

Form LEAA-OLEP-159
(edition 6-1-70)



LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE
ADMINISTRATION
OFFICE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT
PROGRAMS

NCJRS

DISCRETIONARY GRANT
PROGRESS REPORT

1. Grantee: California Council on Criminal Justice	4. Grant No. 7496 5. Date of Report: <input type="checkbox"/> April 1 <input type="checkbox"/> October 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
2. Implementing Subgrantee: (CA) - Richmond Police Department	6. Grant Amt. \$150,000 7. Character of Report: <input type="checkbox"/> Interim <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Final
3. Title or Character of Project: Final Report	8. Covering Period: 23 August 1970 to 23 August 1971

To: Cognizant Regional Office
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

State Planning Agency, State of California

*Reviewed
8/1/72
TD*

Submitted herewith is the grantee's progress report for the period shown above:

RECEIVED
AUG 11 11 28 AM '72
SAN FRANCISCO REGION
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Lourn G. Phelps
Project Director (signature)

LOURN G. PHELPS, CHIEF OF POLICE
(Typed Name and Title)

[Commence report below and add continuation pages as required.]

ABSTRACT:

Richmond's Police Helicopter Program was started August 24, 1970, with a grant from LEAA. The program became operational 6 months later and operates out of the Patrol Division. The several goals of the program all centered about crime reduction. There is strong anecdotal evidence (documented by offense reports and citizen letters) that the program is meeting most of its goals. A questionnaire distributed to sworn officers in Richmond found them to be highly favorable toward the program and to endorse its continuation. The number of complaints concerning the helicopters has been low, and all but three of these have concerned noise level. Part I Crime Statistics were inconclusive in showing program results, although statistics were only available for a 6 month period. The ratio of apprehension and arrest to total felony assignments has been for better than that obtainable with patrol cars. The program was brought to the operational stage quickly and efficiently and the federal funds received have been used almost exclusively for aircraft purchase and for maintenance, fuel and oil.

Instructions Appear on Reverse Side

35594

INTRODUCTION

The City of Richmond is an incorporated city, with a City Manager-Council type government. The city encompasses an area of 54 square miles. Parts of the city are divided by the incorporated city of San Pablo to the north as well as the unincorporated area of Contra Costa County. At the west end of the city of Richmond is the San Francisco Bay. The city limit extends for a distance of 1 mile into the bay.

On the city's north boundary is the incorporated City of San Pablo. On the south, and partial south and east boundary is the incorporated City of El Cerrito, sharing the east boundary with El Cerrito is the unincorporated area of Contra Costa County. Also on the east boundary of the city is a very large portion of land which is a hilly, semi-wilderness, area. The greater portion of this land is a park with title invested in the East Bay Regional Parks.

The population of the City of Richmond, according to the 1970 census is 79,000. Of this 79,000 approximately one-third, or 26,333 constitutes various ethnic groups, primarily Black. The statistics on the age groups of the total population follow:

<u>AGE GROUP</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>
Total Under 6	11.0
Total Under 18	34.2
Total Under 21	39.2
Total 16 and over	69.4
Total 65 and over	7.7

The median age of the total population is 27.6 years. The population of the neighboring City of San Pablo is 21,500 and El Cerrito is 25,000.

There is an urgent need to reduce the crime rate in the City of Richmond. Richmond ranked eighth in the nation in the crime rate, and fourth in the nation in cities with a population of under 100,000, according to the 1970 Uniform Crime Report published by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The Richmond Police Department has an authorized manpower structure of 159 sworn personnel. At the present time there are 159 sworn personnel and 47 nonsworn personnel. The sworn personnel are assigned to the Divisions as follows:

Uniform Division	94
Criminal Investigation Division	26
Inspectional Services Division	10
Administration Division	5
Records & Service Division	<u>24</u>
TOTAL	159

The Uniform Division is operating under a new concept put into effect by the former Chief of Police, Robert B. Murphy. Under this plan, the organization for patrol is divided into eight (8) teams. Team number one works from 7:00 AM until 3:00 PM; team number two works from 11:00 AM to 7:00 PM; team number three is on from 3:00 PM to 11:00 PM; team number four's work hours are from 7:00 PM to 3:00 AM, and team number five works from 11:00 PM to 7:00 AM. The remaining teams serve as relief teams for days off and training time.

