
- Reductions in Clifton, from 2015 to 2014, were driven by a drop in theft from auto offenses in the area East of Burnet Woods, along Bishop Street, Jefferson and Ruther Avenues.
- CUF, specifically near the University of Cincinnati, contains the largest portion of property crime, followed by Avondale, which is driven by the moderate clustering near the Reading Road Hot Spot.

Table 7. YTD Property Crime Counts by Neighborhood, Jan 1 – Dec 31, 2012-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Change from 2014</th>
<th>Change from 3-yr avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avondale</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>-5.5%</td>
<td>-18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>-25.9%</td>
<td>-24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corryville</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>-13.1%</td>
<td>-18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUF</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>-10.3%</td>
<td>-10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Auburn</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>-10.9%</td>
<td>-10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Avondale</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>-12.4%</td>
<td>-19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Property Crime</td>
<td>3,110</td>
<td>2,736</td>
<td>2,720</td>
<td>2,376</td>
<td>-12.6%</td>
<td>-16.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Property Crime Hot Spots

Figure 7 and Figure 8 show the areas in Uptown that contain a disproportionately high amount of crime compared to the rest of the Uptown area. Red depicts high clustering, orange depicts moderate clustering, and green indicates a low clustering. Collectively, the cluster locations depict the areas that contained approximately a quarter (24.4%) of Uptown’s total property crime.

Using Figure 7, several key findings were derived and presented below:

- Property crime was concentrated less severely than violent crime in 2015, despite having clear property crime hot spots.
- The hot spot south of the University of Cincinnati (CUF/Corryville/Mt Auburn Hot Spot) accounted for 19.1% of Uptown’s total property crime in an area of 0.44 square miles.
  - Forty of these property offenses occurred at 1 W Corry Street (Kroger/Walgreens), and this location alone, accounted for nearly two percent of Uptown’s total property crime.
  - Other facilities within this crime cluster include: Cincy Steak & Lemonade, Waffle House, Shell Gas Station, Uptown Rentals, Clifton Heights Tavern, American Apparel, and Hughes High School.
- Property crime in 2015 also moderately clustered near the intersection of MLK Drive and Burnet Avenue. Thirty-eight property crimes (1.6%) were reported at 3030 Burnet (United Dairy Farmers) and, to a lesser extent, at 413 MLK Drive (McDonalds).
  - These two addresses accounted for 1.0% of all Calls for Service (328 calls) in the Uptown area.

Figure 8 closely examines the CUF/Corryville/Mt Auburn Hot Spot, an area less than a half square mile that contained nearly 20% of Uptown’s total Part I property crime and 11.9% of its total calls for service.

- In 2015, 1 W Corry St (Kroger/Walgreens) clearly exceeded other addresses in both reported crimes (40) and calls for service (188). However, after the building demolition in October of 2015, Kroger/Walgreens related property crime and calls for service were greatly reduced.
- The 210-249 blocks of Calhoun Street represented a highly disproportionate amount of property crime and calls for service.
  - With the exception of the Shell Gas Station, reported property crime and calls for service were relatively evenly distributed among businesses along these street segments.
- Property crime was also highly concentrated near the west end of Calhoun and McMillan Streets, near Hughes High School and the American Apparel store.
- There was moderate and low crime clustering along the side streets off of McMillan Street, including Rohs, Warner, Schorr, and Chickasaw Streets. This area has remained a consistent property crime concern since 2014.
Figure 7 Property Crime Hot Spot in Uptown Area, YTD 2015
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Property crimes include burglary, auto theft, theft from auto, and all other theft. Equal interval classification was used to identify the last three deciles, indicating the top 30% most concentrated areas. Parameters for kernel density include cell size=50 ft, search radius=500 ft.
Figure 8. Property Crime in CUF/Corryville/Mt Auburn Hot Spot, YTD 2015
Changes in Property Crime Compared to 2014

Monthly Property Crime Trends  Figure 9 displays the monthly property crime counts for 2014, 2015, and the three-year average (2012-2014) and indicates which months were statistically significant reductions from the three-year average. Overall, nine months of 2015 were statistically below the three-year average, meaning the differences were not due to random fluctuation. Property crime tended to pattern the same as in past years, meaning crime peaked in August and September, and reduced in March and June. These trends tend to follow the patterns of the University of Cincinnati school year and its students. It is notable that October 2015 had a historic low compared to 2012, 2013, and 2014, despite being a historically high-crime month.