The City is divided into two areas, with one team assigned to each area. Each area has eight (8) patrol areas. Under the team system, the Department is able to deploy maximum manpower during the peak hours of crime, and thereby making full use of its sworn personnel.

THE RICHMOND HELICOPTER PROGRAM

On August 24, 1970, the United States Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) approved a discretionary grant in the amount of \$150,000 for the Richmond Police Department's Helicopter Program. The City of Richmond's contribution to this program was \$100,954 in cash and "in-kind" services.

In September of 1970, four (4) police officers were selected to be trained as helicopter pilots. Six (6) additional police

officers were selected as observers. The total cost of training for these ten (10) officers was \$16,132.00, excluding salaries paid during the training period. When the four (4) police officer-pilots completed the training, they received commercial helicopter licenses from the Federal Aviation Administration. One of the above police officer-pilots was dropped from the program in April of 1971, due to medical reasons. In June, 1971, a police officer was selected for pilot training as a replacement. This officer was sent to the IACP Public Safety Aviation Institute in Huntsville, Alabama for training. This officer is currently flying routine patrol missions over the City.

During November, 1970, two (2) new Hughes 300C police equipped helicopters were purchased from the Hughes Tool Company, Aircraft Division, at Long Beach, California. The total cost of the two (2) aircrafts, including all necessary equipment was \$93,997.00. After a good deal of research into the various models and makes of helicopters available, it was decided that the Hughes 300C was the preferred helicopter for this Department's particular use. The factors that were considered were: Aircraft safety, economy, depreciation value, and availability of maintenance and service.

Maintenance on the helicopters is being performed under a maintenance contract. All maintenance costs are covered under this contract, with the exception of damage caused by pilot error or vandalism. The cost of the contract is \$22.95 per hour of helicopter flight. Total operating cost per flight hour is \$28.50, which includes in addition to maintenance, gas and oil.

The police helicopter is assigned to the Uniform Division. A Sergeant is in charge of the program. The helicopter flies two shifts a day, the first shift starts at 12:00 PM and ends at 8:00 PM. The second shift starts at 8:00 PM and finishes at 3:00 AM. The flight schedule was established to allow maximum flexibility during the hours of the peak crime rate. Between four and five hours per shift are spent in the air. With the remaining three hours devoted to pre and post-flight checks, refueling, meal breaks, report writing and administrative maintenance.

GOALS

In the original Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) grant application, this Department put forth its goals in a seven part format, for the reduction of the incidents of crime:

1. Reduce police response time to a crime in progress call.
2. Make escape from established observation very difficult.
3. Make pursuit of fleeing suspects extremely effective.
4. Increase the area of effective patrol.
5. Facilitate effective police surveillance.
6. Improve ground police officer assistance and security, and
7. Make possible police security patrol of roof tops, backyards, schools and business plazas, fenced-in industrial areas and the more remote open and water-shed areas.

RESULTS

Although the helicopter patrol program has been in operation since March 7, 1971, very satisfactory results have been noted in establishing the goals of the seven part format:

1. The reduction of police response time to a crime in progress call: Reports number 71-5045, April 5, 1971, 487 P.C. Grand Theft, from person (purse snatch). At 2:00 PM, the helicopter was detailed to the area where a "purse snatch" had just occurred. The helicopter was in the area while the ground units were still enroute to the scene. Two suspects were observed that matched the description of the suspects. The ground units were informed by the helicopter unit that the suspects were fleeing through the backyards of the homes in the area. The ground units were deployed around the area, and the suspects were subsequently arrested. The average response time of the helicopter to any part of the city is one minute or less.
2. Make escape from established observation very difficult: Report number 71-5870, April 20, 1971, Burglary (459 PC). At 1:02 PM the helicopter unit was given a description of two suspects that had just committed a residential burglary. The helicopter proceeded to the area and observed the two suspects hiding in a backyard near the scene of the crime. The helicopter was able to direct the ground units to the suspects' location where both suspects were arrested.

3. Make pursuit of fleeing suspects extremely effective:
Arrest Report number A71-2162, April 24, 1971, 23102 CVC (Reckless driving). At 7:15 PM, 24 April 1971, the helicopter unit was informed that a ground unit was attempting to catch a suspect in a fleeing vehicle. The helicopter located the fleeing vehicle and began a surveillance. The suspect vehicle proceeded at a very high rate of speed through San Pablo, California, back into Richmond, and then into the unincorporated area of Contra Costa County. At this time, the ground unit that was pursuing the suspect vehicle was forced to abandon the pursuit due to mechanical problems. The helicopter continued the surveillance of the suspect vehicle for approximately five miles, and directed the ground units to the location, where the suspect was placed under arrest.
4. Increase the area of effective patrol: With the use of the police helicopter, there is not an area in Richmond that does not receive police patrol during the hours of helicopter operation. Before the helicopter was put into operation, there were areas within the City that received no police patrol. This was mainly due to the tremendous workload of the patrol officer, responding to details and taking reports.
5. Facilitate effective police surveillance: On March 8, 1971, during a function which was taking place in the Civic Center Auditorium, a very hostile crowd formed in front of the

Auditorium, when the members of the crowd failed to get admission tickets. Every available ground unit responded to this area, and the police helicopter was sent into the area. From the helicopter, the ground units were able to be informed of people trying to break in the various locked doors of the Auditorium, the size of the crowd, and their movements, thereby enabling the command officers to deploy the available manpower to the best advantage.

6. Improve ground police officer assistance and security:

Several incidents have occurred since the helicopter has been put into use; whereby the members of the helicopter crew have been able to obtain help for an officer, while the officer was attempting to make an arrest, and was not in a position to get to the police radio.

Reports 71-4838 through 71-4841, April 1, 1971, Grand Theft, Burglary, possession of marijuana, and sales of marijuana, can be used to demonstrate the helicopter's psychological effect on the criminal element. On April 1, 1971, a detective sergeant and a detective were pursuing a suspect in a vehicle at a high rate of speed through the City. The detectives lost sight of the vehicle, and the helicopter unit directed the detectives to the vehicle, and the suspect. The suspect was placed under arrest on the above charges. When the suspect was being interrogated by the detective sergeant, the suspect

stated to the sergeant that when he got out of jail, he would never return to Richmond, because of the police helicopter.

7. Make police security patrol of roof tops, backyards, schools, business plazas, fenced-in industrial areas and remote maintenance and water areas possible: The police helicopter has been shown to be of great value in the field of ecology. Since the police helicopter has been put into service, the garbage dumping in the remote areas have decreased. The helicopter crew is able to observe the suspect dumping the garbage and direct the patrol units to the suspect.

The helicopter has shown its value in the discovery and arrest of suspect cultivating marijuana.

Report number 71-6450, May 2, 1971, possession of marijuana (11530 H&S), in the Wildcat Canyon area of Richmond, a hilly park, several suspects were cultivating marijuana. The marijuana crop was observed from the helicopter, and the area was watched for several days, until two suspects came to care for the plants. The helicopter alerted the ground units and the arrest was made, and the plants taken as evidence.

Although rescue work was not included in the goals of this program, the helicopter made a rather dramatic rescue on

June 19, 1971, report number 71-9132: At 4:00 PM a call was received that a sailboat with one occupant had overturned in the Bay near the coastline of the City of Richmond. The helicopter was dispatched to that location. The helicopter crew located the capsized boat and observed a white male, later identified as Bruce Young, hanging onto the boat. The United States Coast Guard advised the Richmond Police Department that their helicopter was involved in another rescue mission, and would be unable to respond. A rope was obtained by the helicopter crew and Young was told, via the public address system, to tie the rope around his waist. Mr. Young was then towed approximately 800 yards to the shore. After Mr. Young was on shore, the helicopter was landed and Mr. Young made the following statement: "You Cops are all right"!!