Figure 9. Uptown Monthly Part I Property Crime Counts, Jan 1 – Dec 31, 2012-2015

Changes in Geographic Distribution  Figure 10 displays the geographic shifts in the concentration of property crime in 2015 from 2014. The lack of bold coloring (both red and blue) indicates there were no major shifts in the location of hot spots. In many areas, especially in the CUF/Corryville/Mt Auburn Hot Spot, there are muted blues neighboring muted reds, which indicates small shifting. For example, there were 16 fewer crimes reported near Hughes High School and American Apparel, but small increases in property crimes near the U-Square businesses and the CVS (totaling 10 more crimes). In addition, there appears to be a small influx of property crime on the west edge of the Uptown area, bordering Clifton and CUF.

Despite the small amount of change overall, there was a major cooling of a 2014 hot spot located east of Burnet Woods along Bishop Street, Jefferson Avenue, and Ruther Avenue. In 2014, this area had approximately 50 property crimes, generally theft from auto offenses. Overall, there were 35 fewer crimes in this area in 2015 than in 2014.
Figure 10. Changes in the Concentration of Property Crime in Uptown Area, 2014 – 2015

Note: Raster calculator was used to show how the concentration of crime changed from 2014 YTD to 2015 YTD. Bluish colors show a decrease in concentration, indicative of a hot spot in 2014, but not in 2015. Red colors show an increase in concentration, indicative of a hot spot in 2015 that was not present in 2014. Beige depicts areas with little change.
UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI CRIME

This section of the report examines the trends of Part I crime within the University of Cincinnati West Campuses, as recorded by the University of Cincinnati Police Department, from January 1 through December 31, 2015. Table 8 displays the crime occurring at the UC Main and Medical Campuses. Table 9 shows summary of the counts by specific UC buildings.\(^{10}\) Tables 8 and 9 highlight the following:

- Overall, there was slight increase in total Part I crime in 2015 (3.2%; nine offenses) compared to 2014 on UC’s campus, but a decrease of 12.1% when compared to the three-year average.
  - Despite changes in the coding of burglary and all other theft offenses\(^{11}\), this increase is being driven by all other thefts.

- There were two additional robberies reported by UCPD, only one of which occurred on UC’s campus.

- Tangeman University Center (TUC), as the ‘core’ of UC’s campus, houses the bookstore, a small restaurant/pub, food court, a various classrooms/lecture halls, had 25 reported thefts (9.8% of all other theft offenses at UC).

- Stratford Heights, an off-campus housing option, accounted for largest number of theft from auto offenses, eight incidents, on UC’s campus; the Calhoun Hall garage (connected to Gettler Stadium) had five reported thefts from auto.

\(^{10}\) This table was derived from the UC Annual Crime Report, 2015, authored by Gabby Isaza.

\(^{11}\) Following FBI recommendations about how burglaries and thefts should be classified, incidents were only classified as a burglary if there was evidence of unlawful entry. If not, the incident defaulted to “theft.”
Table 8. YTD Part I Crime Counts Reported to the UCPD, Jan 1 – Dec 31, 2012-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Name</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Change from 2014</th>
<th>Change from 3-yr avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent Offenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide/Murder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agg. Assault</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Offenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-84.2%</td>
<td>-82.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from Auto</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-37.1%</td>
<td>-47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Theft</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Total</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>-12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part I Total</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>-12.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. YTD Hot UC Facilities Reported to UCPD, Jan 1 – Dec 31, 2012-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Theft from Auto</th>
<th>Auto Theft</th>
<th>All Other Theft</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TUC</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Science Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Rec Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford Heights</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calhoun Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniels Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAA - Addition</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dabney Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gettler Stadium</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linder Hall</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stratford Heights and Calhoun Hall counts also account for incidents occurring in their parking facilities**
Figure 11 Geographic Distribution of Part I Crime at the University of Cincinnati, Jan 1 – Dec 31, 2015
SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

After reviewing the findings of this report, ICS has outlined several best practices in criminal justice that have been theoretically and empirically supported to positively impact the type of issues faced by the Uptown area. These views are solely those of the authors of this report and are derived from current criminal justice literature. They are designed to assist ongoing law enforcement action, as each district is currently combatting issues in their respective neighborhoods. With the exception of a few articles, all other cited references are publicly available; links are provided in the Reference Section. Other problem-specific guides can be found at: http://www.popcenter.org/problems/.