Clearly, no program will be successful if it lacks the support of the members of the organization running the program. In order to assess the level of acceptance of the helicopter among the sworn personnel of the Richmond Police Department, a questionnaire was developed and administered after three months of program operation. The results of the questionnaire are listed below:

1. The helicopters have reduced our burglary rate:

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree
<u>15</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>

2. The helicopters have reduced our robbery rate:

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree
<u>17</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>

3. The helicopters have reduced our auto thefts:

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree
<u>17</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>8</u>

4. The helicopters have reduced our vandalisms:

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree
<u>17</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>

5. There is less crime because of the helicopters:

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree
<u>30</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>

6. The helicopter is an aid in the apprehensions of fleeing suspects:

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree
<u>98</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

7. Most citizens of Richmond feel safer because of the helicopter:

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

8. The helicopter contributes to your safety on the ground:

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree
<u>71</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>

9. The general citizen reaction to the helicopter is positive:

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree
<u>24</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>

10. The helicopter program should be continued:

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree
<u>97</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>

The acceptance of the helicopter program appears to be favorable. The results of questions 1, 2, 3, and 4, probably reflect general optimism about the effects of the helicopters on the crime rate, and also the uncertainty of the men with regard to very specific effects. This uncertainty is likely due to the short duration of the project and the difficulty of relating any broad program to fluctuations in, say, vandalism rates. This interpretation gains support from the question 5 tabulations, which show that 80 men (of 120) think that the helicopters have decreased crime (31 don't know, 9 disagree), while on a single offense like auto thefts, only 61 of the men feel the rate has been decreased by this program.

The sworn officers were even more positive about the effectiveness of the program in other areas. For example, 98 of the 120 respondents "strongly agreed" that the helicopters help in apprehending fleeing suspects, and no officers expressed disagreement. Further, 106 of the men strongly or moderately agreed that the helicopters contribute to their safety. Finally, the men overwhelmingly support the continuation of this program.

The Inspectional Services Division of the Department has taken forty-two formal complaints against the helicopter and its crew members since March 28, 1971. Of the forty-two complaints received, thirty-eight were complaining of the noise level of the helicopter, and two of the forty-two were also dissatisfied with the helicopter

for lighting up their backyards with the spotlight. One complaint was taken from a local resident who stated that the police helicopter had an adverse effect on his television reception. One complaint involved a resident objecting to the helicopter flying over his house while his wife and daughter were sunbathing in the backyard. A petition bearing 251 signatures was received by this Department from the members of a house development in this City. The petition requested: "that the police helicopter should make more flights over the village and to use their light overhead at night". This petition had eight negative opinions on it.

A result of the follow-up investigation by the Inspectional Services Division, thirty-nine of the forty-two complaints were resolved, in a most satisfactory manner, once the reason for the helicopter being in the area was explained. The remainder of the complaints taken by telephone have been resolved by explaining why the helicopter was in the area. If the person that makes the complaint is not entirely satisfied, a formal complaint is taken. It should be noted that the total number of formal complaints received (42) is very low for a program of this type. Also, thirty-eight of the complaints involved noise and it is very likely that some of these complaints were actually about helicopters not belonging to the Richmond Police Department. Several radio station "traffic report" helicopters and two Navy helicopters fly over Richmond daily. Almost all of these aircrafts are much louder than the Hughes 300C's used by the Richmond Police Department (its low noise level was a major factor in the decision to purchase it). Unfortunately, citizens tend to assume that any helicopter over

the city must belong to the police. A total of eight formal complaints have been filed since the last evaluation was submitted on May 23, 1971. With all of the above taken into consideration, it is anticipated that occasional noise complaints will continue to be filed.

Upon approval of the grant, this department embarked on a community orientation program. This program included talks given at public service organizations, civic groups, neighborhood council meetings, and articles published in the local newspaper. The helicopter was available for display purposes upon request of any group or agency. The members of the Human Relations Commission, as well as one member of the grand jury, were given orientation rides.

Information is available upon request to individuals who are interested or dissatisfied with the police helicopter. It appears that this type of orientation program is an asset to community acceptance of the helicopter program.