We also recommend any new Uptown area crime prevention strategies (such as DDACTS in D4) be communicated to both the Uptown Public Safety Subcommittee and our ICS team. This will permit ICS to better understand the impact of the strategy and allow for both a pre and post intervention comparison of the intervention strategy and an assessment of its effectiveness.

Recommendation 1: Support Third Party Policing

What is Third Party Policing and how does it work?

Third Party Policing is a crime prevention strategy that attempts to persuade, and in some cases coerce, non-offending persons in order to reduce criminal opportunities in the facilities they control (Buerger and Mazerolle, 1998). The end goal of this technique is to eliminate criminal opportunities, typically at a specific place, by compelling a place manager, owner, or responsible party to make crime preventive changes. This approach shifts the burden of place-related crime prevention from the state (specifically law enforcement) to individual problem property/business owners. These properties are not “typical” businesses or properties. They are often operating below accepted standards and regularly violate both ordinances and regulatory codes, and are characteristically unresponsive to improvement requests or recommendations from law enforcement. The changes required are usually not expansive or expensive. The improvement requests merely require changing management practices or simple design elements, or enforcing existing rules and standard codes of conduct. Doing so would create a safer environment for their employees and patrons, and the surrounding community.

The “coercive tool” that puts pressure on these problem business/property owners is typically the threat of civil (and sometimes criminal) penalty, which can include: monetary fines, license revocation, and ultimately court ordered property seizures. For example, let’s say law enforcement was called to convenience store\(^\text{12}\) for a large number of shoplifting offenses, which were deemed the result of poor management/clerical practices, self-checkout counters, or easily accessed goods. Although shoplifting is seen as a minor theft, it consumes a large portion of police time and effort for very little payoff and can be seen as a “gateway” for other crimes (Clarke, 2012). In some cases, retailers avoid changing practices and rely solely on security or law enforcement to handle problems after the fact, rather than try to prevent them from occurring in the first place. Law enforcement could attempt to compel compliance by threatening to revoke liquor licenses (if the premise had a liquor store) or by enforcing other violations resulting in

\(^{12}\) For clarification, we are not implying any specific convenience or grocery store, we are simply using this as an example to better understand how this process works.
fines. This legal process is most successful when combined with a strong police partnership, which can include: cooperative consultation, regular stakeholder meetings and/or premise inspections, and crime prevention suggestions (Mazerolle and Ransley, 2008).

What can Uptown do and why does it matter?

Current policing scholars argue this activity is most successful when led by law enforcement, but local community businesses and residents can greatly support the overall efforts. Third-party policing, although an emerging doctrine, is still rather new to policing, thus providing uncertain political reception (Mazerolle and Ransley, 2008; and see Buerger, 1998 for a description of the politics behind this strategy). Because of this political uncertainty, it is essential to create a compelling picture of the extent of the problems these few properties are creating. The team needs to clearly display that these properties are operating far below acceptable standards, and not only are the negative conditions impacting their own business, but also the safety of others in the area. Surrounding business and community organizations, such as Uptown or the Short Vine Street Business Alliance, can strengthen the case by explaining to the prosecutor and/or court how this business is adversely impacting their own properties and the patrons/constituents they represent. A case is more likely to be well received if it appears to be an issue of concern to multiple community stakeholders, especially those outside of the police. This support, which can include attendance at civil court cases or writing a support letter to the local judge or prosecutor describing the adverse impact of the facility is most valuable in portraying the true extent of the problem.

Recommendation 2: Publicize Statistics

Why should statistics be disseminated?

There are two major reasons we argue that statistics can increase the Uptown Consortium’s reach and effectiveness. First, it can address the negative perceptions of crime in the Uptown area. Individuals’ perceptions of safety can influence their residential and business choices as much as the actual safety of an area, even when the two are inconsistent (Cordner, 2010). The Uptown area has seen sizable decreases in crime in 2015 when compared to the last three years, largely due to efforts by the Consortium and its members, the Cincinnati Police Department and the University of Cincinnati. However, these statistics and efforts are not largely known to the general public. Publishing statistics can begin changing negative perceptions of areas, such as Corryville, while bringing more patrons to existing businesses and attracting new area development and residents.

Second, by publicizing their positive crime statistics Uptown can communicate to other area businesses and residents/patrons exactly what the Uptown Consortium is, the work it does and that daily safety is something the Consortium takes very seriously. This may entice other area business organizations to join, assist, or share information with the Consortium and attract notice at City Hall of the successful private/public partnership that is working daily to improve the quality of life in the Uptown area.

How can reports be disseminated?

One the easiest methods of disseminating the impact of the Consortium is to update the Public Safety Subcommittee webpage to include reports, simple statistics, or successes by the
committee. Additional patrols or business changes can be communicated. In addition, the Consortium can utilize other social media platforms to extend its communication reaches. ICS can present the information to the Uptown Consortium Executive Board at one of their meetings to educate them on the success of the Public Safety Subcommittee in the past 3 years. Uptown should also explore the possibility of using traditional media, both print and television, to publicize the success of the past 3 years with an emphasis on how a non-conventional private/public partnership improved the quality of life in an area.

**Recommendation 3: Keep Kroger/Walgreens Safe**

*Why is it important to keep Kroger clean?*

The building design and management practices of the new Kroger and Walgreen’s being built at 1 W Corry Street are outside of the Consortium’s reach. It’s important, however, to help keep the surrounding area safe and clean from disorder, and provide assistance to the management when necessary. Some environmental theorists believe disorder or disorganized areas (areas with few informal norms, and/or large levels of deviant behavior or minor offenses) can attract more offenders because of the known criminal opportunities. Eventually, crime becomes tolerated, expected, and eventually the norm, which sounds similar to the previous Kroger area. Although some subtheories (such as Broken Windows Theory) are somewhat controversial, others provide strategies to increase informal social control and the effectiveness of community crime prevention.

*What can the Consortium do?*

The first option for Consortium is to communicate with Kroger owners that they are here to help in any way possible; this could be helping with marketing or informally changing the norms around Kroger. In addition, the Consortium and its members can communicate with business and property owners about Keep Cincinnati Beautiful and encourage them to report any graffiti type vandalism so it can be swiftly removed. Local businesses can report suspicious behavior crimes around the area, and the Consortium can monitor the crime in area to determine solutions for any specific issues that arise. We cannot predict what will happen when Kroger is reopened, but we can continue to improve the surrounding areas to reduce the possibility it again becomes the hot facility it was the past several years.

**Recommendation 4: Address Hospital Theft**

*What is the extent of theft at hospitals?*

Despite our prior beliefs, only five property crimes reported at hospital occurred in other locations, meaning these hot spots of crimes are not simply due to reporting practices. Closer examinations of the incident reports, revealed that the remaining 90% of property crimes occurred within the hospitals themselves, which included theft from auto offenses (five incidents), shoplifting (five incidents), theft from waiting area lobbies, patient rooms and employee offices (34 incidents), and employee lockers (7 incidents). This problem is somewhat unique because few scholars have examined theft from hospitals. However, its characteristics appears similar to theft of café/bar patrons’ personal property, and theft issues the University of Cincinnati faced in their Recreation Center (Johnson et al, 2010). Patrons are often unaware of
the risks, thus less likely to take precautions, in addition to being distracted by surroundings. Furthermore, there is a high turnover of patrons coming and going, meaning there is relatively high degrees of anonymity for potential thieves.

**How can hospitals control patron behavior?**

To change the structure of criminal opportunity, one or more of the following characteristics need to be altered. First, the number of potential thieves or the number of unguarded targets (unattended cell phones, bags, etc) needs to be reduced. Because hospitals cannot screen “potential” offenders, they can change either the actual number of unguarded targets (attempting to modify the victim behavior that can contribute to victimization) or create the perception that targets are being guarded (perhaps by surveillance cameras, security, or employees). Hospitals can raise awareness of the risk and importance of watching belongings, while promoting personal security measures (Johnson et al, 2010). They can also increase general guardianship, in hopes that offenders will perceive increased risk of theft. Hospitals can encourage staff to keep an eye out for suspicious behavior, use CCTVs more consistently, or increase the visibility of patrolling security personnel.