SAMPLE CITIZEN LETTERS ABOUT PROGRAM

Included for review is a random sample of some of the letters of appreciation that have been received by the City Council, the City Manager, and the Police Department:

"Mary Cartner
614-43rd. St.
Richmond, Calif.

Chief of Police
Robert Murphy
Richmond Police Department

Dear Sir:

I would like to commend the entire police department on their fast and efficient action.

The other night I had my first encounter with a very frightening event. Upon entering home with my boyfriend, I thought somebody was in my home. My parents were gone and there were a number of things out of place. So we went to the neighbors and called the police. It was the first time that I ever needed the help of the police. It was really quite an experience. I might add that my family and I were very impressed. Within, what seemed like seconds, after I called the police, the police helicopter was already above my home. Then right away there were patrol cars all over. I never thought it would be possible to get here so fast. The helicopter was something I had never seen before, and I believe that it was very effective. I hope that it will be around for a long time helping more people like myself. It was also the first time I have seen the police dogs at work. You certainly have them well-trained. But most of all, I would like to thank the officers for their efficiency and their consideration at a time when we really needed them.

I only wish more people could realize how lucky they are to have such an excellent police department as we have. I guess it takes an experience like mine to fully understand.

Thank you again.

Sincerely,

Mary Cartner
Richmond Resident."

"6041 Park Avenue
Richmond, California
94805

April 30, 1971

Richmond City Council,
City Hall,
Richmond, California

Gentlemen:

Both my wife and myself wish to go on record in that we are so very pleased in the positive results obtained since the Richmond Police Helicopter has been in service.

Prior to this machine being put in service, we had been plagued with motorcycles and all sorts of undesirables causing all kinds of problems in our area, this is practically non-existent now and only due to the thorough patrolling being performed by these pilots.

All of our neighbors are in accord with us and urge you to keep this very much needed service in operation.

Very truly yours,

Donald McFadden."

"Richmond Police Department
City Hall
Richmond, California

May 20, 1971

Gentlemen:

During the course of a conversation with your Sergeant Lewis today, he inquired (since I told him I lived in Richmond) as to what I thought of the "whirly bird." Evidently many complaints have been forthcoming since the advent of same but you can rest assured, as far as I am concerned, that whirly bird and many more like them can fly over our home in Crescent Park any night of the week. We have had two attempted burglaries on our home and have since been keeping the front and back lights burning all night. I am sure that at least leaving the lights on also helps our "bird men" to see what is going on.

I have read of numerous attempts on people that have been foiled because of the close cooperation between the helicopter personnel and the patrol car, and it's just too bad that they don't put these articles in a more "prominent" place in the Richmond Independent

and in larger type. I am sure it would bring home to the Richmond populace just how much we need these "in-the-air" and "on-the-ground" personnel.

As for these people who have so little to do but to complain about our new "sound of protection" - they must have no one that they care about or nothing material that they value or that motor overhead should be the "sweetest music to their ears!"

KEEP 'EM FLYING! ! !

Sincerely,

Peggy A. Oviatt
4905 Hartnett Avenue
Richmond, California
94804."

"As a citizen of the City of Richmond, I wish to express my appreciation for the Helicopter Service.

The Federal Government is to be thanked for its generous grant, and I will be most willing to maintain my share of the expense of operation.

Very few reasons for raising our taxes are anywhere near as worthwhile or as beneficial to all of us.

Consider the noise a comfort rather than an aggravation. Consider the patrolling friendly rather than an infringement of our privacy.

Expect our City Council to be more concerned with our welfare rather than of petty complaints.

Sincerely,

June E. Lee."

"May 1, 1971

Mr. Ken Smith, City Manager
City Hall
Civic Center
Richmond, California 94804

Dear Mr. Smith:

Recently I had the misfortune to be attacked, my life threatened and my purse stolen by a member of the black race on a well lighted downtown street. I had just left a meeting being held at the Richmond Veterans Memorial Hall. Upon reaching my car a young man in his early twenties grabbed me from the rear around my neck. He threatened to kill me if I didn't stop screaming. He dragged me by my hair to the side of a small building where it was dark. Picking up a rock he again said he was going to kill me. At the precise moment that "guardian angel in the sky", the Richmond Police Helicopter flew over and hovered just above us. My attacker, looking up and seeing the helicopter, dropped the rock and fled picking up my purse as he ran.

I shall be eternally grateful to the Police Helicopter and the officers that operate it for saving my life. I know if it had not been for them I would not be alive today.

There has been talk that the City of Richmond does not need the helicopter and we cannot afford it. If that helicopter saves just one life it has more for itself and in my case it did.

I must appeal to you to do everything in your power to keep the helicopter. To many citizens, as well as myself, it is such a comforting sound at night that "angel of the sky" flying around. In my mind, any peace-loving citizen would not want it removed.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. Billie Green
A Taxpayer

cc: Chief of Police L. Phelps."

PART I CRIME STATISTICS

The Part I Crime Statistics for the three months period of March through May for the years of 1969, 1970 and 1971, and the three months period of June through August, 1969, 1970, and 1971, are presented for review in Schedule A.

SCHEDULE A-1

	March - May 1969	June - August 1969	% Increase or (Decrease)	March - May 1970	June - August 1970	% Increase or (Decrease)	March - May 1971	June - August 1971	% Increase or (Decrease)
ROBBERY	93	71	(23.7%)	66	76	15.2%	79	73	(7.6%)
BURGLARY	692	598	(13.6%)	600	613	2.2%	722	682	(5.7%)
THEFT (OVER \$50)	334	384	14.9%	347	282	(19.0%)	378	334	(11.7%)
AUTO THEFT	284	218	(23.2%)	210	244	16.2%	204	189	(7.4%)

The Part I Crime Statistics comparing the first six (6) months of program operation with the same months for years 1969 and 1970 cannot be used as a guideline for the complete evaluation of the helicopter program. An examination of the six month statistics for the years of 1969, 1970, and 1971 shows the very large degree of variation from month to month, year to year, and offense to offense. To further evaluate the statistics submitted, the crimes of robbery, burglary, theft of over \$50.00 in value, and auto theft have been further compared on Schedule A-1. The comparison shows a percentage decrease in all four of the above categories for the three month period. The comparison also shows the variability of the crimes committed for the three month period covering the three years. From the comparison the following conclusions can be reached:

1. In 1969, the crimes of robbery, burglary and auto theft showed a percentage drop. The crime of theft showed an increase.
2. In 1970, the crimes of robbery, burglary, and auto theft showed an increase, with the crime of theft showing a decrease.
3. In 1971, the crimes of robbery, burglary, theft, and auto theft showed decreases the only period in this comparison to exhibit a decrease in all four crimes.
4. It was during this six month period of 1971, that the police helicopter became operative. It was not until

the latter part of June, that the helicopter patrol gained a certain amount of expertise. The precise way to evaluate the helicopter's influence on the statistics for the six month period of 1971, would be to know what the statistics would have looked like without the helicopter program, and this kind of projection is at least imprecise.

HELICOPTER USE

Schedule B shows the monthly use statistics for each of the two helicopters:

SCHEDULE A

	March-May 1969	March-May 1970	Increase or (Decrease)	March-May 1970	March-May 1971	Increase or (Decrease)	June-August 1969	June-August 1970	Increase or (Decrease)	June-August 1970	June-August 1971	Increase or (Decrease)
MURDER	2	1	(1)	1	6	5	2	2	0	2	2	
RAPE	10	16	6	16	12	(4)	17	23	6	23	8	(1)
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	115	102	(13)	102	102	0	141	117	(24)	117	109	(8)
ROBBERY	93	66	(27)	66	79	13	71	76	5	76	73	(3)
BURGLARY	692	600	(92)	600	722	122	598	613	15	613	682	69
THEFT (OVER \$50)	334	347	13	347	378	31	384	282	(102)	282	334	52
AUTO THEFT	284	210	(74)	210	204	(6)	218	244	26	244	189	(55)
TOTAL	1530	1342	(188)	1342	1503	161	1431	1357	(74)	1357	1397	40