Unlike cafe/bar patrons, crime prevention techniques for these types of facilities are more complicated because the patron turnover is high, employees are busy, and the buildings are busy (in some cases, hectic). This makes changing victim behavior and surveillance difficult using methods above. The University of Cincinnati responded to their theft problem by adding lockers with electronic keypads around the sports courts (similar to those in the picture below). Unlike traditional lockers, patrons do not need to bring their own locks, they are fairly simple to use, and can be easily unlocked with a master code (if the patron forgets their combination). Essentially, they optimize accessibility and ease, making them more likely to be used. These lockers could be placed in either the waiting room or within each patient room, allowing patients or visitors to lock bags, electronics, and clothes while receiving care, leaving the room for tests, or simply visiting with other patients. These could also be used in employee work rooms, although it seems that the Uptown hospitals currently have lockers available.13

**Figure 12. Example of Electronic Access Lockers.**

13 An evaluation of the layout, access, and design of the employee locker rooms is needed to more accurately identify criminogenic factors relating to theft in work rooms.
Recommendation 5: Monitor McGregor Avenue Drug-Related Hot Spot

Why is this area such an issue?

The McGregor Avenue Hot Spot, although likely known to law enforcement, is a new issue presented to the Consortium. The area did not have a large number of Part I crimes reported in 2015, thus it is a relatively confined issue.

Typically what occurs within a drug hot spot, specifically open-air drug markets, is that drug markets bring violence and/or property crime related to its sales, more so than its actual drug usage (Harocopos and Hough, 2011). For example, in 2002 an open-air drug market was identified along the 3500 block of Burnet Avenue. Not only were the drug dealers highly territorial, resulting in increased violence when territory disputes arose, but it was a common drug use area, which also increased property crime within the area (Madensen et al, 2005). This pattern was not unique to the Burnet Avenue drug market, but seen in other drug hot spots in Cincinnati and other urban areas (Harocopos and Hough, 2011).

What can Uptown Consortium do?

It is important to remember that violent and property crime did not highly concentrate in this area in 2015 and due to the sheer number of area calls for service, this location is likely already known to officers of District 4. ICS recommends that no formal actions be undertaken by the committee at this time. However, the McGregor Avenue hot spot area is deserving of increased law enforcement attention because of its potential impact on both violent and property crime.
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Appendix A-1. YTD Distribution of Hot Street Segments in Reading Road Hot Spot, 2015

*Distribution of Hot Street Segments in Reading Road Hot Spot*
*Year-To-Date, Jan 1 - Dec 31, 2015*

Legend

- Part I Crime Count
  - 1 - 3
  - 4 - 5
  - 6 - 10
  - 11 - 21
  - 22+ (Hot Street)

Note: Part I crimes have been attributed to the street segment (both sides of the street between intersections). Colored lines display the number of total Part I crimes at each segment; classifications reflect natural breaks in the data.
Appendix B-1. YTD Geographic Concentration of Drug-Related Calls for Service, 2015

Distribution of Drug-Related Calls For Service in Uptown Neighborhoods
Year-To-Date, Jan 1 - Dec 31, 2015
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The crime displayed includes all Calls for Service occurring in 2015, coded as DRUG or DRUGR. Kernel Density parameters include cell size: 15 ft, search radius: 1000 ft; classification method displays top 50% equal interval categories.
Appendix B-2. YTD Distribution of Hot Streets in McGregor Drug Hot Spot, 2015

**Distribution of Drug-Related Calls For Service in McGregor Hot Spot**
**Year-To-Date, Jan 1 - Dec 31, 2015**

Legend

- **Drug-Related CFS Count**
  - 1 - 3
  - 4 - 9
  - 10 - 22
  - 23 - 49
  - 50 - 97

Note: Drug-related calls for service have been attributed to the nearest street segment (both sides of the street between two intersections). The crime displayed includes all Calls for Service occurring in 2015, coded as DRUG or DRUGR.