S C H E D U L E B

March

April

May

June

July

August

TOTAL

Individual Pilot Flight Time

A. Officer Turner	52.2 hrs.	86.0 hrs.	88.8 hrs.	37.0 hrs.	84.6 hrs.	54.4 hrs.	403.0
P. Officer Glover	35.8	83.8	87.3	75.8	27.0	94.2	403.9
C. Officer Freitas	32.6	72.9	70.1	69.0	87.9	52.8	385.3
D. Officer Maples	17.4	4.5	0	0	0	0	21.9
E. Officer Krug	0	0	0	0	1.0	15.3	16.3

Fuel (gallons)

1,234	2,518	2,377	1,732	1,806	2,111	11,77
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Oil (quarts)

14	25	30	25	27	31	152
----	----	----	----	----	----	-----

TOTAL FLIGHT TIME

SCHEDULE B

Helicopter N9637F
Helicopter N9638F

March	April	May	June	July	August	TOTAL
52.1 hrs.	126.3 hrs.	87.0 hrs.	80.7 hrs.	63.6 hrs.	99.0 hrs.	508.7 hrs.
86.6 hrs.	120.9 hrs.	155.0 hrs.	96.6 hrs.	136.9 hrs.	114.0 hrs.	710.0 hrs.

TOTAL

138.7 hrs.	247.2 hrs.	242.0 hrs.	177.3 hrs.	200.5 hrs.	213.0 hrs.	1218.7 hrs.
------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	-------------

Routine Preventive
Patrol Time

77.3 hrs.	141.0 hrs.	129.8 hrs.	113.6 hrs.	120.3 hrs.	133.6 hrs.	715.6 hrs.
-----------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------

Public Appearances

1.4	1.9	1.3	2.6	.5	2.1	9.8
-----	-----	-----	-----	----	-----	-----

Training

1.9	.5	4.9	1.1	2.1	20.1	30.6
-----	----	-----	-----	-----	------	------

Helicopter Assignments

A. Felonies

27	35	55	50	34	24	225
----	----	----	----	----	----	-----

B. Misdemeanors

40	55	83	54	51	45	328
----	----	----	----	----	----	-----

C. Miscellaneous Crime
Reports

534	849	823	636	742	913	4497
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------

TOTAL

601	939	961	740	827	982	5050
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------

Helicopter Assignments
Involving Arrests

A. Felonies

12	23	14	15	14	9	87
----	----	----	----	----	---	----

B. Misdemeanors

12	19	10	19	8	15	83
----	----	----	----	---	----	----

TOTAL

24	42	24	34	22	24	170
----	----	----	----	----	----	-----

Percentage of Assignments
to Arrests

A. Felonies

44.4%	65.7%	25.5%	30.0%	41.2%	37.5%	40.7%
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

B. Misdemeanors

30.0%	32.7%	12.1%	35.0%	15.7%	33.3%	26.5%
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

(1) Average

An examination of Schedule B reveals that the helicopters are averaging about 200 hours per month total air time. It is very encouraging to note that while the aircraft have been used for a few public appearances and some training, far more than 90 percent of the air time has been spent on preventive patrol or assignment to some specific offense.

A second positive aspect of this program shown in Schedule B is the high percentage of arrests per assignment (over 40 percent) on felonies. This note (four arrests per ten felony assignments) is far higher than a radio car rate.

PROGRAM EFFICIENCY

One important criterion of program success is whether the program is implemented as planned. Many large programs are very different in action than in planning or concept. It is also relevant to inquire as to whether most of the funds received were used for the central aspects of the program. The Richmond program has been doing very well by both these criteria. During the first six months of the project, equipment was purchased, arrangements for landing zones and maintenance were completed and four (4) pilots were selected, trained and licensed. The program was operational six months after initiation. Secondly, the cost of the two helicopters when added to the hourly rate for in-air time for the 1200-1300 hours of operational time anticipated by the end of the first year, totals approximately \$130,000. That is, aircraft cost plus maintenance,

gas and oil (excluding, training time) accounts for \$130,000 of the \$150,000 of federal funds received. By this standard, too, the program has been very efficient. Almost all administrative and other allied costs of the program have been borne locally.

END

7 11-11-11